

which they have long sought, and were well entitled to. The next county which the bill proposes to ameliorate is that of Pictou. It has three representatives now, the bill proposes to give four, and to separate the county into two electoral divisions, each having the free choice of two representatives. The township of Pictou now sends one member, and the county two,—and the consequence is, that the townships of Egerton and Maxwellton are excluded from the privilege enjoyed by the other township. It may be said that the bill does not increase the privilege of voting to any in Pictou. That is true, because to give the county the right of sending four members by one vote would not be prudent, as regards the general interests of the province; but it separates each district from interference of the other, while each has the privilege of sending two representatives to guard its particular interests; which would not be so, if all were to be county representatives. Another county in which such disparity appears, is that of Cape Breton. The township of Sydney sends a member to this house; but outside of that township are three others, St. Andrew's, Miré, and Louisburg, besides smaller settlements which do not enjoy the franchise equally with Sydney. The bill proposes to put these townships on an equal footing.

In Lunenburg great inequality exists. Running through the centre of the country, is the township of Lunenburg, which sends one member, while on either side are the townships of Chester, New Dublin, and LaHave, each larger in area than the first named township, and they enjoy inferior electoral privileges. The bill proposes to remedy this inequality. We have also Cumberland, which exhibits much irregularity of representation. The township of Amherst is small compared with the entire area; but it enjoys a privilege from which Wallace, Pugwash River Philip, Maccan, Minudie, Advocate, Parsboro', and other districts, are excluded. This bill designs to put those places on an equality. Hants stands distinguished for an anomalous state of representation. With its five members, giving it advantage in comparison with all other counties, it presents a most flagrant instance of inequality within its own limits.

The townships of Falmouth, Windsor, and Newport, lying in one corner of the county, and not one third of the entire area, send each a member, while Uniacke, Kempt, Noel, Douglas, Rawdon, Maitland, Nine Mile River, and other places are deprived of similar privilege. Is it unjust to place those on an equality? It was remarked on Saturday that the bill does not in all cases give an increased voice to the sections thus relieved. Is it nothing, however, to remove the inequality,—to give to each district a right to choose a representative to attend to local objects and interests.

In Annapolis, the township of Wilmot, and the settlements of Albany, Springfield, Maitland, Dalhousie, and others, are all excluded from the privilege enjoyed by Annapolis and Granville. The bill places these on an equal footing. Is justice done? A petition from Wilmot, strange to say, has been presented against the bill, although it elevates the township to a footing of equality, and gives it three votes instead of the single vote it now possesses. So it is also in Kings county; Aylesford, Dalhousie, and other

districts are excluded from the privileges enjoyed by the electors of Cornwallis and Horton. In the county of Digby also, portions of the people are debarred from privileges enjoyed by the townships of Digby and Clare. In the county of Richmond, the small township of Isle Madame sends a member, while L'Ardoise, Bourgoise, and other places in the county are excluded. The bill places all equally. These remarks include the ten counties to which I previously referred.

Here let me enquire whether the alterations proposed by the bill in this respect are just and right in themselves. Is it right to do away with the inequalities of representation that exist within the counties? If it be, the bill is framed on a just and proper principle, and it will require a large amount of eloquence and argument to prove the reverse. I know not by what process of reasoning the member for Lunenburg is to be satisfied that the people of Chester, New Dublin, and LaHave ought to stand inferior in electoral rights to the inhabitants of the township of Lunenburg. I know not how the member for Hants is to appreciate the argument that Noel and Maitland, Kempt and Rawdon, Uniacke and Douglas, ought to be held inferior to the inhabitants of Falmouth, Windsor and Newport. The mode in which the evil is to be remedied is this: Having found necessary, for the reasons given, to leave untouched, except to a small degree, the numerical inequality of representation, as comparing one county with another, and confining ourselves to the inequalities within the counties, we dealt with those counties which by the bill are to return more than three members each, viz., Kings, Pictou, Hants, Colchester, and Halifax;—(removing one from Hants, and giving the member to Pictou,) we have five counties, each sending above three,—and of these Halifax is to have five representatives; Pictou, Colchester, Hants, and Kings, four each. The bill then divides each of those counties into two electoral districts, giving to each the choice of two representatives, except in the case of Halifax, where the western district is to have three. This I think is fair; it places the system of representation, so far, on a proper basis—it does away with the anomaly of double representation and double voting in counties—it prevents too large a vote by any one constituency, and gives to the counties thus divided, the advantage of having the particular interests of each district under the care of two members, selected among themselves for that portion, without the interference of any neighboring township. Of the remaining counties having not more than three members each, over which the operation of the bill is required from the inequality within them, the proposition is to bring them to a uniform system, by creating only county members.

There would then remain the counties which, represented by county members, calls for no change in the mode of representation under the present bill,—such as Inverness, Sydney, Guysborough, Victoria. One other class remains, consisting of three counties which would still retain the double mode of representation, by means of townships; these are, Yarmouth, Shelburne, and Queens. These are not brought under the operation of the bill, because they do not present the evil which the bill is mainly designed to remedy. The inequality of representation existing in other places, does not appear in these