

more severely in Upper Canada, and therefore was well worthy the attention of hon. gentlemen. The bill on the table contained several amendments which he had no doubt were beneficial, but there was one clause which would entail great hardship and damages on those who were subject to its operation. He referred to the clause which gave power to the Sheriff to break open doors, windows or trunks where property was represented to be concealed, so that it was quite sufficient for a person to say "property is concealed here or concealed there," for the Sheriff on mere suspicion to make use of this power. He looked upon that as one of the most objectionable clauses in the bill and brought it under the notice of hon. gentlemen that it might be considered in Committee.

Hon. Jas. MORRIS did not rise to speak to the bill, but to the appeal of the hon. Receiver General. His hon. friend opposite must have misunderstood the hon. Receiver General entirely. The latter had never said that there was no bankrupt bill before the other House, but he had stated in very few words that there was one there, but that it depended on the majority of votes in the House whether it would come up. He thought he would be confirmed in this statement.

Hon. Mr. WALKER corroborated the statement just made.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON was very glad his attention had been called to this subject by his hon. friend. There was no man more ready to acknowledge an error, and he would at once admit that he must have misunderstood both the words and the drift of the hon. Receiver General's remarks. What had surprised him was, that a bankrupt bill should be introduced by any other than a member of the Administration, if he had said that it was a ministerial measure he would not have said a word about it. He would however, apologise to the hon. gentleman and the House, for he believed he had allowed himself to be carried too far.

Hon. REC. GENERAL was quite satisfied.

The bill was then read a second time and referred to a select Committee.

The House adjourned from six till half-past seven, p. m., when the reporter entered.

Hon. Mr. DEBOUCHERVILLE was speaking to the motion for the second reading of Administration of Justice bill. He said before the Union, the expenses of the Administration of Justice in Lower Canada were defrayed out of the public revenue, and in Upper Canada by District assessments, and yet the Government came down and told the Lower Canadians all that must be changed, and that they must contribute to the payment of the expenses of Upper Canada, because there was but one Legislature, yes there was but one, but they acted as though there had been two Legislatures. It was true that House had no right to make any alteration in the bill, but they had the power of putting it off for another year, and that was what he contended they should do. What was the duty of the Government? To protect the subject against the subject. That appeared strange, what did it mean? That if one party in the country wished to increase its authority over the rest of the Province, they should prevent it, but instead of that, it was the Government that this day brought forward an iniquitous measure, which could not but have the effect of widening the breach between both sections of the Province. There is but one Legislature it is true, but when it is proposed to change the constitution, and force Lower Canada to pay a part of their revenue to Upper Canada, he held it necessary that it should be done only with the consent of Lower Canada, but this bill had been passed through

the Lower House by a majority of Upper Canadian members, and very few Lower Canadians consented to it.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON believed there was an honest desire on the part of the Government to do justice to both sections of the Province, of which this bill was a proof, and therefore he would give it his most cordial support.

Hon. REC. GEN. said, the hon. gentleman who had spoken before his hon. friend, characterised that as an iniquitous measure, of which the only proof was that the Province generally would support the expenses of the Administration of Justice. He supposed that hon. gentleman did not remember that the people of Upper Canada are contributing cheerfully for the erection of a Lunatic Asylum in Lower Canada, and surely he did not imagine that the Upper Canadians would long remain satisfied with being assessed for what was paid out of the Provincial Revenue in Lower Canada. And as to the double majorities he spoke of, what would it be in effect but a division of the Province. That no question could be determined without taking the opinions of the members of each section distinctively, and not passing any bill which was not agreed on by a majority on each side. The idea was absurd.

Hon. Mr. BRUNEAU did not know that the people of Upper Canada were tied down to that mode of paying the expenses of the administration of justice by the Union Act, or that it could not be changed by the United Legislature. He could see no injustice to L. Canada in the bill, and would therefore support it.

Hon. J. NELSON opposed the bill. He considered that the L. Canadians were treated unfairly by the Administration.

The bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

The Jesuits' Estates Bill was read a second time and ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. BRUNEAU gave notice that he would protest against the passage of the bill.

The Smuggling Prevention Bill and Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Bill were both read a second time.

Hon. Mr. MACAULAY reported from committee on bills to amend Toronto Incorporation Act and Cobourg Incorporation Act, with amendments. Reports adopted and bills to be read a third time to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. BRUNEAU laid on the table a report of the committee on contingencies. To be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Hon. W. MORRIS laid on the table the letters he had referred to in the discussion respecting Col. Fitzgibbon's case.

The fifty-eighth rule of the House was suspended in order to allow the Etobicoke Road Bill to be read. Carried by the casting vote of the Speaker.

The House then adjourned.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, June 4.

The House went into committee on Supply, and took up the Supplementary estimates.

On the item for granting £500 to McGill College, Dr. Bontillier moved that it be divided equally between the school of Medicine and McGill College.

Mr. SMITH, of Frontenac, said that he was compelled to oppose the amendment. Last year, when they applied for the act of incorporation, it was expressly stated that they did not desire that any aid should be afforded them

out of the Provincial Revenue. To support this he read a letter from Dr. Arnoldi, Junr., to the members of the House last session, in which that gentleman, in the name of the school, in which it was expressly stated that they did not desire one copper from the Provincial Revenue, and that the school was not started by the professors for the sake of filthy lucre.

Dr. NELSON stated that the monies which had been already granted had found their way into the pockets of the Professors; they did not apply it to procure a library, museum, or anatomical preparations.

Atty. Gen. SMITH stated that the College had a medical library of some 15,000 or 16,000. [Dr. Nelson, 15,000 or 16,000] yes, you are right, it is only between 15,000 and 16,000 out of the £500 granted last year they had applied the sum of £130 to the foundation of a Lying-in Hospital.

Dr. NELSON drew a comparison between the School of Medicine and McGill College, in which he animadverted in very strong terms on the conduct of the faculties of medicine of McGill College. He was glad that mention had been made of the University Lying-in Hospital; he would ask hon. members if they knew the animus with which that institution had been got up, he would tell them that it was for the purpose of putting down an institution of a like nature, that had been set on foot by the late lamented Dr. McNider. It was not got up because it had been found deficient, on the contrary, that institution was amply sufficient. He called upon the Attorney General to say whether when the grant was made last session, he had not stated that it would be the last time that they would be called on to make that grant.

Dr. TACHE would have liked much that the motion had been to make no grant at all; rather than to divide it. He wished that both Colleges should stand on their own revenues. He stated that the College at which he had studied, in 1818 and 1819, was considered one of the best in the United States; but if he had a son, he would sooner send him to the School of Medicine.

Atty. Gen. SMITH said, that he could not recollect having made the statement referred to, but he had no doubt that he did so. If so, however, he must say, that the Government had not notified the college of the discontinuance of the grant, and he must therefore support it from the present year.

Mr. McFATT would have been better pleased if the hon. member for Richelieu had confined his observations to praising the new School, without detracting from the old one. He knew that McGill College had been established under great difficulties, and he could not understand why the establishment of another institution and rival one, should deprive that College of the advantages it had always possessed.

Mr. LAFONTAINE thought that justice would dictate the division of the grant. He said that he was not at all satisfied with the explanation of the Attorney General, as to the application of the grant of last year. It was well known that this sum was given for the encouragement of lectures, and it appeared that £130 out of it had been applied to establish a Lying-in-Hospital, in opposition to the one established by the late Doctor McNider.

Att. Gen. SMITH could see no reason why the Professors of McGill College could not apply to a benevolent purpose, that which they might have put into their own pockets.

On a division on the amendment the numbers were 27—27. The Chairman, Mr. Christie, gave his vote with the yeas.