

examination. He defended the general principles of the bill as being in the interests of the public. The leader of the Opposition apparently did not object to the bill, except in so far as it gave the Government power to appoint a number of inspectors.

Mr. Meredith—I was only discussing the clause.

Mr. Fraser said this was not a very reasonable objection on Mr. Meredith's part. The Dominion Government appointed inspectors in the case of steamboats, etc., and there seemed equal reason for Provincial inspectors in the case of matters not touched by the Dominion.

Mr. Phelps, who has taken an active part in opposing the bill from its inception up to the present time, said there were 6,000 engines in use, giving employment to 18,000 men, and this bill would involve great loss of time and not less than \$130,000 out of the pockets of the employers.

Mr. Davis remarked that the object of the bill was to provide regulations by which life might be protected. It seemed to be a recognised principle that when a bill involving a new departure was introduced it should be as moderate as possible, and that was the reason why this measure was moderate as it was. The hon. gentleman observed that those who read the newspapers accounts of accidents caused by defects in boilers would admit that something should be done to protect the lives of the citizens. The inspection need cause very little expense.

Mr. Meredith thought the bill so important that it should not be in the hands of the private members, but should be taken up by the Government as the Factory Act had been. He would approve of any legislation that would secure competent men to fill the positions of engineers, but he did not approve of giving the Government the power of appointing these officials. They should be appointed by the Councils of the various municipalities. He thought it unreasonable that men should be required to be examined every year, also that every man should have to pay two dollars for a certificate, to be renewed every year, to continue to carry on the occupation he had been hitherto engaged in. Why should all this money be taken from the engineers? Then, again, there was no provision for these annual examinations, no means by which they were to be held, though the bill, if it passed, was to come into effect next year. As to boiler inspection, why should not the Inspectors under the Factory Act have the power to inspect boilers? The scheme suggested would cost too much. He thought Mr. Garson would altogether fail in his object if the bill became law as it is. It would create so much agitation through the Province, he (Mr. Meredith) felt convinced that so far from any reasonable scheme of inspection being allowed, it would be impossible to enact such a measure after this had become law. He would not oppose the bill absolutely, because he believed in something being done in the direction in which the bill pointed.

The Hon. Mr. Hardy said that although many of its objectionable clauses had been removed, it still appeared to him that the bill went further in some directions than it ought to go, or than it was desirable it should go. He did not know whether the hon. gentleman would be prepared to accept the provisions as to the voluntary sections with powers of granting certificates to the engineers as to their standing in their profession. So far as that went he (Mr. Hardy) was prepared to lay the foundation of some system such as the hon. member was desirous of promoting. There were objections to these annual inspections, and he saw that there was no discrimination between the cost as it affected a boiler of 20 horse-power and one of 100 or 200 horse-power. There ought to be some regulating provisions in that matter. Then, again, if the bill were passed it ought to include some legislation which would prevent an engineer being thrown out of employment should he fail to pass his first examination. He thought that if the bill was not so wide in its scope and so general in its operation it would be a useful measure.

Mr. Lees opposed the bill and seconded Mr. Raeside's amendment that the Committee now rise.

Hon. Mr. Gibson discussed the question at some length, defending the principles of the bill and admitting that it might be modified in respect to some of its details. He thought it would be much fairer if Mr. Meredith, when he wanted to kill a bill, were to come out and oppose it altogether, instead of taking the attitude he had taken on this bill. He suggested, too, that if the House pleased the bill need not become law until the 1st of April, 1891, instead of 1st January, 1891, and then the House could, if it saw fit, remodel the bill on the line of public opinion as it had been reflected during the interim.

Mr. Meredith—The Provincial Secretary had no right to impute motives to him as he had just done. He was sorry that hon. gentleman had added himself to those members of the Government who were in the habit of lecturing the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Fraser—Mr. Gibson was quite justified in saying what he had said, in view of what Mr. Meredith had said just now.

Mr. Ingram spoke in support of the bill. Mr. Mack was inclined to support the bill if it were introduced by the Government upon the lines suggested by the member for London, because it would involve less expense.

Mr. Raeside's amendment, that the Committee now rise, the effect of which would have been to kill the bill under consideration, was then put and defeated by 37 to 35.

Then, it being six o'clock, the Committee rose and reported and the Speaker left the chair.

After recess the House again went into Committee on Mr. Garson's bill respecting engineers and boilers, and Mr. Meredith moved an amendment embodying his proposition that the Municipal Councils rather than the Government should be given the power of appointing one or more inspectors to carry out the purposes of the bill. Mr. Garson, Mr. Hardy and Mr. Gibson (Huron) argued that such an amendment would make the bill almost valueless, and that it would prevent anything in the shape of uniformity in the certificates that would be granted under such a system. Mr. Meredith said he merely wanted to make the appointment of inspectors permissive. It should be so at least in the first instance. Mr. Garson insisted that the law would become inoperative under such an amendment. The

Municipal Councils had already all they could do without having this matter added to their work. Moreover, if the inspectors were appointed by the Government and anything went wrong, people would know just where to put the blame. Mr. Meredith still insisted that the permissive character of the amendment would outweigh these considerations. Hon. Mr. Fraser strongly opposed the amendment. It would, even if it were accepted and were possessed of merit, almost kill the bill, inasmuch as it would necessitate the recasting of the entire bill, which would be almost impossible at this time of the year. Mr. Garson quoted statistics to show the loss of life occasioned by boiler explosions and the consequent necessity that something should be done in the direction the bill looks to. After a few words from Mr. Raeside the amendment was put and lost.

Mr. Meredith then objected to the technical character of the examinations which the engineers were required to pass and to the graded certificates proposed. He moved that all the words in the clause as above printed after the first two lines be struck out, and the words "for the purposes of this Act" be substituted. The amendment was accepted by a vote of 34 to 25.

The next clause of the bill was passed without amendment.

Then Mr. Lees, of Lanark, suddenly made an attempt to kill the bill by moving again that the Committee arise, instead of continuing the consideration of the bill.

The motion was put without discussion, and defeated by 32 to 25, and the consideration of the bill was resumed.

Mr. Waters recommended the withdrawal of the bill for the present session. He did not approve at all of its provisions, but a bill might be introduced next year that would be better considered and that would be more apt to attain the object of the hon. member introducing it. Mr. Garson said the bill had already been considered for three years, and that should be sufficient for it. Mr. Waters' advice was not at all consistent with his practice in regard to the bill (Woman Suffrage) which he himself had brought in year after year in the face of advice repeatedly tendered him to withdraw it. Mr. Conmee did not want to see the bill dropped altogether. He was in favor of the principle of the bill and it could be modified so that any objectionable features contained in it could be removed. Mr. Lees said he had been on the Committee that had considered the bill. He had disapproved of it in the first instance, and he disapproved of it still, in spite of all the modifications made in it.

Mr. Caldwell pointed out that where the greatest risk was was in the small mills, where the owner himself possibly set the engine in motion and then left it in charge of a boy. In the larger mills the owners would never trust machinery to other than competent men. The effect of the proposal would be that a power would be created which would control the manufacturing industry to a greater extent than the owners. He hoped the bill would not be allowed to pass, and

Globe
April 2nd

131