of distributing the extra copies proposed, because, if the Government proposed that the Bill should be passed this session at all, it would be read a third time before the opinions of the municipalities could be had on the subject.

The SPEAKER ruled the motion out of order.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. RYKERT—To further amend the Act respecting the Court of Error and Appeal.

Mr WOOD (Brant)—To incorporate the London and Victoria Oil Refining Company.

Mr. MEREDITH—To amend and consolidate the law as to wills.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria)—Bill to amend the Assessment Act of 1869.

Mr. McLEOD—Bill to provide that any Act to amend, or alter, or add to any Act, or repeal any portion of any Act, shall re-enact the whole law.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE—Respecting the institutions for the education of the deaf and dumb, and blind, in Ontario.

Hon. Mr SCOTT—Relating to Christ Church, Ottawa.

PROTON COMMITTEE.

Mr. WELLS asked of Mr. Rykert whether he, being Chairman of the Proton Committee, intends, at an early day, to move the motion for the adoption of the report of the Committee, of which he gave notice last Session, and which motion was adjourned, because the evidence had not been printed.

Mr. RYKERT called the attention of the hon. gentleman to the rule of the House that prevented any discussion unless on some matter before the House. He might state, however, that he was not Chairman of the Proton Committee; that no such Committee existed, it having been by the act of this House dissolved; that that report was not adjourned on account of the evidence not being printed, but because the leader of the Government felt that one of his colleagues had been condemned.

EARLY SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. COYNE desired to call the attention of the House, and especially of the Government, to a suggestion as to whether some changes could not be made in the rules of the House that would make it practicable for the House to rise at a reasonable hour before midnight. This matter was discussed by the press last session, and he thought such a change could be made without interfering with the business of the House. The Speaker might take the chair, say at half-past one o'clock, and some rule might be adopted whereby the House could rise about 10 o'clock, instead of sitting to all hours in the morning. Were this plan adopted he believed the business of the House could be better conducted.

FUSION OF THE LAW AND EQUITY COURTS.

Mr. RYKERT moved for copies of all Orders in Council relating to the Law and Equity Commission, also copies of all instructions to said Commission, and a memorandum of the costs and expenses attending said Commission. He found in the Address of his Excellency reference made to a bill the Government were about to bring down respecting the administration of justice in the Courts of the Province. He also found in the "organ" of the hon. gentlemen an article referring to a Bill which the Government were bound to introduce, with regard to the reform of the Courts of Law and Equity. He contended that the hon. gentlemen opposite should have enlightened the House with regard to their actions in reference to this important subject. The matter had been discussed throughout the country for a great many years and it was one upon which public opinion had been expressed in strong terms. The public were not in favour of the Court of Chancery and the antagonism against that court had increased; and he judged this from his practice in that court and by what he had seen in the country. It was important that the House should legislate upon the question. A very large majority of the people of the Province were in favour of the abolition of the Court of Chancery. He had always been in favour of that abolition. In 1857 a motion was made in the Legislature in favour of the abolition of the Court of Chancery, and a large number of Reformers of the Province supported that amendment contrary to the course they had pursued in years gone by. He found by reference to the Statute Books that the County Courts had equitable jurisdiction and that the Courts of Common Law had a certain amount of equitable jurisdiction. The second Government of the Ontario Legislature declared that it was a disgrace to the country that there should be Courts having two separate jurisdictions. The hon. gentleman then referred to resolutions introduced into the House on the 25th January, 1871, for the purpose of instituting a commission for the purpose of considering the fusion of the Courts of Law and Equity, and said that during the discussion of those resolutions the hon. gentleman took very strong grounds for his expression of opinion that the Chancery Court should be abolished, or that there should be a fusion with the Courts of Law. He did not want any law controlled by Equity law, but he wanted the rights he was entitled to in one court to belong to all other courts. In that debate, he recollected that the Hon. Provincial Secretary also strongly expressed himself in favour of the fusion of the courts. The leader of the Government, in his speech at Kincardine, made use of some very strong language, with which he (Mr. Rykert) heartily agreed. He then stated that it was a disgrace to any country to have two systems of law and two sets of courts—one undoing the decisions of the other. In the face of this declaration of the hon. gentleman, they (the Opposition) had a right to expect that the present Government should succeed to the policy of the late Government. They had a right to expect a Bill which would entirely do away with the Chancery Court, which had been an enormous expense to the country. The officers of that Court prolonged the business as long as they possibly could, with a view of increasing their fees and emoluments. He maintained it was a standing disgrace to the country that there were persons making from one to two thousand dollars a year by merely taking evidence. He could see no reason why the judges could not take the evidence *viva voce*, and give decision upon it. In alluding to what he termed excessive bills of costs, he said there were Chancery lawyers of the city of Toronto living upon the vitals of the practitioners of the country. After condemning the system of taxing bills of costs, he proceeded to illustrate the working of the Court of Chancery in certain cases, and concluded by asserting that the Government were bound to carry out the policy of their predecessors with regard to the fusion of the Courts of Law and Equity. The Court of Chancery, he affirmed, was a sink of iniquity which had done an injustice to the country. (Oh, oh.)

Mr. BETHUNE was surprised that any gentleman occupying a seat in the House, and who had any self-respect, should apply to any of our Courts of Justice the term "den of iniquity." If there was one thing the people of the country held in respect it was our Courts of Justice, and he did not think that any Court had that respect to a greater extent than the Court of Chancery. In many cases it was allowed that cases should be brought either before a Court of Chancery or of Common Law. In these cases, three out of four of the suits were presented to the Court of Chancery. He could say without fear of contradiction that as much litigation was disposed of in the Court of Chancery by the three judges as was disposed of in the other Courts by the six judges. The judges in that Court were worked much harder. As a general rule the cases coming before the Court of Chancery were much more complicated than those before the Common Law Courts, which generally were simple and easy of determination. The law was the same in both Courts, but the forms of procedure were different, and he would rejoice if a fusion could be brought about. He thought the procedure could be so simplified that there would be no difference between law and equity; but that would not suit the purpose of the hon. member for Lincoln, for then the Courts of Common Law would administer Equity jurisdiction, and the Court of Chancery would not be swept away. In fact, when the hon. gentleman opposite cried so loudly for the desired change, they were quibbling with words. He dared say that these men who clamoured so loudly for the abolition of the Court of Chancery had had some experience of the judgments of that Court—had felt its sting, and knew full well that no other Court of law would have been able to reach them. (Hear). This was the class which clamoured for the dissolution of the Court. The hon. gentleman who had just sat down had told them that the equitable jurisdiction of the County Courts had been swept away. He (Mr. B.) was not aware whether the hon. gentleman had concurred in that measure, but he was aware that that equitable jurisdiction had been taken away by a Government of which he was a supporter, and vested in the Court of Chancery. The late Mr. Sandfield Macdonald gave it to the Court of Chancery, and no doubt the hon. member for Lincoln voted for the