able rates, and the Government decided that, if Mr. Carroll could not get men to work at the same rate, the work should not be proceeded with. However, although the works were suspended, Mr. Carroll, with a small party, commenced on the 8th May to underbrush the road, in defiance of the instructions from Government. He worked for a couple of days, and then sent in a bill for $300. He also charged a large sum for his own services up to the 1st July and for provisions. Of course the account could not be for a moment entertained. Now, the fact was those provisions were taken up in the winter before there was any intention of commencing work on the road, so that it was hardly just to charge the Government with the cost of them. There were other items in the account similar to those mentioned. Besides this road, there were others in precisely similar circumstances, yet the bills from all of these were below $100, except one where the charge was $109. There was another case in which a claim for $500 was presented, but Government paid only $100 of the amount, refusing to give any more. All the other accounts had been settled, and so would this have been liquidated if it had been a reasonable one.

Mr. McKELLAR said if the hon. Commissioner were prepared to investigate this case, he (Mr. McK.) would not move for a committee; he was prepared to leave it in the hands of the Government. He believed there was something due Mr. Carroll.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—We never denied that. We owe him $50.

After some further discussion,

Mr. McKELLAR withdrew his motion, leaving the matter in the hands of the Government.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE.

Bill (No. 92), To amend the 25th sec., cap. 21 and 32 Vic., intituled "An Act respecting the Election of members of the Legislative Assembly," went into Committee.

Atty-Gen. MACDONALD wished to submit a clause in addition to the Bill. He said that the purpose he had in view was to leave out the property qualification of Membership, which now was necessary. It might not be a conservative step, but as hon. members took the oath, he did not think it necessary to continue the property qualification. He moved the adoption of the clause.

Mr. BLAKE did not consider that it was necessary to pass the clause proposed. It was enough to say that the law requiring qualification is repealed, and the clause of the hon. gentleman was entirely needless.

Atty.-General MACDONALD contended that it was necessary,

Mr. BLAKE said it would apply to every section, and it was ridiculous to say that this part of the law could be in force any more than others.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS said the law was to continue until "otherwise provided."

Mr. BLAKE—Certainly—but we have "otherwise provided."

The Committee then rose, and reported the Bill with certain amendments. Third reading to-morrow.

THE SUPPLY BILL OF 1869.

Mr. BOYD moved the second reading of Bill (No 32,) To repeal section six, chap. one, passed in the 32nd year of Her Majesty's reign The decision of the Minister of Justice was that the clause for the additional payment of the judges should be repealed unconditionally, and this was not done by the Government in their proposed Bill, and therefore he moved the second reading of this Bill, in order to prevent any complication between the Legislature and the Minister of Justice.

Atty.-General MACDONALD said he supposed the Minister of Justice was much obliged to the hon. member for Prescott. The Government were quite willing to accept all the responsibility. The House had adopted the Bill of the Government by a large majority the other evening, and he did not think that the time of the House should be taken up in this way. If the Bill was disallowed he was prepared to send the hon. member of Prescott a silver medal for his endeavours. The hon. member ought to withdraw the motion, as he had now an opportunity of ventilating the question.

Mr. BOYD would not withdraw the Bill.

Atty. General MACDONALD then moved the three months' hoist.

Mr. BLAKE said the question ought to be placed in its proper light. The better plan would be to repeal the clause which had been disallowed by the Minister of Justice. The course proposed by the hon. Atty.-General would only complicate the matter. He thought the suggestion of the Minister of Justice was worthy of consideration. He did not think that they ought to put the constitution in this difficulty. He thought that the hon. member for Prescott was quite right in pressing his Bill.

Mr. LOUNT thought that it was a failure of courtesy on the part of the hon member for Prescott to press his Bill. The opinion of the House was against him, and he should, therefore, withdraw the Bill.

A division was taken on the amendment, with the following result :—

YEAS—Messrs Beatty, Boulter, Calvin, Cameron, Carling (London), Carnegie, Cockburn, Colquhoun, Corby, Coyne, Craig (Glengarry), Craig (Russell), Eyre, Fitzsimmons, Galbraith, Graham (Hastings), Grahame (York), Greely, Hooper, Lauder, Lount, Luton, Macdonald, Matchett, Monteith, Murray, McColl (Elgin), McGill, Paxton, Richards, Rykert, Scott (Grey), Scott (Ottawa), Secord, Smith (Leeds and Grenville), Strange, Tett, Trow, Wallis, Wigle, Williams (Durham), and Wood.—42.

NAYS—Messrs Baxter, Blake, Boyd, Christie, Clemens, Cook, Finlayson, Gow, McCall (Norfolk), McDougall, McKellar, McMurrich, Oliver, Perry, Sinclair, Springer, and Williams (Hamilton).—17.

MEDICAL ACT.

On the Bill (97) being called,

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH said that when this Bill was up for discussion on the second reading, a point of order was raised as to whether this was a public or a private Bill. He asked the Speaker for his decision.

The SPEAKER said he considered it a public Bill. The motion before the House was the six months' hoist, moved by Dr McGill.

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH said all the Bill asked for was the privilege of allowing the Homœopathists and Eclectics to examine their own students It was hardly fair to ask them to be examined by the Allopaths. If there was anything asked beyond this reasonable request he would not be found to advocate the measure. If this were not granted the Homœopathists and Eclectics would ask to be placed in the position they held before the Bill of last session was passed. It was a reasonable request, and any one who had watched the proceedings of the Medical Council at their last meeting would see the necessity of such a measure as this.

Dr. BOULTER said it was well known the Medical Bill which was passed last session occupied a great deal of the time of the House. It empowered the Medical Council to do certain things, and gave the Homœopathists and Eclectics a fair representation in the Council. It was, therefore, most unfair for the honourable member for North York to come forward with this Bill now before the House. If any injustice had been shown the two bodies on whose behalf it was brought forward, it would be very well to entertain it; but there was no necessity for it, and he would most cordially support the motion for the six months' hoist.

Dr. McGILL rose to speak, when

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH said the hon member for South Ontario was out of order, having spoken once before on the Bill when he introduced the amendment.

The SPEAKER ruled out of order.

Mr. BAXTER believed the Homœopaths and Eclectics were fairly represented at the Medical Council, and he could see no reason for complaint. In looking over the subjects for examination, it would be seen that there could be no injustice done the students. They were first examined in certain branches, after which they were asked in which branch of the profession they desired to practice. If they said they wished to practice in the Eclectics they were handed over to the Eclectic examiners, if Homœopathists, to the Homœopathist examiners. At the last meeting of the Medical Council, which was, on the whole, a harmonious one, the subjects for examination were thoroughly discussed and agreed on by all. He believed there was no necessity for this Bill, and he would therefore support the motion of Dr. McGill.

Dr. McGILL said he made no speech when he moved the six months' hoist. He was about to do so when he was interrupted by the hon. Provincial Secretary, when the debate was adjourned.

Mr. BLAKE said when the hon Attorney-General made a motion the other day, after having made a speech on the same subject, the Speaker ruled that he was in order It would be but justice to treat Dr. McGill in the same way.

Atty-Gen MACDONALD said that was a different case. He made no speech, but simply made the motion.

Mr BLAKE—That is what the Doctor did.

Atty-Gen MACDONALD said the hon member was then in order.

Mr BLAKE did not believe the Doctor was in order—but he was as much in order as the Attorney-General. (Laughter)

Dr. McGILL spoke at some length on the course taken by the hon Provincial Secretary with respect to this Bill. That hon gentleman had taken occasion to say that there was a decidedly hostile spirit displayed towards the Homœopathists and Eclectics by the Allopaths at the last meeting of the Medical Council. He (Dr. McG.) denied that statement. It was not so. The meeting was, in fact, most harmonious. All the members of that Council had shown a desire to uphold the character of the profession They were aware that the fundamental principles of the Medical Act were acknowledged by all the branches of the profession, and it was on these that the examinations were to be conducted. There was no desire on the part of the Allopaths, and especially of the Council to snuff out the Homœopathists, as had been asserted by the hon member for North York This Bill was unnecessary. It had not been asked for by the Homœopathists as a body. He believed there was not a single member of the regular profession in the Province that asked for it. He believed the majority of them were satisfied with the existing law True it was that lately a few had been found to support this amendment, but even those few would not have shown the slightest dissatisfaction if the hon. member for North York had not brought in this measure He (Dr. McG.) believed that when amendments were required, the Medical Council would ask for them He would be the foremost in advocating a change suggested from that quarter, but otherwise he would oppose any amendment It was unfair to come forward and ask for this amendment before a single examination had taken place under the present law. He only asked the House to reject this Bill till after the next meeting of the Medical Council. If at the end of the year it should be found that the present law had not worked well, it would be time enough to bring in this amendment.

Mr. LOUNT said he was not a medical man; in fact he had a holy horror of medicine *in toto*. Last Session the House had been physicked thoroughly with the Medical Act, and he hoped that all the Legislation that would be successary for some time to come had been passed. But here came another Bill this Session to amend the Legislation of last year. He would not discuss the principles of this Bill. He had the misfortune to be on the Committee to consider the Medical Bill last year, and he was sick at heart at the recollection of the manner in which the Committee had been dosed. (Laughter.) If these amendments were necessary, it would be well to send this Bill to a special Committee. Let the House swallow the bolus and hand the Bill to a Committee. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEATTY agreed with the hon. member for North Simcoe, that it would be better to send the Bill to a Committee. He (Mr. B.) could not vote either for the Bill or for the amendment of the hon. member for South Ontario.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said the Homœopathists desired to have the opportunity of being on an equal footing with the Allopaths at the examinations. Why should they not be allowed to be present? It was putting an indignity on them to deny them the right of being present. He was confident the hon. member for South Ontario would accept this Bill if he were not subjected to other influences.

Mr. LAUDER said the Homœopathists were a small a body compared with the Allopaths, and in spite of all the assertions of hon members to the contrary, there was a most illiberal hostile spirit displayed toward the Homœopathists by the more powerful body. He had no sympathy with either party, but he did not believe in allowing the minority to be crushed out of existence. He would be sorry to see this Bill thrown out. Let it be read a second time and be referred to a committee.

The amendment was put and lost on a division.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to a Special Committee composed of Hon. Mr. Cameron, Drs McGill, Baxter, Messrs. Fraser, Beatty, Boyd, Williams (Hamilton), Sinclair and the mover.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—"And Dr. Boulter."

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH.—That would make the committee too large. (Laughter.)

After a short discussion, Dr. Boulter was added to the Committee.

The House rose for recess at six o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. COYNE wished, before proceeding to business, to have his name taken from the division list. He had paired with Mr. Crosby.

Mr. BLAKE objected to it. He did not believe in establishing such a precedent.

After a short discussion, Mr. Coyne was permitted to have his name taken off.

COMMON SCHOOL LAW.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON moved that the House go into Committee on the Bill (No. 3) to amend the Common School Act of Upper Canada. Mr. Lauder in the chair.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON moved the adoption of the fifth clause. He believed the Lieut.-Governor had an equal right with County Councils or Boards in appointing or diminishing superintendents.

Mr. BARBER objected to giving such power to the Lieut. Governor.

Mr. PERRY thought the Superintendent should be appointed for a certain term. He therefore moved that the 10th line of the clause be amended by inserting these words, "hold office for the term of three years only."

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said if a Superintendent were inefficient, or if he misconducted himself, the Council had the power of removing him. If the Superintendent proved an efficient officer he should be retained, so there was no necessity for the limitation.

Mr. CALVIN would support the amendment on the ground that it would tend to make the Superintendents more efficient The members of this House might be said to be very efficient, but that was no reason why they should hold their seats for life. No one could doubt that members were more alive to the public interest and performed their duties more efficiently, from the knowledge that they had to go before their constituents once every four years: and they knew very well that if they did not attend to their duties they would not be sent back to Parliament again. Then, again, it was so difficult to impeach an office holder. It was almost impossible to impeach one, and a superintendent might be incompetent to fill his position and yet hold it.

Mr. GRAHAM (Hastings) rose to move an amendment, to the effect that the power of dismissal be left to the Council or Board appointing the superintendent.

The motion was declared out of order, the motion for the hon member for North Oxford being before the chair.

Mr. GALBRAITH believed it would be better to appoint the superintendent for life.

Dr. McGILL concurred. It would be better to give the Bill a trial without amending it.

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH wished to know if at the end of the three years the superintendent would be eligible for re-election.

Mr. PERRY.—Certainly.

Hon. Mr McMURRICH said it would be well to strike out the word "only" in the amendment.

The word was struck out.

Mr. OLIVER spoke in support of the amendment.

Mr. McCALL (Norfolk) said while the appointments were made yearly the same men had been re appointed year after year. The people were in favour of yearly appointments, and he hoped the House would have the good sense not to make the proposed change in our School laws He did not approve of extending the term of office, even for three years; but he would vote for the amendment believing it to be better than no limitation at all.

Mr. TROW believed the most objectionable feature in this clause was the power given to the Governor. He considered the amendment of the hon. member for North Hastings to strike out this feature, more important than the amendment before the House.

Mr. PERRY said it was well known that incumbents for life became careless from the knowledge of being secure in their offices He had heard nothing to convince him that the clause as it stood was a good one, and he hoped the House would accept his amendment.

A count was then made and the amendment was carried, 52 yeas.

Mr. GRAHAM, (Hastings) moved that the words empowering the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to remove superintendents be struck out.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON explained that the object of appointing the superintendents for life, and of giving the Lieut-Governor the power of removing them, was to place them beyond the possibility of political influence This was no attempt to interfere with the rights of the people. The measure was one which should not be cut up piecemeal in this way. At the various meetings held through out the country, this clause was approved of; and he hoped the House would not strike out the best feature in it.

Mr. McDUGALL could not see how this clause would prevent the superintendent from being influenced in his political course. If he voted against the Government, might he not be removed from his office for it.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said the superintendent could only be removed for incompetence in the discharge of his duties, or misconduct.

Mr. TROW spoke in support of the amendment.

Mr. MONTEITH thought the Government should exercise their power as they contributed towards the support of the offices.

Mr. McKELLAR objected to centralizing power. He did not believe in giving Government too much power over such offices. He did not mean to say this Government would misuse their power, but he did not want to give them the chance. He would, therefore, most cheerfully, support the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM (Hastings) said his object in moving the amendment was to do away with the fixed prerogative which it provided He was just as desirous as the hon. Provincial Secretary to see this Common School Law perfect, and for that reason he moved this amendment.

Mr. McCALL (Norfolk) said there had been quite a number of petitions presented in the House, praying that no change be made in the School Law. He agreed, however, with the hon. member for North Hastings (if the law must pass) to give the power of dismissal to the appointing Boards alone.

Mr. CODE would support the amendment, believing the clause as it stood, if passed, would create a good deal of trouble in the country.

Mr. CALVIN believed the Government wanted to assume all the control. If this power were granted, then the House might as well be closed up, the members go home, and let the Government do all the business. The Government claimed this power because they assisted the schools but they only expended the money of the people for the people. He would support the amendment.

Dr. McGILL would support the amendment.

Mr GALBRAITH would also support the amendment, believing the power would be rightly exercised by the County Councils. There was nothing more obnoxious to the people than this everlasting tinkering with the laws of the country. It made officers uncertain how to act, for it was almost impossible to be conversant with all the changes.

Hon. Mr CAMERON said there was no attempt to interfere with the rights of the people. The representatives of the people surely expressed the views of the people better than the County Councils. It was true that the Government had the power of removing the superintendents for misconduct against the Government, such as misappropriating public moneys, but the County Council had the power of immediately afterwards appointing a successor. There was, therefore, no desire to interfere with the rights of the people, the desire was to protect the rights of the people by seeing that the public moneys were rightly expended.

After some further discussion the amendment was carried, and the clause as amended then adopted.

On clause 6,

Mr. SCOTT (Grey) wished to ask if the County Superintendents were to have no power accept that which was granted by the Chief Superintendent.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said, that no further power was conferred on Chief Superintendents by this clause.

The clause was then carried.

On clause 7,

Mr. FERGUSON moved that the words "who shall also determine and provide for the allowance for travelling expenses" He did not believe in allowing the superintendents to charge whatever they pleased for travelling expenses.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said the amount of these expenses would be entirely within the discretion of the County Council.

Mr. SINCLAIR thought that it would perhaps be better if travelling expenses were done away with and the salary made a lump sum.

Mr. McKELLAR raised the question whether the clause could be proceeded with except by resolution, as it imposed a new tax upon the people That course had been adopted with the various clauses of the Drainage Act.

Atty-Gen. MACDONALD thought the exclusion of the Government from any control over the superintendents while they contributed towards their maintenance unfair. He thought it was a one sided arrangement, and they might as well strike out the clause altogether. He had met some very bad specimens of orthography on the part of some of the County Superintendents appointed by the County Councils.

Mr. GRAHAM (Hastings) thought it was not a matter of dollars and cents.

Mr. CALVIN said that they now paid $4 a school; but the Act provided that they should now pay at least $5, the Government paying an additional $5. Now, the people paid the Government, and therefore the generosity of the Government's proposition was that they should now pay $10 for each school, while they formerly paid but $4 (Laughter) He could not agree to that kind of thing. (Renewed laughter)

Mr. FERGUSON was in favour of a certain sum being fixed, instead of the present uncertain manner being followed.

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH wished to see the sum contributed in equal proportion to the expenses.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said he had better drop the clause at present

Mr SINCLAIR hoped the clause would not be dropped entirely.

Hon Mr CAMERON said the clause would