

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): This section stood over last night for further consideration, and I submit that the question does not now arise.

Mr. POULIOT: This section is not an independent section of the bill; it is the whole bill. The whole thing will rest upon the shoulders of the minister, for whom I have great respect, and I want him to be empowered with full authority when these powers are conferred upon him. That is the point. You cannot give powers to a dummy; the minister must first receive authority to control the harbours of the country before these harbours are transferred to him. This is elementary; it is common sense, and the legislation should be drafted in that way. There were complaints yesterday about the way in which the legislation was drafted, and those complaints were serious. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that you are here not to please anyone but to see that the rules are observed and that discussion is carried on in accordance with the elementary principles of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. RINFRET: May I point out to the hon. gentleman that there is a precedent for having the legislation in this form. I recollect distinctly that last year the government introduced several bills that were interwoven. There was a bill transferring to the tariff board the activities under the combines act; there was another bill creating a commission on trade and commerce, one of the sections of which bill provided that the commission should be under the tariff board; and then there was an amendment to the Tariff Board Act. These were all considered together on the distinct understanding that none of the bills would be put into force until they had all been passed. I submit to the hon. member that he is raising with some emphasis a point of order which is really not in keeping with the common practice in this chamber. I understand, moreover, that the point was left in abeyance last night, and I see no objection to our proceeding with the bill in the meantime.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not insist upon it, but if I raise a point of order it is because an hon. gentleman the other day said that I was an expert on points of order. One thing more. The rulings of the chair in the last five years, and the legislation passed in the last five years cannot be cited as a precedent; it is all wrong.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: There is no reason in the world why we should not go on with the bill, but I do not think it should

be passed until the department of transport has been set up. I do not see how you can pass a bill referring matters to the minister of transport when there is not a minister of transport. But there is no reason why we should not go on with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Johnston, Lake Centre): The section having to do with the minister of transport was allowed to stand.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The minister is making light of the suggestion put forward by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. The minister said that many evils had grown up in the administration of the harbours; he went into that fully and used some extreme language. I can see in this clause, however, nothing that alters at all the situation in regard to patronage. Personally I am glad that he has brought down the bill if its terms are made satisfactory to everyone. I think something was needed to alter the administration of the harbours and to put them into a more businesslike shape.

But let me submit this to the minister as far as patronage goes, and that is one of the evils to which he referred last night. It is one of the things which, we know, have happened through the years, the difficulties in regard to the employment of persons by the harbour commissions, the manner in which they are to be selected, and the right claimed by members in constituencies in which there are harbours to name the persons to be appointed. There is in the proposal now before us nothing whatever that changes that situation in any way. If, as I assume, the minister is desirous of bettering the administration of the harbours in respect of patronage, there should be a different arrangement from that which is proposed in this section, because as far as I am able to visualize it the position in connection with the appointment of persons in the different harbours will be exactly the same as it has been in the past. I know the difficulties that exist, but I urge the minister to consider the position in which he will place himself. As Minister of Transport administering the canals, if he has to appoint an engineer on one of these canals he must go to the civil service commission. I see no harm in that; it has been working out very well. On the other hand, if he wants an engineer in the harbour of Vancouver or in Saint John he can appoint that man himself; that is to say, the man is appointed by the board which is under his direction and the minister does not have to go to the civil service commission at all. There is a small canal in the constituency of Argenteuil, which I have the honour to represent, and if a