

suppose he will want his usual fee as allowed by the Dominion Act. Am I correct or not on this point?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is correct to a certain extent. I am not speaking in regard to the Act relating to port wardens. I am quite aware that in certain cases, where a port warden is required, he is allowed certain fees; but the hon. gentleman pointed out that every collector would come on board the ship and demand a fee for inspection. I again repeat that the Act speaks for itself. Collectors when they board ships cannot collect any fee.

Mr. KENNY. The Minister has informed the Committee that those interested in marine matters on the inland waters have asked for this Bill. There seems to be a difference of opinion as regards the necessity of the measure among hon. gentlemen who are very much better informed than I am in all matters connected with inland navigation; but, as regards the Atlantic coasting trade, the Minister has not told us that any requests have been made for this Bill as regards those waters. I must say it will be a very heavy tax if our small coasting vessels are obliged to either line their craft or put in shifting boards for cargoes of grain. While I make that statement from my own knowledge of the business, I am aware that cargoes of grain shipped from Prince Edward Island in vessels of say 30, 50, 60, or 70 tons, very frequently use shifting boards, and those cargoes are often composed of different articles and the boards are used to keep them separate. But even when the cargo is exclusively oats, vessels coming to the port of Halifax, at least, sometimes use shifting boards. I do not say that that is inevitably the case, I say it is very frequently the case. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) who stated that he thought a very great hardship would be imposed if small coasting vessels of 30 or 40 tons going to Pictou to load coal were obliged to put in shifting boards to make that short voyage. But if I understand the Bill aright, I do not think it proposes to oblige such vessels to use shifting boards. I should like the Minister to correct me if I am wrong. As I read the Bill it says: "Shifting boards or other proper precautions," to prevent grain cargoes from shifting.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman will read the main section he will find the other precautions, "shipping grain in bags or in barrels."

Mr. KENNY. The bill says "or otherwise." Who is to decide that question? I suppose it is to be left to the officers of the Government to decide, in some places harbor masters or port wardens and at other points Custom officers. I really do not know if the Bill is necessary as regards the inland waters, and upon that point I do not express any opinion. I do not think it is necessary in our Atlantic waters or for our coasting trade, but I do not think, at the same time, it would impose any very great tax on our coasting trade. If it does, I think we should take all the precautions we can to protect our coasters. We know that many of the vessels in the fall make one voyage only, and it would be too costly to fit them up with shifting boards for one voyage. Reference has been made to the expense, \$50, \$60 or \$70. That would not be a very large amount for a voyage from New York to Liverpool, but it would be coasting, for a vessel carrying only a small cargo of oats from Prince Edward Island to the mainland of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. The rate of freight as we all know is very low, and I will ask the Minister to do all he possibly can to protect these coasting vessels from any unnecessary expense. I cannot remember in my experience an instance where a small coasting vessel was lost owing to the cargo shifting. We have had disasters on the Atlantic from cargoes shifting, but I am not aware of a cargo of grain in a coasting vessel ever having shifted.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not want to place my opinion against the opinion of seafaring men from the eastern Provinces,
Mr. WELSH.

but among the workingmen who sail the vessels and are employed on the vessels on the inland lakes there is a strong feeling, there is an agitation in fact in favor of a greater extent of protection for their lives, and so far as the Bill has relation to inland waters I will give it my hearty support. It does not, however, go far enough in that direction in some particulars. I do not see why a provision as to deck loads should not be made applicable to the inland waters. As I read the law at present and the amending Act, there is no provision preventing vessels on the inland waters from placing loads on the deck to any extent whatever. I should be very glad if the Minister of Marine could see his way to providing a load line for vessels on the inland waters. As British ships have this load line to-day, I do not see why Canadian shipowners should be allowed to drown their men with any greater freedom than is allowed in England. With respect to the objection to shifting boards on the ground of expense, gentlemen who have spoken in regard to the Atlantic coasting trade may have some good reason for objecting to it, but, as regards the inland waters, the lack of these is a fruitful source of loss of life, and I hope the Minister of Marine will adhere to this provision in regard to the inland waters.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No doubt from the remarks offered these provisions are required for the inland waters, but the general opinion of hon. members from the Maritime Provinces acquainted with the coasting trade is that it is unnecessary as regards that trade and would involve a large expense. In the opinion of the hon. member for Queen's N.B., the hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh), all of whom have had experience in shipping matters, this would be a very harsh provision in regard to small vessels running between Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, carrying cargoes of oats from the island to those points. The provisions respecting the inland waters and those relating to the Atlantic coasting trade should constitute separate Bills. That respecting the inland waters would meet with general satisfaction. That relating to our coasting trade would be an interference with it, and it is not necessary.

Mr. MULLOCK. I quite agree with the remarks of the Minister of Marine who, when asked if any petitions had been presented by ship-builders in favor of the Bill, replied that petitions had been received in favor of the Bill from those who navigated the vessels. Speaking only from public opinion in the inland portions of the Dominion, I entirely sympathise with the object aimed at by the Bill. I do not know whether the provisions are adequate to meet the case in point, and I do not intend to offer an opinion upon that question; but it is safe to say that the absence of the protection proposed has been the cause of the loss of many valuable lives on the inland waters. We are developing an immense inland fleet for the carrying of cargoes on our great inland seas, cargoes of shifting freight, such as wheat and grain. We are building up an enormous inland port of shipment for grain at the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we also have a vast number of Canadian vessels carrying wheat from Duluth, Chicago and other American ports, and there is scarcely a limit to the extent to which that trade can be developed. It must be in the memory of many hon. gentlemen here, and I am sure that my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) will remember, the loss of great vessels owing entirely to the shifting of cargoes. I think, speaking from memory, the propeller *Asia* foundered in the Georgian Bay from that cause alone. It is impossible for those huge propellers carrying twenty or thirty thousand bushels of grain, in a heavy sea such as there sometimes is in the inland waters, to "wear" without being cast over on their beam ends, and in such a case, if the cargo shifts the vessel cannot right, and down she goes. It has been