

there was less press of business than now, at the eleventh hour. He thought that if the Government were satisfied with having only two Ministers representing them in this House it was nothing for this House to grieve over. In England the number of members of the Cabinet in the House of Lords varied with the different Ministries. He hoped his hon. friend would withdraw his motion.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said that his views were fully in accord with those of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He had seconded the motion, but only out of politeness to the mover, and he hoped the latter would now withdraw it, as it was too late in the session to bring the matter before the House. There were enough Ministers to bring Government measures fairly before the House. This was, at any rate, a matter for the Government themselves. (Hear, hear)

Hon. Mr. LEFELLIER DE ST. JUST remarked on the lateness of the period at which the motion had been brought forward, and said if the mover did not withdraw it he would be obliged to move the previous question. He went on to say that at the time of Confederation there were four members of the Cabinet in this House, but that number was subsequently reduced gradually to two, and it would be more difficult to return to that state of things than it would have been to maintain it. Two new Colonies had been added to the Confederation, one of which had received representation in the Cabinet, at the expense of the other Provinces. That was a further reason why they could not have a larger number of Ministers in the Senate.

HARBOR MASTER.

The House went into Committee on the bill for the appointment of Harbor Masters in certain cases, which was explained by Hon. Mr. Scott. Their salaries would range from \$300 to \$600 a year, according to the importance of the harbor.

Hon. Mr. RYAN—By whom to be appointed?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—By the Government in Council.

The bill was reported without amendment and passed.

THE MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION.

The House went into Committee on the bill respecting the Montreal Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners. Hon. Mr. Kaulbach in the chair.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT explained the measure, one of the chief objects of which was to

give the Government the control of the Board, which would be composed of nine gentlemen, five appointed by Government. A large amount of public money was spent on that harbor for which the goods distributed all over the Dominion had paid duties. Therefore, though the harbor was, in a sense, a local work, in other senses it concerned the whole Dominion, a very large amount of public money being annually spent upon its improvement. It was necessary, then, that Government should be responsible for its due expenditure. Of the remainder of the Board, one gentleman was to represent the shipping interests, one the Board of Trade, another the Corn Exchange, and the fourth would be the Mayor of the city. Heretofore each of those bodies elected its representative at the Harbour Board, but it was proposed, for hereafter, to take the already elected head or president. The President of the Commission would receive an annual indemnity not exceeding \$2,000 a year, from the revenues.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL could not say he approved of the changes described by the Secretary of State. He did not think it was fair to legislate in the direction contemplated by the first clause. The present Commissioners had been elected under an existing Act of Parliament, those representing the Board of Trade, Corn Exchange and City Corporation for five years, subject to a removal any year by a ballot. They might remain in for five years, or be changed by one going out yearly. This bill then, said in the most arbitrary way, they should cease to form a portion of the Board after the first of August next.

Hon. Mr. LEFELLIER—How did you treat the Legislative Council of Quebec and Ontario when you passed Confederation? You did the same thing.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL denied it.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Yes, you did. There was the case of Mr. Philip Moore.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said there was an easy explanation; there were not seats enough for all the members of the Council representing Quebec under the old system. They legislated nobody out of his seat, nor did they say that Philip Moore should not hold a seat. But in this case Government desired to act in a way extremely arbitrary, and contrary to the ordinary spirit of Legislation. He did not see any reason in the world why they should assent to a change of that kind, to the prejudice of those three gentlemen who had been elected by proper authority, under an Act of Parliament for five years.