

some influence in the Cabinet, yet, as in Great Britain, the principal point in forming an Administration here ought to be and would be power, influence and status in Parliament. That, I think, was the sum of my observations on that occasion, or on all occasions when the subject was brought up. With respect to this Bill I would say that the particular reason for increasing the number of members of the Treasury Board to six was not only that the number was limited to six, but to six specified officers—Ministers, and sometimes it might happen that one of those Ministers could more conveniently sit aside and allow another Minister to take his place. There is this further reason for making this arrangement that it was sometimes found that we could not get a quorum of the Treasury Board, four being a quorum, and we would have a much better chance of obtaining a quorum at all times by having six instead of four. With respect to the hon. member's remarks as to the work of the Treasury Board, I may say we have found that in its practical operation the Treasury Board operates to a very considerable extent, as their attention is directed to matters that are specially confided to them, and, like the Auditor-General, they are very efficient in the way of giving information to Council in regard to various matters brought before them. The quorum will be four, and I fancy, practically, the Board will be as it has been, composed of four members. But sometimes, as I have said, we have not been able to secure a quorum of the individual members of the Government certified by statute to form the Board.

Mr. MILLS. The right hon. gentleman has overlooked the complaint made by my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Blake), that the Minister of Finance, in introducing this Bill, declared that it was necessary to give further provincial representation on the Treasury Board. It was to that point especially that my hon. friend directed the attention of the House. The First Minister has told us that this feature of provincial representation in the Cabinet was one which, although at the time the discussion took place he declared to be necessary, was one which would ultimately disappear; that it was necessary in the first instance because members of the House were, in a great measure, strangers to each other, and also because some of the Provinces were not favorable to Union. All that might be quite true at the time Confederation was established. But the right hon. gentleman has failed to point out to the House the necessity of giving further provincial representation on the Treasury Board. But the Finance Minister, in proposing this measure, has not declared that a larger Treasury Board was necessary; he has pointed out that some of the Provinces which are not now represented on the Treasury Board ought to be represented. That is the statement of the Minister who introduced the Bill, and in defence of that statement the First Minister has said nothing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has spoken about representation of the different Provinces on the Treasury Board. If any of the Provinces are not represented in the Cabinet they cannot be represented on the Treasury Board. That is quite clear. But this arrangement will give an opportunity to utilise on the Treasury Board the services of any provincial representative in the Cabinet. To show you how impartial we are in our operating of the present Act I may say that Quebec, one of the largest Provinces, is not represented on the Treasury Board at all. The four present members of that board are, two from Ontario, and two from New Brunswick; neither Quebec nor Nova Scotia has a representative on it.

Mr. BLAKE. Of what consequence then is it that the number should be increased?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose it is of very great consequence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad the First Minister says that, because I thought it was unfortunate that the Minister of Finance should have formally announced that it was the desire of the Cabinet to extend provincial representation to such a body as the Treasury Board. I am glad to find that the First Minister practically disclaims that idea, and I think he is deserving of all support from this side of the House for disclaiming the idea of extending this provincial representation further. I have heard him and other hon. gentlemen opposite again and again declare—and I agree with them—that our object in this House should be to become Canadians to a great extent—not forgetting individual Provinces, but still remembering that we are inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada, and that sentiment I most heartily agree with. I cannot, however, for the life of me, see what is the object, after the statement of the First Minister, of adding the sixth member to this board. All of us who have had an experience of this kind of thing know that a small board is generally more serviceable, and does its work better, than a large one, and even if there be a reason for adding the fifth member, in the person of the Secretary of State, I think it is a good reason for not having the sixth member. Five, an odd number, is always more convenient on a committee, as it prevents a dead lock; and I do not think, from my recollection of the attendance of hon. gentlemen opposite at the capital out of Session, that he will find it very easy to get four men together, or even three, which, I think, is the present quorum.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 105) respecting the Bank of British Columbia. He said: I may read for the information of the House a memorandum which has been given to me, in explanation of the objects of the Bill:

"The Bank of British Columbia was incorporated by Royal charter dated 31st May, 1862, and supplemental charter dated 30th August, 1865, to carry on banking business in certain portions of British North America for twenty-one years from date of original charter, or until 31st May, 1883. By supplemental charter dated 11th May, 1883, this time was extended for a year, and by further supplemental charter dated 27th May, 1884, the charter was further extended for ten years from 31st May, 1884, subject to the general banking laws of the Colonies in which its business may be carried on. The object of this Bill is to declare what banking laws of the Dominion of Canada are applicable to the bank, and the provisions made applicable are those that relate to the general conduct of banking business, viz:—those providing for returns, the limit of circulation (which is not to exceed the amount of the unimpaired paid up capital), the denomination of notes allowed to be issued and the payment thereof in case of insolvency, dividends, reserves, powers of the bank in holding real estate, etc., and the penalties for the breach of all provisions made applicable to the bank, but the internal regulations are not touched. The provisions made applicable to the Bank of British North America are made applicable to this bank and for the purposes of the Act Victoria is made the head office of the bank. The charter of the bank provides for a double liability of the shareholders, in case of the winding up of the bank. The Bill has been submitted to the authorities of the bank in England and has been approved by them."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman aright, that all the regulations of our Banking Act shall in future apply to the British Columbia Bank?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think at present they are not required to hold any particular amount of legal tenders?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And in future do you require that they shall hold the same amount as the banks of Canada?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, they will be brought under the operation of the Banking Act.