

strict territory should be taken into account as well as population. If we had but one representative, and he should be at one end of the County, he would never see half of his constituents. I could be prepared to go for reduction in the large Counties if it was necessary to reduce the representation, but I would rather not have it reduced.

Mr. FERRIS.—There are always two parties in every County, and if a small County sent but one representative it could give one man all the power. I do not think a County with one representative would get fair play in the Legislature, but those large Counties might be represented by three members as well as four. It is just throwing away so much money to send four representatives, for I think the Counties would be just as well represented by two, and there could be a reduction made of four or six in the Legislative Council.

Mr. BECKWITH.—If a reduction takes place it should be done by some general rule which would do justice to every County. I am in the happy position, that if either the small or large Counties are reduced, we in York will have the same representation.

Mr. LINDSAY.—The Bill does not provide that it was only suggested that the City of Fredericton should have one.

Mr. BECKWITH.—I have no doubt at that would be the result, for the Committee would be showing some little fairness. Although some of our best men will be abstracted from us in consequence of this Ottawa Legislature, yet I still believe that forty-one good men will remain in New Brunswick capable of doing the business of the Province. We had forty-one members when our population was but 179,000, and we have the same number now when our population was 252,000 five years ago. Some very important features in the business of the country, such as Education and the settlement of the country, have still to be attended to.

Then again, one member cannot attend properly to the duties of his County. I would be better to throw two Counties to one than to have only one representative for a County, but it would be regarding to do even that. Carleton County should have three members, and King's four; with those two exceptions cannot see any alteration we can make which would be advantageous. We could not go into this question now, as not twelve of the members here will legislate upon this who will not legislate again, for they will be in Ottawa. Let us get through with all these changes which must take place in consequence of the General Legislature being at Ottawa, and then those who are here years after it, can take the question up coolly and

deliberately, with ample time to consider the question and do justice to the different Counties. With these opinions I must go against passing the Bill.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN.—I am opposed to the Bill, not because I happen to represent one of the smallest Counties, for I believe that that County, in consequence of certain changes at hand, will contain as large a population as some of the largest Counties in the Province, but because I believe there will be no saving of money effected by the reduction. If you are going to carry out the principles of Responsible Government you will find they cannot be carried out in a small Legislature. If you leave nine men in the Executive and reduce the House to thirty-five, you could not turn the Government out at all. There will be talent enough in the House to carry out the principles of Responsible Government after the leading men in this House go to Ottawa. You will have the cleverest young men in the country come here to receive a political education, with a view to a higher position in the General Government. There will be sufficient talent left in this House to deal with all matters left for them. Probably fifteen in this House will offer for Ottawa; it is fair for them now to pass a law which will not affect them at all, but will affect the party responsible for it hereafter. We are on the eve of great changes, therefore, those who are left should decide with regard to this reduction, and not those who are going into another sphere, and who, in order to gain popularity, try to make it appear that there will be a great saving of money. I believe it is premature to deal with this matter; we had better leave it to the parties who are to be affected by it; they can determine whether they can do with a less representation than they now have, and they will be responsible to the people for their decision.

Mr. SMITH.—I was rather astonished by some of the remarks made by my hon. friend, the Postmaster General; he says because some gentlemen will go to Ottawa they cannot have any interest here. He expects to get a seat at Ottawa, but I should not suppose that would prevent him from having a sympathy for the people he represents. I do not suppose that because a man is going to Ottawa he should have no voice on this question, for those who go to Ottawa still expect to remain citizens of New Brunswick. In speaking upon the appointment of Delegates last year I moved that the Legislative Councillors should reside in the Province, but no hon. member here except the French Brigade sympathized with the proposition.

Mr. LINDSAY.—I sympathized with the proposition, and a great many sug-

gestions of my hon. friend I gave him credit for, but he brought in a resolution to get certain conditions, and if we could not get them we could have no Union.

Mr. SMITH.—I wished to restrict the power of the Delegates, for I did not approve of the Quebec Scheme, and I took many objections to it. Some of those objections were adopted, but other objections, equally forcible to my mind, were not adopted. I took an objection to the principle of representation by population, but I find this principle is laid down in this Act of Union as inflexible and immutable. The conflicting opinions on this small Bill corroborate the opinion I then took. It is wrong in principle, and not recognized or adopted in any part of the British Empire, but for purposes peculiarly ultra Canadian that principle was laid down and established and becomes the governing principle of the country. In the Act of Union it is established, and I will venture to prophesy that in a few years Upper Canada will have a numerical majority of representatives, not only over Lower Canada, but over the Lower Provinces, too, and we will be at their mercy. They should have agreed upon a certain number of representatives and not increased them. We cannot help it now, but what I have seen here to-day in reference to this Bill has satisfied me of the wisdom of the course we took upon that question.

My hon. friend, the Postmaster General, is wrong to say we have no right to legislate upon this matter; the people of this country expect us to legislate upon it. Was it not preached in every part of the Province that the expenses of the Legislature would be vastly reduced? Where is the reduction to be made? Two offices created already, and I do not know how many more the Government contemplate to carry before the close of the Session. We resisted their measure yesterday, in regard to the appointment of Receiver General, and got the salary reduced from £500 to £400, and we had a section struck out which provided for the appointment of a clerk in the Receiver General's office; by this means we saved the country £300 a year for all time to come.

I do not think it would be wise to have any County confined to only one representative, because he might have imperative business that would call him home, and he could not attend to his legislative duties. I am willing to support any hon. member who will bring forward a Bill to reduce those Counties that have four members to three, leaving other Counties as they are.

Dr. DOW.—My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) has said, in speaking about the Bill for appointing a Receiver General, that they saved this country three hun-