it was a prejudiced tribunal. He was not wedded strongly to the tenth clause.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said in the only city where it was likely this measure would be required the two magistrates were very superior men.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL thought the Bill would be of very little use unless it were amended as proposed. Of course it would only come into operation under very exceptional circumstances. If in a community exposed to great excitement, there should be trial by jury what chance would there be of getting a conviction or enforcing the law? Unless such an amendment were made, the Bill would be useless. It did not say that cases should be referred to any single magistrate, but to a single class of magistrates, men on whom reliance could be placed. There were certain classes of magistrates who under certain cases usually did the duty that three magistrates ordinarily did, and to that class those summary trials would be referred, this was a guarantee that they were men of certain attainments, and that certain reliance could be placed on their integrity, knowledge and firmness, and that they were worthy of the public confidence. He felt that unless there was summary jurisdiction the Bill would turn out to be of little use.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said the facts to be adjudicated upon were extremely simple. The only questions to be decided was whether a man had arms upon him or not. It would be a very rare case indeed where injustice could be done in such a simple matter.

Hon. Mr. BROWN said most of the offences that would be tried under this Act were of a semi-religious character, and the satisfaction which the decisions would give would depend very much on how the magistrate felt towards the man being tried.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Suppose it were trial by jury.

Hon. Mr. BROWN said the jury would then be mixed: if it were a case for conviction, the jury would convict; if not, they would discharge the prisoner. In such cases, it was very difficult to control a community which was divided, and where there was strong feeling, and both sides were convinced they were right. He doubted the expediency of doing away with the protection of trial by jury. Everyone knew how those cases were brought on; some foolish person, without consideration, gets excited, perhaps under the influence of liquor, pistols are fired and men rush in, thinking it their duty to take a part in the disturbance; they are brought up before the magistrate of an opposite opinion, in the midst of an excited community, and it would not be felt satisfactory to leave the decision in the hands of any one man.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said he was one of those who thought in cases of this kind prompt and decisive punishment was the only way to put down rioting. However, this Bill had originated in the House of Commons, and they had thought fit not to take away the right of the subject, and he thought the amendment should not be made.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL said it should be borne in mind the whole character of this Bill was exceptional, and there was nothing more exceptional in the amendment than in the other clauses. It was unfortunate that in the place where this Bill was likely to be put in force, the population was divided into two camps, one party pretending to be the party of order and of peace. They would say, if disarmed: "We are not in a position to "defend ourselves, while the other party are not disarmed." If the circumstances were not very exceptional, this Bill should not be passed at all; if they were, then it was necessary to make it as stringent as possible, in order that it might be efficient. Therefore, he thought the amendment should be adopted. Perhaps the whole extent of the evil was not known to this House. Everybody knew that Montreal was the place referred to by the hon. Senator from Hamilton, in his remarks a few moments before. If he (Mr. Trudel) had a right to speak for the population of Montreal he he would say "let us alone and we will "manage our own affairs provided you "pledge yourselves that nobody outside of