

THE PILOTAGE COMMISSION.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) to an editorial appearing in *Le Progrès du Golfé*, issue of March 7 last, and which reads as follows:

At a sitting of a commission appointed to enquire into the pilotage of the St. Lawrence on Friday last, Captain Belanger, commander of the Eureka, on being called to give evidence in connection with the enquiry as to the conditions under which the work was being carried on at Rimouski, endeavoured, if newspaper reports are to be credited, to show that the men employed on the Eureka, in the course of the last season, were incompetent.

Just now, do we read in *L'Action Sociales* account of the captain's evidence, the boat is manned by Rimouski farmers, appointed for party considerations, on the recommendation of the member for the county and who have no knowledge whatever of navigation. These men are sent on board by Mr. Boulay, member for Rimouski.

Now, Captain, it will not be said that you were permitted to make such a false statement uncontradicted by any one. You insinuate, Sir, that only since Mr. Boulay is our representative is the pilotage service carried on by people from Pointe au Père and neighbouring places, people whom you brand as incompetent. However, that is false. You know as well as I do that the pilotage service here has always been performed by men of this locality and neighbouring points, barring one occasion. Once, while Mr. Ross was the representative of the county, you were allowed to choose your own men to man the ship, and you hired them in Quebec. Now, it is notorious that the pilotage service on that occasion was far from satisfactory, that several of your 'strangres' departed before their time was up and that you were under the necessity to replace them by men from Pointe au Père and the county. Which shows that then as to-day, we had in the district competent men, handy men, capable of handling the oars on the high sea.

And such are the men who were employed on the Eureka, on Mr. Boulay's recommendation.

But why, Captain, instead of making such absurd statements before the enquiry commission, did you not make reference to insufferable captains, surly, ill-tempered growling, cavilling and quarrelsome captains.

There are some such, Captain, as you know, but you did not refer to them in any way. We will do that for you one of these days. You will not be the loser for waiting a while, Boss.

To set the matter right, I may say that at the time the crew was engaged in April 1912, out of nineteen men, there were twelve I had recommended, and among them some men who had been formerly employed, who had served during the year previous.

By the month of July, Captain Belanger had managed things so well that, of the

men I had recommended, only six remained, he having recruited substitutes for them among his own friends.

That Mr. Belanger is still in the employ of the Government this year. He is a mischief-maker not only for the people of the locality, but for the whole of his crew, so much so that he dispenses with the services of thirty or forty men every year.

I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine to that state of affairs, and to request that the Government should dispense as promptly as possible with the services of that troublesome man who is unwilling to tell the truth before a commission of enquiry.

Mr. HAZEN: While I did not follow my hon. friend (Mr. Boulay) very closely, I understand that he is making reference to certain evidence given before the Pilotage Commission consisting of Mr. Robb, Captain Lindsay and Mr. Lachance, I expect, probably to-morrow, to be able to lay the report of these gentlemen upon the table, and perhaps it would be better to defer any discussion until the evidence is before hon. members of the House.

THE RULES OF THE HOUSE— LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Consideration of the proposed resolution of Mr. Borden, to amend rule 17 of the House of Commons, and the proposed motion of Mr. Hazen, that this question be now put, resumed from April 11.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): In discussing the proposed resolution, I do not wish to be considered as objecting to amendment of the rules of this House. As there is change of conditions, it is right and reasonable that there should be amendment of the rules. But, in objection to and emphatic protest against the resolution now before the House, I take the position that it is not a mere amendment of the rules; that it is a reversal or subversion of the principles upon which those rules are based; that it changes the constitution and purpose of this House of Commons in vital respects. I have followed the discussion in regard to the proposed rules, and, to my mind, the reasons which have been given are more objectionable than the rules themselves, if that were possible. It appears to me that this resolution is based upon an idea of the purpose of Parliament that is diametrically opposed to everything that we have been accustomed to believe in regard to that purpose. If I understand the purpose of Parliament correctly, it is to permit of discussion. Parliament represents the people of all parts and sections of Canada, and the purpose of the meeting of Parliament is that the views and opinions