of the money of the port. The hon. mover of the amendment must have been influenced by some after-thought-

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON-The hon.

gentleman is in error.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST would not attribute motives, but what he had stated about the gentleman who was willing to accept the office without renumeration, was as correct as what the hon, member had stated about the gentleman he thought would obtain the appointment. 'The latter had never been a political friend of bis. The Government had to appoint five men, and they were good and honest men who would perform their duties as members of the Board; two other members were appointed by the shipping interest, one by the Board of Trade of Levis, and another by the Board of Trade of Quebec. When the hon. gentleman declared they had violated a sacred compact with certain merchants, he could not be serious. When were the Government bound by such a compact, when were they prevented or precluded from making any better arrangements for the disposition of the port affairs of Quebec? Such a compact, if it existed, would be a ridiculous arrangement, and one which could not stand against the power of the legislature of this country. The hon. gentleman also said something about the vigilance of Parliament. was all very well, but he did not believe the hon. gentleman should take such high ground on a question of small importance like this. He hoped the motion of his hon. friend would not be sustained by the House. It was true the hon. gentlemen had not made an appeal to their friends from Lower Canada to make this a sectional question, but he trusted they would not look at it in that light, and that a fair remuneration should be allowed for this office.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said the Govcomment might think it was a small matter to break faith with the merchants of Quebec, but he considered there was no such thing as little breaches of faith; no such thing as small violations of honour, either by men or by governments. hoped hon, gentlemen of the nationality of the proposed Chairman of the Commission would resist this motion. If it were necessary for the Government to provide for this gentleman, let it be done openly the Board an annual salary not exceeding by pension out of the consolidated Dominion, not fund of the but him onthe pension of Quebec and Ontario, exempting the chants and traders of Quebec, an oppor-

rest of the Dominion. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that they had discovered that the Chairman of the Harbour Commission of Montreal was a paid officer. He did not say when he had became a paid officer. Would he be surprised to hear that the Chairman of the Commission of Montreal harbour was an unpaid official for about forty years. He was an unpaid officer down to the time this salary was provided for him by the present Administration in 1874. In the seasion of that year the present Government introduced and passed bill a authorizing his being paid a salary of \$2,000 a year. In doing so they sunk, so far as that harhour was concerned, a sum of \$50,000 which should have been expended, and would have been expended in improvements in the harbour, had it not been sunk in order to provide an annuity for that gentleman. He would move, seconded by Mr. Ryan, that the amendments be not now con-, curred in, but that it be taken into consideration this day three months.

Hon. Mr SKEAD said this matter was of great importance, and his sympathies were largely with the gentleman whom it was intended should fill the office. It was true that some of the merchants were large contributors to the fund out of which the salary would be paid, but it should be remembered that the greater portion of it was borne by the vessels trading at Quebec, and distributed among them it was a small amount. At first he thought the question of some magnitude, but taking this view of it, its proportions lessened somewhat, and he would vote

with the Government.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said this was a very harmless Bill when first introduced. It was to correct certain errors which had crept into the legislation of last year. It went down to the other House, however, and came back at this late period with the important amendment.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE St. JUST said the Bill in its present state had been

before the Chamber ten days-

Hon. Mr. RYAN said at any rate the Bill had not been printed with the amendment, and it might be objected from that point of formality. As very few had seen the amendment, he would read it as follows :- "Clause A-The Harbour Commissioners may pay to the Chairman of \$2,000 out of the revenues of the Harbour." The least that could have been trade done in this matter was to give the mer-