duced. There was more confusion introduced in countries by uniting the two systems than had previously existed. Certain equitable jurisdiction to County Courts he was in favour of. He admitted that until comparatively late times the Canadian Court of Chancery resembled more in practice and details the old court in England, but it had shown a literal spirit in introducing reforms; and so, while admitting that abuses in practice had crept in during the early working of the court, he condemned as extremely uncalled for the language applied to that court by the hon member for Lincoln. In regard to the taxation of bills, he believed that leading practitioners in Toronto had made it a point to go to country towns to get their bills taxed by the Masters there, because they were allowed more for costs than they would be here. The revision of bills here was therefore a good point. He could hardly credit the language said to have been used by the hon member for Lincoln in reference to the Court of Chancery. There must be a jurisdiction of that kind exercised, and he hoped the Government would keep the systems of common law and equity separate As there was a new Lord Chancellor appointed in England, who was said to contemplate reforms—though of what nature he could not say—he thought it would be wise to wait and see what action may be taken there in reference to Chancery reform. (Hear, hear.)

Attorney-General MOWAT had no objection to bring down the papers. He desired to say a few words with reference to some points raised in the discussion. Reference had been made by some hon. gentlemen opposite to the policy of the Government of which Mr. Blake was the head. On examining the statement of his policy which he made after taking office, it would be found that the measure which he promised on this subject was a measure in the direction of fusion. Now, with regard to absolute and entire fusion of the jurisdiction now exercised by courts of Law and Equity, it was no easy matter to prepare a measure for that purpose. It was that, however, which the Commission set about doing. It was not the intention of the Government by whom that Commission was appointed that they should do so; they seemed to have misapprehended the intention of the Government His hon. friend the Treasurer discovered that they felt the task to be one involving so much difficulty and requiring so much time for the adequate performance of it, that it would be necessary that the two judges who were on the commission should be released for a period from their judicial duties, in order to prepare the necessary measure and make a proper report. The gentlemen of the Commission who were not on the bench could only give to the work, of course, a small portion of their time, as it was impossible for them to abandon their practice. Under these circumstances, the hon. Treasurer thought it was not in the public nterest that the Commission should continue. It was not in the power of this Government to relieve the judges from their official duties, and if it had been so, the policy of so doing would be doubtful. The work was one which in other countries had caused several years, severe labour on the part of learned lawyers, and we could not expect it to be different here. However, two Bills had been prepared—and placed before him—one by several learned members of the Commission, and the other came from another quarter. Both of these Bills were prepared or the purpose of securing absolute fusion of law and equity so far as that was possible. One of these Bills would probably leave the Chancery practice about as it was now; and the other would make it more cumbrous and expensive. The evil which existed under the present system did not arise from any idea that in this matter a division of labour might not be desirable in this as in everything else. But the evil was two-fold. It occasionally happened that there was a doubt as to whether a suitor should go into Law or Equity for the purpose of obtaining the remedy which he was entitled to. This doubt very seldom arose, but it certainly arose occasionally. The other evil connected with the existing system was this: In a class of cases which occasionally arose it was necessary for the defendant at law, in order to make available the evidence he was entitled to, to occasionally commence a suit in the Court of Chancery, that court in that case undoing what had been done by the court of Law. This anomaly involved a great deal of expense. These were the two evils which the fusion would be intended to cure. A great deal of attention had been given to the subject in England, and several reports had been prepared by learned lawyers. In these reports would be found the strongest expression of opinion of the evils of hasty change and the confusion that might arise in making the fusion. He thought that, considering all that we knew upon this subject, it would be found quite possible by a few provisions carefully prepared to remove—he thought, entirely—but if not, at least almost entirely, the anomalies which have led some of the advocates of entire fusion to take the grounds which they have. It was a Bill on that principle which he would have the honour, in a day or two to lay before the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) He had not intended to make any statement on the subject until he presented the Bill; but owing to the turn which the debate had taken, he thought it proper to say what he had done.

Mr. PRINCE had thought that a good plan would be to make an attempt in the direction of fusion. Our Legislature was not of so expensive a character as to make it impossible for a measure to remain in force for a few years in order to see how it would work. He instanced a case which had occurred in his practice which showed the inconvenience and anomaly of the present state of the courts. Something ought to be tried at all events.

Mr. McMANUS said that in his part of the country the people were pleased to hear that a Commission had been appointed to fuse the courts, because although it was known that a man lost some of his property by going into the Superior Courts, he lost it entirely if he went into the Court of Chancery. (Laughter.) He agreed with the member for Stormont that it was the poor man's court, because a man was sure to be poor when he came out of it. (Laughter.)

Mr. WELLS contradicted the inference of the member for Niagara as to leading lawyers of Toronto sending their Bills to outer offices to be taxed, and explained fully the circumstances of the case.

Mr. ROBINSON protested against the practice the legal members of the House had of occupying all the time of the Assembly with these law Bills, which were discussed before empty benches. He suggested that these gentlemen should have a room by themselves, where they could come to some satisfactory conclusions, and then the rest of the House would agree to those conclusions. One hon. member had a nightmare the other evening, and imagined there was a lawyer on top of him. (Laughter.)

Mr RYKERT denied that he had called the Court of Chancery a sink of iniquity. What he said was, that if he repeated what he had heard of it he would so call it. He had the highest admiration for the judges of that court. He then went on to repeat his former statement as to what the policy of the late Government had been on the subject of this court, and contended that the present Administration had abandoned that policy.

The motion was then carried, and at six o'clock the House rose.

After Recess,

WELLINGTON, GREY, & BRUCE RAILWAY.

Mr. RYKERT resumed the debate on his motion for papers relating to the Wellington, Grey, & Bruce Railway. With reference to the statement made by the Commissioners of Public Works that he (Mr. Rykert) had threatened an employee of the House that he would bring him before the bar of the House if he refused to give him certain information, he said he had written to that employee, Mr. Notman, and had received from him an answer to the effect that he (Mr. Rykert) clearly expressed the intention of bringing the matter before the House if the desired information was withheld from him, but that he never hinted that he would bring him (Mr. Notman) or any other employee before the bar of the House.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said he would briefly state the facts. Mr. Hunter called upon him and said that the hon. member for Lincoln had threatened either to bring Mr. Notman before the House or to bring the subject of his not being able to get the information before the House.

Mr. RYKERT said that every member of the House had the right to bring such a matter before the House.

The motion was then carried.