

adopted their fiscal policy, and they seem to be slavish imitators of the policy of the United States ; but the policy of the United States is not what the hon. gentleman has stated in this matter. A seaman there has only to declare his intention to become a citizen, and, I believe, to take the oath of allegiance, before he can get a certificate ; but domicile for a term of years is unnecessary. If he is living in the United States and declares his intention to become a citizen, if he passes the examination he can obtain his certificate. Our law is much more illiberal. According to our law, he must remain in this country for three years before he can pass an examination. The question of residence has nothing to do with his fitness for the position of master of a vessel. He may be a Norwegian, a Swede, a Dane, a Greek, or may come from any maritime state, and may be fully qualified to take charge of a vessel, and yet, unless he remains three years in this country, he cannot fill that position. The question which should govern the Government should not be, Where does the man come from, or whither is he going ; what is his religion, his creed, his height or his colour ? but, What are his qualifications—is he a safe man to entrust the care of a vessel to ? If he has those qualifications it is absurd to say that he must have lived here for three years. I would suggest that this clause be amended by striking out the words "for at least three years," so that the clause will read :

"Examinations may be instituted in Canada for persons domiciled in Canada who intend to become masters or mates of ships, etc."

I knew a case of a Canadian by birth who was the master of a vessel which was sold by the owner about two years ago. This threw him out of employment, and he went across the line and became the master of an American vessel, which he sailed for one season. He had not left Canada, but when he came back here, having been the master of an American vessel he was unable to take a position similar to that which he had occupied here before. He had declared his intention to become an American citizen. He had probably taken the oath of allegiance, though he said he had not, but when he came here, having been the master of a Canadian vessel before, he could not become again the master of a Canadian vessel, unless he lived here for three years. That was a case of hardship. I am sure my hon. friend does not intend by this Bill to make it difficult, or even impossible, for Canadians who have gone to the United States to come back here and enter upon the same avocations which they previously pursued ; but that would be the result in such a case. I think the Bill would be much more in consonance with fair principles and fair play, and more in the interests of the ship-owners, as it would give them a wider scope in the selection of their officers, if these words were eliminated as I propose.

Mr. KENNY. I would not like the Committee to be under a misunderstanding. I do not know what happens in the inland waters of Canada, but I know as a fact that Nova Scotians who sailed as masters, and who had formerly qualified and obtained a certificate entitling them to sail a ship as masters in Canada, have subsequently commanded American ships. I assume that when they did that they had to take the oath of allegiance to the Government of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. CHARLTON. Suppose they did, if they wanted to come back again.

Mr. KENNY. That has been done. These men came back to Canada, and had no difficulty in the world, on the production of their English certificate, in resuming command of an English ship ; so that the argument as regards a foreign country, which the hon. gentleman has advanced, does not hold. I assure the hon. gentleman that it is not the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I assure the hon. gentleman from Halifax that I know the circumstances of the case to which I alluded. It is true this captain got employment again, but the question as to whether he had taken the oath of allegiance was kept in abeyance, it was not examined into at all, and if it had been examined into, and if it had been found that this captain had taken an oath of allegiance, he could not have got a certificate. I know this.

Mr. KENNY. It is an imaginary case.

Mr. CHARLTON. No ; it is an actual case. I know the owner of the vessel, I know the captain, I know the circumstances ; I visited the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and know all about it.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree with the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) in thinking that can be done.

Mr. FRASER. I can understand that the case mentioned by the member for Halifax might occur through ignorance, but not otherwise ; because he knows very well that in such a case, if it was known that he was an American citizen, although he may have had an English certificate, if the ship was lost at sea the owner could not collect the insurance.

Mr. TUPPER. The Committee ought to understand that if we emasculate this Bill we leave as law all that hon. gentlemen are now opposing. That is the law of the land now, and if we cut off this clause we will fail to do what every ship-owner in Canada desire us to do, that is, to make the law what they have supposed it to be since 1883. That is one reason why I urge the Committee that we should not go so far afield and discuss general reforms, when all that was required was merely to make the present law more workable. The amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman will make this clause ridiculous. If we take out the words "for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years," then the section reads, "Examinations may be instituted in Canada for persons who intend to become masters or mates," and so on.

Mr. CHARLTON. No ; that is not what I suggest. My amendment is that the words "for at least three years" be struck out, and the clause then reads : "Examinations may be instituted in Canada for persons domiciled in Canada who intend to become masters."

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to say that if a Canadian goes over to the United States and declares his intention of becoming a resident, and applies for papers, they will be granted. Now, I do not think such is the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I know it is the case.