

would press the matter. He could see no reason why a little County with only 5000 inhabitants should get as many as a County with 13,000. Distribution by population was the only fair and true way.

MR. CAIE could not see why the whole Province should suffer for the advantage that St. John would obtain if the Debates were distributed according to population, nor could he see why Kent should suffer for the benefit of Restigouche. According to the method of distributing according to members, Kent, with a population of 16,000, only got as many as Restigouche, with a population of 5000. He did not wish to see the motion pressed at present, as he would like to see a full house.

MR. OTTY.—The present motion was only for re-consideration. He had a resolution to move which he would read:

Whereas, on consideration, this House is of opinion that the amendment to the resolution affecting the distribution of the Debates, adopted on the first day of the Session, would be unfair to a large portion of the inhabitants of the Province; therefore,

Resolved, that the distribution of the Debates be according to population.

He, (Mr. Otty) had no objection to let this amendment lie over until there was a fuller house.

MR. CONNELL agreed with the observation of the hon. member of Kent. If St. John did get a little more than its share, that was no reason why other Counties should get less. He was entirely in favor of re-consideration, and of the principle of distribution according to population.

MR. WETMORE.—That was the only fair and reasonable way, to distribute according to population. In St. John they certainly had facilities for getting information, but they had also the privilege of paying for them. That was no argument against St. John getting the proportion it was entitled to by its population. With regard to the smaller Counties, as Restigouche and Sunbury, they could not reasonably expect, nor did they require, so many as the larger Counties of Kent and Carleton for instance. He was sure, should the principle of distribution by population be carried, the members of St. John would be quite willing to let the country members have a number of their Debates. It was said that this proposition would not meet the view of one of his honorable colleagues. He would meet it with a refusal. But then again, it was said that that hon. member had no views of his own, but looked entirely through the spectacles of the Attorney General.

MR. CUSHIGAN argued that if this principle of distribution by population was carried out, it might be carried out in other privileges. The members of the larger Counties might demand a larger amount of stationery, and a larger amount of bye-road money. He trusted that the old arrangement would be continued.

MR. LINDSAY argued in favor (quoting from the Census of 1861 the population of the various counties) of distribution by population.

MR. SUTTON argued against making any change, it would be just as well to let the matter rest as it was.

MR. LEWIS maintained that the Debates should be distributed equally according to members.

MR. FRASER said that last year he

had voted for distribution according to population, and as he had not since that time changed his view, he would vote for re-consideration. There, on his right, sat the member of Restigouche, a County that had only five thousand inhabitants, yet he got as many Debates as the hon. member for Albert, (Mr. McClellan) a County that had one thousand, who sat on his left. He did not see any justice in that at all.

MR. MCCLELLAN could see no reason for changing the apportioning of the Debates. Each representative had an equal share in all the privileges. He received an equal share of stationery, an equal privilege in bye-road money; then why should they seek to make a change in this matter? It was certainly competent in the House to make the change; but he did not see why it should be made; the principle involved in it had never obtained here; representation, for instance, had not been by population in this Province. There was his own County, Albert, where there was a variety of interests to be represented, which, with less population than other larger Counties as Kent, was entitled to more privileges.

MR. GILBERT thought the conclusions of the Surveyor General were not connected with business, it was a most extraordinary assumption to say that the County of Restigouche, with its five thousand inhabitants, was entitled to as many as his (Mr. G.'s) County of Westmorland, with its twenty-five thousand. He thought the hon. member, a man of mathematical mind, could never arrive at that conclusion. He still hoped that he (McMillan) would help to carry out a fair and equitable arrangement.

After some further remarks from hon. members MR. OTTY said he would read a tabular statement of the different Counties, showing their population, the number of Debates they would be entitled to if the principle of his resolution was carried out, and the number according to members.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF DEBATES, 1866.

7,000 COPIES.

COUNTIES.	No. of Representatives.	Population according to Census of 1861.	No. of Debates distributed according to population.	No. of Debates distributed according to members.
Albert,	12	9444	258	338
Carleton,	12	16,374	447	338
Charlotte,	12	23,668	617	676
Gloucester,	12	15,076	411	338
Kent,	12	15,854	433	337
King's,	12	23,283	637	607
Northumberland,	4	18,801	516	676
Queens,	12	13,359	365	338
Restigouche,	12	4,874	133	338
St. John City and County,	6	48,922	1338	1014
Sunbury,	2	6,057	165	338
Victoria,	2	7,701	209	338
Westmorland,	4	25,247	694	676
York,	4	23,393	638	676
		412,502	6860	6929

One to every thirty-six inhabitants.

MR. NEEDHAM said, in considering this question let honorable members think, to whom did the Debates belong? Did they belong to the members or to the people? Certainly to the people, for the people paid for them. If then they belonged to the people, the House had no right to deprive the people of them. The House printed the Debates for their information, and they should be so distributed that the majority over the Province should receive them. If by one way of distribution every thirty-sixth inhabitant got a copy of the Debates, and if by the other way they could not, he would certainly go for that mode that would afford the greatest benefit to the largest number. If St. John, by this arrangement, would receive a larger number, it was entitled to receive a larger number. What had the members of St. John done last year? They had most freely and most honorably given a portion of their Debates to the members of the smaller Counties, and one of the honorable members (Mr. Wetmore) had told them they would be willing to do so again. He (Mr. N.) was strongly in favor of a distribution by population; no inconvenience whatever had arisen from it last year.

HON. MR. HATHEWAY could not see with his hon. colleague; the principle of distribution by population might be right if applied to certain of the larger Counties; but it would be an injustice to the smaller Counties, as Restigouche, Queens, Victoria, where there was no press and means of getting information. It was different in his own County, York, where the papers published in the Debates contained synopses of the Debates, and where they had decided advantage over the people of the North. If there was a place that required less Debates than any other it was St. John. Look at the number of papers published the last year in the County had easy access to information. Rather than deprive the smaller Counties he would go cheerfully to give Sunbury, Restigouche, Victoria one thousand more copies amongst them. If the resolution passed on the first day of the Session was re-cinded, and the motion of the hon. member for King's carried, he would tell honorable members that a very great injustice would be done the smaller Counties. He hoped that the matter would be settled so that each member would have an equal share.

MR. CAIE said that the Hon. Chief Commissioner forgot that Kent lost most by the distribution according to members. Yet he was willing, overlooking Kent, to give a thousand more copies to Sunbury, Restigouche and Victoria. This arrangement would only make matters worse. The members for Albert (Mr. McClellan) had consumed the business done in Kent with that in Albert, and had concluded that Albert had more interests to be represented than Kent; but he wished he could show that Kent not only exceeded Albert in population, but that its interests were as varied. With regard to the matter in debate he wished fair play and nothing but fair play.

MR. BAILLY argued that Queens had as much claim to information as either Restigouche or Sunbury, and he did not see why it should be overlooked. While he was in favor of distribution by population, he thought St. John would get too much favor by that arrangement. Let the number to St. John be limited, and all the other Counties receive according to population.