

asked that a member should be allowed to retire from a committee, and not exercise his duties as a representative of the people; because he was connected with a public journal. Perhaps it would be inadvisable to agree to the hon. member's request. The House might be curious to know whether he, as a member of the committee in the discharge of his high parliamentary duties, would be able to sustain the course which his journal had taken. It would certainly place the hon. member in a very unpleasant position if he felt compelled, by a sense of public duty, after hearing all the circumstances of the case, to come to the conclusion that the paper of which he was the manager had asserted opinions which could not be borne out by the facts. He (Dr. T.) must certainly express his surprise that the hon. member had not felt the delicacy which he now laid claim to, elsewhere than in the house. It hardly seemed compatible with justice to attack the Medical Superintendent in the way he had been in the journal with which the hon. gentleman was connected. It ought to be remembered that it was quite possible for a public officer holding a highly responsible position not to be entirely exempt from blame—to be open to the imputation of not having exercised that strict surveillance over subordinates he might have done, and at the same time, for his general management, to be such as would prevent him from being treated with any degree of severity. There were few parties called upon to discharge high public duties—whether in the government or otherwise—who could say that their conduct had been always entirely blameless. As respects the Medical Superintendent, it would have been manifestly unfair, in view of all the circumstances of the case—in view of the facts that he had held his position for many years to the satisfaction of several governments, that his general management had been approved of by a committee of medical gentlemen, who had investigated thoroughly the condition of the institution—to dismiss him, and oblige him, with tarnished reputation, to return to a profession which he had given up when he took charge of the Asylum. All the government could justly do was to make such changes in the institution as would give the public an additional guarantee that it was conducted in the manner it ought to be. Under all the circumstances, he thought the hon. member ought to remain on the committee, though if he refused to do so, of course the House would have to yield to his request.

Mr. ANNAND said that he must still ask to be excused from serving on the committee, for he felt he would be occupying a very equivocal position in the eyes of the public if he remained on it, especially if a report adverse to the Superintendent was brought in.

Mr. Annand was excused from serving on the committee.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON introduced a bill for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals.

Hon. FIN. SEC. laid on the table, by command, a petition from trustees of Cumberland

Academy for increased allowance—referred to the Committee on Education. Also petition of H. Lawlor, of Cape Breton, in reference to postal service—referred to P. O. Committee.

LOCAL CONSTITUTION.

Hon. PROV. SEC. moved the third reading of the bill in reference to duration of and representation in the General Assembly.

Mr. ANNAND moved that four members be given to Halifax county, two to the city, and two to the county outside the city. Negatived.

Mr. ANNAND again moved that the bill be re-committed for the purpose of giving four members to the county of Halifax. He did so, because during the debate the principle of representation by population had been recognized as the true one. In fact, it had been to a certain extent recognized in the case of Halifax and Pictou, but he did not think the bill went far enough.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON would be glad if the House would entertain the proposition.

Hon. PROV. SEC. said he did not look upon this motion as in the slightest degree affecting the principle of the bill, and the House was at liberty to pass or reject it. He would, however, vote against the resolution, for he felt that Halifax would have fully as much influence as she ought to have in the Legislature. Indeed, Halifax now had an amount of weight in the Legislature beyond that of any other part of the Province.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that if the resolution passed then Halifax would have a representation equal to that of half of the Island of Cape Breton.

Mr. TOBIN said that he would vote for the resolution in entire deference to the hon. member for East Halifax. That hon. member had no doubt made the motion with the hope of placing the representatives of the city, if possible, in a wrong position, but he would find himself mistaken. He (Mr. T.) would be very happy if the House would grant the additional representation to Halifax.

Mr. PRYOR would also be happy to vote for the resolution, particularly as he appreciated the motives of the hon. member who moved it.

Mr. LOCKE said that he believed his hon. friend, the member for East Halifax, would have to sit alone on his side of the House.

On a division the resolution was lost by 5 to 36.

Yeas—Tolin, Pryor, Annand, Shannon, Balcarn.

Nays—Killam, D. Fraser, Allison, J. Fraser, Bill, Hill, Longley, Heffernan, Hatfield, Hebb, Townsend, Whitman, Parker, Kaulback, Jost, Bourinot, Donkin, Miller, McFarlane, Prov. Secy., Stewart Campbell, Locke, Fin. Secy., Robertson, Blanchard, Smyth, Cowie, Brown, J. Campbell, McKinnon, Ross, Coffin, Blackwood, Colin Campbell, Caldwell, Ray.

Mr. ANNAND then moved that the bill be deferred until the next session of the Legislature. Negatived by 18 to 30.

Yeas—Killam, Hebb, Hatfield, Balcarn, Ross, Locke, S. Campbell, Robertson, Annand, Ray, Coffin, Brown, Blackwood.