

*The Address—Mr. Pearkes*

too greatly mistaken I would say that the electoral funds coming from these tolerances would amount to over \$2 million in four years.

**An hon. Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):** That is the situation.

**Mr. Gibson:** What party gets this?

**Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):** In Quebec province the government is Union Nationale. Mr. Speaker, I should not like to go past my time. I have been speaking for a long time now. If I come back to the question it is because I see the danger, I see the evil done by the immoderate consumption of liquor. I repeat my request to the Minister of National Health and Welfare to help the different organizations in the country, and especially in Ontario and Quebec, so that these organizations will not see their work fade away and get discouraged after many efforts carried on and many years of battle on the right front.

**Mr. G. R. Pearkes (Nanaimo):** Mr. Speaker, may I join with those who have already taken part in this debate by offering my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Larson) and the seconder (Mr. Dumas) of the address. Both of them carried their task through in an admirable manner, worthy of the highest traditions of this house.

In the time at my disposal I desire to make a few observations regarding the intimation that was given in the speech from the throne that amendments to the Canada Shipping Act would be introduced during this session. My remarks will be based upon various occurrences which have happened during the last few months on the Pacific coast.

In the first place I understand that the amendments will be mainly based upon recommendations which have been received from the international convention on the improvements for safety at sea, and they will also be prompted by the findings of the court of inquiry which investigated the tragic disaster of the burning of the *Noronic* last year. I do not intend to go into details regarding that aspect of these amendments, but I should like to say at this time that I hope restrictions placed on small vessels operating in waters that are not far removed from the shore will not be so stringent as to make it impossible for those vessels to carry on their normal trade. It might be that recommendations will be made, which would be more applicable to the larger vessels, that would cause such a heavy expense upon the smaller passenger-carrying vessels as to put them out

of action, and make it impossible for their companies to carry on effectively. It might be that recommendations can be made applicable to larger vessels that would cause such an increase in the weight of the smaller vessels plying in safer waters as to very seriously reduce the carrying capacity of these smaller vessels and ferries.

Also there is the danger that if some types of automatic sprinkler systems were installed there might be just as great a danger from flooding as might exist from the danger of fire. I just close that part of my address with these remarks.

I now want to refer to an occurrence which happened last November just off the coast of Vancouver island. I refer to the sinking of the tug *George McGregor*, which left Bamberton on Vancouver island at midnight on November 25 destined for Victoria. After passing into the open sea she ran into very heavy weather and sank with the loss of the entire crew of seven men with the exception of one young deckhand. A very thorough and efficiently conducted court of inquiry was held in Victoria this year on the sinking of that vessel. The finding of the court was that the *George McGregor* had foundered through losing her stability under adverse weather conditions. Reading from that report the statement is summed up in these words:

After reflecting on all other potential factors we—

That is, the court.

—took the view that this was lack of stability in that the vessel once inclined had a righting lever too low for all conditions of weather that might reasonably be encountered and in particular of the conditions of the vessel in the weather that night.

Then the court went on to examine the various causes of this disaster. It exonerated the crew, the company, the steamship inspectors and all those who were connected with the loss. In fact, the court gave high credit to all those officials and to the members of the crew for having done everything that might reasonably have been expected of good seamen to have saved the vessel.

Referring to the steamship inspectors, after complimenting them upon having carried out to the best of their ability the inspection of this vessel some time before she had gone on this voyage, the court reported:

The steamship inspectors knew that the vessel had been classed in a recognized classification society of the United States, and there was nothing whatever in her construction or otherwise to raise any question in their minds as to her stability. In these circumstances it has not been the practice to carry out inclining experiments.

Then, a little later on, the report goes on to make recommendations, one of which was to call to the attention of the Department of