(Legislative Assembly.
Continued from Second Page.)

Hon. Mr. Boulton moved for a return of the number of insane persons who have been sent to the Lunatic Asylum, Toronto, and the evidence taken. He said he had heard that there had been very great cruelty in the Asylum; that a person had been sent there from a Mr. Gilbert, who had been confined in the Asylum as a person very likely to commit suicide, for whom he had been appointed so that she had an opportunity of which she availed herself, to put an end to her existence. It had come to his knowledge, also, that the Coroner whenever he was called to the duty of holding inquests in the Asylum, having completed the Superintendent to give evidence without the usual fee; the cause he was in receipt of an annual salary, but never since that time had sent him, although thirteen or fourteen inquests had been held, for some of which, Mr. Gilmour had been brought from Hamilton by telegraphic message.

Mr. Hincks gave a flat denial to all the statements which had been made. Dr. Scott never refused to give evidence without a fee.

Mr. Boulton gave it the same flat assertion. That fact came from a party about whom there could be no mistake.

Mr. Hincks said that it was untrue, and so was the assertion which had been made with reference to Mr. Wetenhall—that the superintendent had not followed the advice of Dr. Widmer, but had treated it with disrespect. In disproof of the allegations, Mr. Hincks read a letter from Dr. Widmer to Dr. Scott, in which the former stated his entire disbelief of the charge of insolent language, and his perfect appreciation of the treatment which had been followed. Then again, as to the poor woman. It was untrue, as had been stated, that she was placed in a room with a four post bed. There was no such thing in the institution; nor was she alone. On the contrary, having been kept for some time in restraint, she appeared to be recovering, and was allowed to sleep not alone, but with another patient, and she was visited at 10 or 11 o'clock on the night of her death. The hon member concluded by a warm censure on the cruelty of lightly bringing charges against professional men performing a public duty such as that of Dr. Scott, and by offering to give the return of the inquest in the case of Mrs. Gilbert.

Mr. Notman hoped the motion would be rejected. He had often visited the institution, and his opinion was, that it was conducted in the best possible way. He, therefore, desired to avoid a proceeding which would be similar to the finding of a bill by the grand jury.

Mr. Sherwood contended that a public institution like the Asylum, ought to be open to public inquiry. He had thought Dr. Scott a very competent and zealous person, and was not prepared to say that he was not so.

Mr. LaFontaine resisted the motion, on the ground that it would be irregular to bring up in the House the records of Coroner's or other Courts; for this would be to make the House the Court of appeals to all other Courts. A very strong case must be made out to justify it.

Mr. Price took a similar view, and denied another of the allegations made the other night, that the superintendent had declined to allow a parent to leave the Asylum to see a dying child. Dr. Widmer had told him (Mr. Price) that there was not the shadow of a charge against Dr. Scott.

Mr. Baldwin pointed out that the true principle of the inquiries, was, that there should be no information granted, on the motion, unless a case were made by some one member, who would vouch from his knowledge for the fact that there was something in the matter, into which he desired to make further inquiry.

Mr. H. J. Boulton reproved Mr. Price for an incidental illustration which occurred in that hon. member's remarks, viz, that many a wounded lion signed his place to avoid being disclaimed. The word wounded must be intended to apply to the petitioner, Coppins, who had brought the Asylum before the House, and was not a word that fitted the mouth of a minister of the Crown. The hon. member then read a number of letters to show the great respectability of Mr. Coppins. The government, so tender now about Dr. Scott, were by no means equally delicate when Dr. Funk was assailed in a public newspaper. He ridiculed the idea of Mrs. Gilbert having been improperly protected, merely because she, a mad woman, had another crazy woman to watch her.

Dr. Nelson was of opinion that no inquiry should be permitted like that contemplated in the motion, unless some foundation were shown for the charges. In proof of this he mentioned a letter he had received that day, giving an account of the charges lately brought against the medical superintendent of the Marine Hospital at Quebec, which charge, he said, had been given up, when fairly tried, by the very people who had been the first to make it. He, however, desired some enquiry into the statements relative to the change in corners, and also into the large increase in the number of deaths—a circumstance which admitted of many explanations. In reply to a demand of Mr. Boulton, he said that it seemed at first sight culpable negligence to allow one lunatic to take charge of another; but there were various kinds of insanity, and in Europe females were sometimes arranged in pairs under the charge of one of themselves. For these reasons he thought it would be just as well to accede to the motion.

Mr. Boulton, in replying to the insinuations made against him by Mr. Price, read two extracts from ministerial papers, the *Kingston Herald* and the *Milton Journal*, both complaining of the bad classification of the lunatics, and to deaths on the authority of the deceased women's brother, that she was recovering at the time of her death. The day evening before that announcement, Dr. Scott told the brother that he despaired of her.

Mr. Hincks said that in regard to the mortality in the institution, it was well to mention that it was less than in other similar institutions in the States, where the mortality was eight, ten, eleven, and twelve per cent. He asserted that all the charges had been investigated by the Commissioners, who had found them all to be unfounded. It was ultimately agreed that the inquest in the case of Mrs. Gilbert should be brought down, with a return of the number of deaths in the Provincial Asylum.

Mr. H. J. Boulton moved that the House do go into Committee of the whole, to take into consideration the state of the Province, with reference to the resignation of the Honorable Robert Baldwin of his seat in the Cabinet, and of his continuance to hold the subordinate office of Attorney General. It was, he said, ten years since Responsible Government had been introduced by certain resolutions passed in 1841. The course of proceeding contemplated by those resolutions was that which prevailed in England, in opposition to that which had formerly prevailed in the Province, with the exception of a momentary attempt under Sir F. B. Head. In England, when any member of the administration resigned his place, if he were not followed immediately by his associates, he retained all the political responsibility of office. It had also been the custom in the Province that the Attorney General should be the leader of the Cabinet, and therefore compared those officers to analogous officers in England. He (Mr. Boulton) then proceeded to note (Sheriff) enumerated, as to duties, the Home Secretary of State in England. But to never found that any Home Secretary had ever remained in the Cabinet, or continued to be supported by the hon. or members of Parliament, if he had resigned; yet it was said he would be in a position to fulfill the duties of his office; the administration being still responsible for his acts. This was quite inconsistent with Responsible Government, and had never been supposed in England in the case of any great officer of the Crown. When the Attorney General had been represented for an entire session the Ministry had been told that they were a Ministry with political backbone; but if the Attorney General had to be of more consequence than the Premier, he would be in a position to prove that at present, when these two Attorney Generals (Wed) in the Cabinet, there was no Premier. Cabinet meetings were held without the Premier, Cabinet meetings with pieces meetings; it had not been so in former times; they gave the impression of a great table. With reference to the Upper Canada Ministry, it was not, their place had been filled up in such a manner as to avoid any appeal to the country, it was at the cabinet in a new cabinet, Upper Canada in all, hardly be said to have a Premier. Upper Canada, in all, With regard to the Upper Canada Attorney General, he was an able lawyer, and up to his work; but was only an administrative officer, and at the moment in Upper Canada; for, if was this year that which made the hon. member (Mr. Price) say such a speech; a committee of Parliament, which is part of the Province. He was not, and it was the duty of the Province. He was not, and it was the duty of the Province, in which the Ministry had lost the confidence of the Province, and the Ministry had lost the confidence of the Province, and the Ministry had lost the confidence of the Province, and