

House. Some say they will go for reducing them one half. I would not go for that at the present time, for the simple reason that I believe in a representative Government we ought to have a deliberative body sufficient to think, consider and weigh all matters that come before us.

Mr. STEVENS.—A constitutional change like this requires us to exercise mature deliberation. There is not a member around the House but would be inclined to give the question a calm consideration, in order that the best results might be obtained. A great deal has been said in regard to the expressions of the people of the country. It is said they expect us to retrench at this time. If retrenchment is necessary now it is necessary at all times. Whatever the people wish me to do in this question I would do, for it is their own business; but I do not know the minds of the people of Charlotte, whether they want the representation reduced or not, for it is a question that has not been much considered. Should I, on returning home, find the people wished this reduction to be made, I would be well prepared to vote upon the amendment. I make these remarks because I do not see the reason for any hurry in passing a measure of this kind; even if the measure was complete there would be nothing lost by the delay. What is gained by delaying it? In another year you will ascertain the views of the people upon it. I am not now in a position to know their views, and as the people sent me here to carry out their wishes I cannot say to them when I return home I consented to take away one of your representatives without knowing that you desired it. It would be much more gratifying to all to have the matter stand over until another session. It might be very well for those who no longer expect to sit in the Local Legislature to vote upon this question, for they will not be affected by it, as they expect to go to Ottawa; but it would be more graceful for them to allow those who come in after them to deal with the question, for they would then have the minds of the people upon it. The people may say we never asked you to reduce our representation. We would then feel that we had not been acting in accordance with their wishes. Then again, when you go to alter the representation you should begin at the bottom and regulate the whole thing. You must make some arrangement in regard to the Executive, for if you allow nine members to hold seats there it would give the Government such a predominance that you could not move them; therefore, this matter requires mature deliberation, and this, I think,

is apparent to every one. I desire all economy to be used. The duties of the House will be curtailed, and there will be no need for the House to sit so many days. Instead of sitting two months the House will be able to discharge its duties in one month, and this will be a curtailment of expenses at once, arising out of the business we have to do, and there will be no encroachment there upon the rights of the people. The duties that remain for us to do still require as much deliberation as they ever did, for you cannot tell me wherein they require less; but it will only require half the time to attend to them, in consequence of their number being less than formerly.

Hon. Mr. McADAM.—If the people are in favor of this Bill we should go for it. In order to do justice to the County of King's we should pass a Bill to reduce the representation, for I do not think it would be right to increase the representation under the present circumstances. I think we should go for the amendment suggested by the hon. member from King's.

Mr. QUINTON.—I do not think it right to be legislating so far ahead, as there is no necessity for passing this Bill at present. It would be better to let it stand over until the House met next winter, and not be taking up the time of the House at this short session.

Mr. HIBBARD.—I do not like the idea of lopping a member off of a County because it has four representatives, we should adopt a fair basis of representation.

Mr. BABBIT.—My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Smith) in the course of his remarks said, that in speaking upon the appointment of Delegates last year he had moved that the Legislative Councillors should reside in the Province, but no member here, except the French Brigade, sympathized with the proposition. In the few remarks I made at that time I said, "I agree with the proposition made by the ex-Attorney General, that if the Legislative Councillors appointed to seats at Ottawa are simply to have a property qualification here, it will not amount to a great deal, because some of them would remove to Canada, and instead of looking after our interests they would be looking after the interests of the Canadians, for it is natural to suppose that a man would be most interested in the place in which he resides. We should instruct our Delegates in unmistakable terms that it should be provided in the Scheme that our Legislative Councillors should both reside and have their property qualification in this Province. If this idea is not carried out I shall think it was the fault of our Delegates and not of the

Canadians, because it is immaterial to them whether they reside here or there." My opinion then was plain and distinct on the question.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—My hon. and learned friend (Mr. Smith) was wrong in reference to the general opinion expressed by the House at that time. The general feeling of the House was that the Legislative Councillors should reside in the Province. When the paragraph was read in reference to the appointment of Legislative Councillors in Lower Canada there was a general concurrence in the opinion that the Legislative Councillors should be required to live in the Province.

Mr. BECKWITH.—My hon. friend (Mr. Kerr) refers to Nova Scotia as having reduced her representation to two members for each County. This would act very unfairly here, as it would give the small Counties all the advantages. Neither would it be right to take representation by population, upon the terms of the Bill, as that would be doing great injustice to the small Counties, for any County having less than 1500 inhabitants would only have one representative. It is the length of the Session more than the number of members which causes the increased expenses of the Legislature. In 1851 when the representation was the same as it is now the expenses of the Legislature were \$32,000, whilst in 1866 the expenses were \$41,000; no doubt but the latter session was much longer than the former, on account of the increased business they had to do. Our business will be much decreased, and we will have only local matters to attend to, therefore our session need not exceed forty days. There will be less expenditure about the House for Coaches, &c.; there will be a less amount of printing—done, and this will reduce our expenditure very materially.

Mr. LINDSAY.—Every hon. member says retrenchment is necessary, but no one is ready to begin. All have admitted that something should be done, but they do not tell us what that something is. Some people try to get all they can, and they have no conscience unless the law gives it to them. They have their \$2,400 a year, and then are off on their pleasure excursions at \$10 a day more. It is a regular grab game all round. A man tries to hold on all he can get, and then get as much more as he can—that principle is carried out in dual representation. One man wants to have one office here, and another in Canada, just as if there was not a man here fit for the office except the present Attorney General. I never sought an office, and if I did I would not get it. So far as the Government is concerned, if they manage the affairs of the country properly, they shall have my