

but upon considering the question I found some of the Counties had about 15000 inhabitants, and the Bill would deprive them of having two representatives. The principle of the Bill is to have one representative for every 7500 inhabitants, but in no case to allow any County to have more than three representatives. St John City should have two members, and the County should be represented the same as other Counties. According to this arrangement there will be thirty members in the House, unless we give the City of Fredericton one, which would make the whole number thirty-one. I would confine the City of St. John to two members, for I do not believe cities should be represented according to population. It is not so in Great Britain, if it were so the City of London would have one-sixth of the representation of all England. Having made these few remarks I shall be glad to hear the views of other hon. members on the floors of the House.

Mr. RYAN.—If I am rightly informed, according to this Bill some Counties will only have one representative. I think any County, however small it may be, should have not less than two members. Suppose a County should have but one member, and he should be absent, or sick; who would attend to the affairs of that County? We cannot get the representation exactly on the basis of population, but even if we did, it would remain so only until the next census, because one County frequently increases faster than other Counties. I would suggest that every County that has four members should be reduced to three: that would take five members from the floors of the House, and leave a representation of thirty-six. I have frequently tried to get an increase of representation for King's, but unfortunately for some cause or other—either from want of being pressed properly, or from a determination of the House not to do justice to King's—I have never been able to effect it. The proposition I have just made is a good one, and will do justice to all. We should decrease our expenses under any circumstances, but particularly now when we are going into Union, for the duties and requirements of the Legislature will not be so great as they have been heretofore.

Mr. HIBBARD.—I fully agree with the Bill brought in by my hon. friend, it he can carry it, but if he cannot carry it I agree with the suggestion of my hon. friend from King's. There seems to be a dread around the floors of the House of placing the representation upon the basis of population. Suppose it does give but one representative to some of the Counties, is not the same provision made for

the representation to the General Parliament, and I do not believe but we will get our rights at Ottawa. I have always advocated the principle of representation by population, and I still support it. This Bill must be prospective, for the mover has not power to dissolve the House. If he carries it he should make it prospective, because it cannot be carried out until the House dies out by law, or the Government tells us to go home. If the Government would dissolve the House to carry out the provisions of this Bill they would meet with the approbation of the country. This Bill brings us down to thirty-one members. I believe ten members would do all the work we have done here up to this time. I do not doubt but five men would have done it. Thirty-one men are amply sufficient to legislate upon all the local wants we will require. I firmly believe that if we husbanded our resources, reduced our expenses, and acted economically, there would not be a Province in the British Empire that would have as much for its local purposes as we would have. But if we retain forty-one members in the House, create new offices, assist Western Extension, while we have no revenue but what we derive from our Public Domain and what we receive from the General Government, there will be nothing before us but direct taxation. Representation by population is the fair, honest principle, and however hard it may bear on some Counties, we must take something as a basis, and if that basis should reduce the representation of the County of Charlotte to two, I would agree to it. My colleagues may have something to say about it, but for myself I would go for it, because I believe ten men could do all the work we have to do. I hope the members of the Government will give due consideration to this question, regardless of interested motives, and do all they can for the reduction of the expenses of the Legislature.

Mr. BABBIT.—I think justice should be done to all parties, but this Bill is going too far for a good many of the hon. members. I acknowledge I do not like representation by population. (A member—You supported the Quebec Scheme.) I never advocated the principle of representation by population, for I believe it will eventually lead to universal suffrage, (Mr. TITLEY.—That is not the principle in this Bill, for it limits the representation of Counties to three members.) I do not think we have so many conflicting interests in this Province as to require a strict adherence to this principle, and I do not think it is right to deprive a county of having two members because it has a few inhabitants less than the required number. I think those Counties which have four representatives should be reduced to

three, and this would lessen the expense to the country. It is not right to reduce any County to one member, therefore I cannot support the Bill, but I would support a Bill to reduce the number in the Counties that have four members.

Mr. LEWIS.—I think those hon. gentlemen who are favorable to reducing the number of members must have their faces turned towards Ottawa. We cannot do with one member in each County, because he might be sick, and the County would not be represented at all. This Bill will not answer unless we are going to give up New Brunswick and go to Ottawa. I would go for striking one member from some of those large Counties, for we must curtail the expense and live within our resources. If our expenditure is beyond our means bankruptcy must ultimately ensue. I do not think the hon. member was in earnest when he brought in this Bill; he only brought it in to have a discussion, and had no idea of passing it. I will go for letting the representation stand as it is, although I have no objection to have one member taken from each of the large Counties.

Mr. LINDSAY.—I will say for the information of the hon. member who has just sat down that I am in earnest. I want to reduce the expenses of the country, and I want the country to know who are willing to reduce them. I suppose there will be some difficulty in carrying it, as the members of those small Counties which are likely to be reduced will go against it. My hon. friend is very generous; he wants to take off of the large Counties; that is, "take my neighbour but let me alone." I believe the members of this House should do their duty and have the interest of their country at heart. My hon. friend said we should not reduce a County to one member because he might get sick; if a man finds he cannot attend to the duties of his constituents, he should give place to another man who can. My opinion is that we must decrease the representation, or to do justice to some Counties we must increase it. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Babbitt) said he did not like the principle of representation in the Bill. I would like him to introduce a Bill upon juster terms. He said it would lead to universal suffrage. I showed him how unfair it would be to have population as the basis of representation in large cities. Hon. members will find fault with the Bill, but I say if it is not right let them prepare a better one.

Mr. BEVERIDGE.—I can agree with some things my hon. friend said, but not with all he said. The County he represents is only sixty miles in length; my County is one hundred and twenty miles long, therefore it would be unfair to take one representative from Victoria. In that