

navigation of the river, recommending that second class pilots should be established, and that all sailing vessels between 80 and 250 tons should be made subject to pilotage dues, as well as all steamers of whatever size they might be. Practically, this resolution would require that all steamers, of whatever description, below 250 tons, and other vessels engaged in that service, should take the services of second class pilots; and all vessels below 80 tons would not require a pilot on board at all.

**MR. MITCHELL:** Will any discrimination be made in the rate of pilotage fees between first and second class pilots?

**MR. SMITH:** It is left entirely to the Harbour Commissioners to make rules, which, however, are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. That power is now possessed.

**MR. LANGEVIN:** Is the pilotage rate now fixed by law or left entirely to the Harbour Commissioners?

**MR. SMITH:** They have the power; yes.

**MR. LANGEVIN:** In this case is a rate to be established by the Bill?

**MR. SMITH:** No; it will be established by the Harbour Commissioners, subject, however, to the approval of the Governor in Council. This is intended to secure the services of skilful men on board of all steamers and of the smaller class of vessels. They will require to have a second-class license, and it will be sufficient if one of the hands or the captain or mate has the certificate of a second-class pilot.

**MR. MITCHELL:** Am I to understand that the Bill which the hon. gentleman intends to introduce will provide that the owners of decked vessels and the smaller class of steamers, or any steamers under a certain class, shall be entitled, if they choose to hire a holder of a second-class certificate as an officer, a captain or a mate or a hand?

**MR. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. BLANCHET:** Will this proposed amendment to the Pilotage Act affect the pilots below Quebec.

**MR. SMITH:** No.

*Motion agreed to.*

**MR. SMITH.**

MALT DUTY BILL.—[BILL No. 61.]

(*Mr. Laurier.*)

FIRST READING.

Resolution reported from Committee of the Whole (March 22nd) *read the first and second time and agreed to.*

**MR. LAURIER** introduced a Bill (No. 61) Respecting the duty on malt.

*Bill read the first time.*

KEEWATIN MUNICIPALITIES BILL.—  
[BILL No. 23]

(*Mr. Mills.*)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

(In the Committee)

On Section 21,

**MR. LANGEVIN** suggested that the ballot system, as adopted in the Province of Quebec, should be introduced into the Bill.

**MR. MILLS** said the Bill provided against frauds. The ballots were initialed and endorsed with the name of the returning officer, and it was impossible to carry them out of the poll house without being detected. The provision in the Bill was sufficient to prevent them being taken away, which was all that could be accomplished by the scheme proposed by the hon. member for Charlevoix.

**MR. LANGEVIN** said that a voter after coming out of the compartment in which he went to mark his ticket, might rush out, unperceived by the officer, with his ticket in his pocket. The result of which act might be fraud. That ticket would be marked by an outside party and given to another elector to deposit, who would return with a similar blank ticket to be marked and handed to another voter in the same manner, and so continue until the end of the election. True, the offender could be punished, but the fraud continued. Under the system adopted in Quebec this was avoided.