

Another reason why he must oppose it was because it had never been before the people, and he considered it a very arbitrary proceeding to reduce the number of representatives without the people's consent. There could be no excuse for passing the bill now, because an election must take place in a short time, when the people ought to be allowed to decide, and fix their representation to suit themselves.

The hon. and learned Provincial Secretary had alluded to his (Dr. B.'s) opposition to the Government while his brother held a subordinate office under Government. He was obliged to the hon. and learned gentleman for that allusion, as he considered it the highest praise that could be given to him. It was complimentary to himself, because it showed he had acted independently, and was alike creditable to the Government, who had not held their officer responsible for what was not his fault.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE said that there was no doubt the measure before the House was one of much importance, especially as it was one of the final acts which they had to discharge. Nobody would deny that the hon. member for South Kings had always opposed the Government with great consistency; in fact, there was never a measure introduced by the men now in power that appeared to meet with his approbation.

Dr. Brown had supported the Government on the Education Bill.

Hon. Mr. McFARLANE went on to say that no more favorable or suitable occasion could offer than the present for dealing with the representation of the country in the local Legislature. Anomalies would exist under all circumstances, for it was impossible to prevent them entirely. The bill of 1859, no doubt, was a step in the right direction, for it did away with those little boroughs which received a representation they were not entitled to. Hants, with a population not equal to that of six or seven other counties, returned no less than five members to the House. He believed that the true principle was to establish county representation. It was not for the interest of any county to have representation allotted to some particular corner or section of it. The man representing a particular district did not feel any deep interest in the rest of the county. It was the best system to make a man responsible to the whole county. In that case, no section would receive an advantage over another, for it would be the duty as well as the interest of the representative to look at all alike. In his own county, for instance, they expended the public

money according to its particular wants, and not with a desire to benefit any particular section over another. By the proposed arrangement the smaller counties would be placed on the same footing as the large ones. No doubt, when Cape Breton had a population as large as that of Pictou, it would receive an additional member if it required it. It was the duty of the Legislature to so mould our institutions that the public business could be efficiently and, at the same time, economically transacted.

Dr. HAMILTON said he felt called upon to say a few words, inasmuch as the bill affected his own county. He remembered when Kings had six representatives in the house, and now it was proposed to reduce the number to two. It might be expected that he would advocate a larger representation for Kings, but when he looked at other counties and made a comparison in respect to population, he was unable to argue in favour of retaining the present number. Inverness, Cumberland, Cape Breton and Colchester had each a larger population than Kings, and yet would have no larger representation. It was true that several of the small counties would have two representatives also, but he felt it would be hardly fair to leave any county with only one member. The principle he would prefer adopting would be this: to leave the limits of the counties as they are now, and to allot additional representatives when counties exceeded 20,000 in population by 8 or 9,000. His desire now was to see the local Legislature so constituted that it would be able to transact all the public business allotted to it under Confederation economically and efficiently. He did not agree with the hon. member for Yarmouth, that there would be so little work to do, the necessity for a Legislative Council would cease. Whatever work would have to be performed by the Assembly would have to pass under the supervision of the Council. He believed in the principle of county representation; if it was applied to the General Parliament it should also be applied to the local Legislature.

Mr. HATFIELD looked upon the question before the House as one of great importance, in fact, as one of the most momentous questions that had ever been before the Legislature. He felt it his duty, as a member of the House and as a representative of the people, to rise and declare himself against the bill now under consideration. He felt it his duty to do so for many reasons; and one of them was, that the county he had the honour of representing was much larger than many others in the Province, and yet was only to receive a representation of two members—the number that was given to Queens and Shelburne, with half the population. But there were some other features connected with the question that he could not well pass by. It was true that Confederation was agreed to, but in what manner? Contrary to the wishes of the people—in a manner that, he felt bound to say, was discreditable. Delegates had gone to England, and there bartered away the rights of the people, without consulting them at all. He would tell the Provincial Secretary and his Government that they should have gone to the country two years ago—that