

dred pounds a year for all time to come. That will appear very well in the Debates, but we know the hon. mover of the Bill stated that it would only continue for some months, and then the Legislature would have the right to legislate upon that Bill again, and when the vote was taken it was with that understanding, and it may be that then the Legislature will make the salary £500 and appoint a clerk besides. While I believe we should keep our expenses as low as possible, I do not believe that you can get a first class man to take the office of Receiver General and act without a clerk for \$1,600 a year. I have heard it stated here that the President of the United States received but \$25,000 a year. The President, although his salary is \$25,000, gets from the Treasury Department over \$100,000 a year to pay his expenses. The Chamberlain of New York gets \$70,000, and ladies in New York offices get \$100 a month. For the office of Receiver General you must have a man who understands the routine of office, and one who will take the responsibility. To ask a man to give bonds for £10,000 a year and give him a salary of only \$1,600 is perfectly absurd.

I cannot support my hon. friend's Bill, for I believe one man cannot represent a County. When Confederation was introduced, I took the position that by the consolidation of the British North American Colonies on this continent they would be advanced as an important part of the British empire, and we would have an increased population in consequence of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Why, then, should we go for reducing the representation in our Legislature when we expect such an increase of population? I firmly believe that the construction of this road and branches will greatly increase our population. This is the position I took at the time of the election, and it is the position I would take again. You may call it Ottawa on the brain; this is a new disease, but I can cure it. I can give you a recipe that will kill it dead, and if I get it myself I will take the same remedy. I did not intend to say anything about this Bill, but I cannot vote for it. I believe we are to grow in importance and prosperity, and we will require just as many and as zealous men in the Legislature after these men go to Ottawa as we have now.

Mr. W. P. FLEWELLING.—I do not think this Bill is exactly what is required by the members of the House. I do not agree with it, from the fact, which has been stated by some of the members here, that it will leave some counties with only one representative. I think the only way of doing equal justice to all the Counties is to reduce the number of members in the large Counties to three,

and there should be an amendment made to the Bill to carry out that arrangement. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Hibbard) that the whole business of the House could be done with fifteen members, for it would require more than that to carry out the principles of Responsible Government. We are now going to change the constitution—it is a good time to make a reduction in the number of members. I have always advocated the necessity of economy, and I think we can do very well with 36 members on the floors of the House to carry out the necessary requirements of the country. I should like to hear every member present express his opinion in regard to the best means of bringing about this desirable result.

Mr. KERR.—I think every member on the floors of this House must be aware that this country expects that there will be a reduction in the number of members in the House, and a vast amount of retrenchment practised here. The multifarious matters connected with the legislation of the Province are taken from our hand, and there is no necessity for the same number of members, the same expenditure, or the same length of Session. Nova Scotia, with a population of one hundred thousand more than we have, and more numerous resources, has reduced her Legislature some eleven or twelve, leaving three members for Pictou, three for the City of Halifax, and two for each of the other Counties. The proposition made to take one member from each of our Counties having four members appears reasonable, and ought to be taken into consideration. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Lindsay) made out a very strong case in regard to Carleton being very badly used. I heard recently of great injustice being done to the River Counties in the appointment of Senators, and we find they always vote together on any question affecting their interest. Now take the population of the five River Counties, that is the five above King's, and divide them by the number of members, and it will give you one member for every fifty five hundred inhabitants. Then take the four North Shore Counties, and divide the inhabitants by the number of members, and it will give one representative for every five thousand four hundred inhabitants. This shows that each member from the North represents one hundred inhabitants more than each member from the River Counties. Therefore, I cannot see that so much injustice has been done to Carleton as has been represented. I believe that the members from Victoria feel as much interest in promoting the welfare of Carleton as they do in promoting the welfare of their own County, and so vice versa all through the River Counties.]

It appears to me to be very desirable that Counties that have two or three members should be divided off into Ridings, as they are in Canada; then candidates would not have to run their election through the whole County, and this would save trouble, both to the candidates themselves and those whom they represent. Something should be done, and the question is whether it is advisable to do it in this short Session. The Bill will not take effect until the next general election, and until something of that kind is looked forward to, it is hardly desirable to legislate upon the subject. We should approach the question with a determination to do justice to every section of the Province. I believe thirty members on the floors of this House will answer all purposes for many years to come, for our interests are not so varied that they would not be able to manage our affairs. We should either reduce the numbers or reduce the pay. It is not so much the number of members that should be considered as the expense incurred while we are here. We should be allowed pay for thirty days, and if we stayed any longer it should be at our own expense. People say, Why do you remain so long at Fredericton, when you might do your business in half the time? Why do you not retrench your expenditure, in order that it may be applied to the building of Roads and Bridges, instead of squandering it away in the House of Assembly? I have always advocated the principle of retrenchment, for I felt the necessity for it in our public affairs. I am satisfied it is the wish of the country that the representation should be reduced, more particularly as politicians have been stating in every County in the Province that one of the great advantages we would have by going into Confederation would be that we would have more money, from the saving in the expenses of our Legislature than we had hitherto.

I think the representation should be reduced very materially. If this Bill before the House is not thought to be a correct one, let some one bring in a better Bill and I shall go for it, but if another is not brought in, I shall go for this.

Mr. McQUEEN.—When a Bill was presented the other day to increase the representation of King's, we were told that it was an annual offering. I did not go for it, because I thought it desirable to reduce the number of members. I thought King's, Carleton and Kent were each entitled to an additional member, but as equal justice could be done to all by reducing the representation, I considered it would be better to reduce the number on the floors of the