to act in a judicial capacity, as well as the provision for their payment, devolved upon the Government of the Dominion, yet it was left to this Government to say how many judges should be from time to time appointed and how they should be distributed. It would, of course, be highly improper to ask the appointment of a greater number than the actual necessities of the country required, but it was also necessary to meet the requirements of the judicial business as it increased. The necessity for an additional number of judges had been pressed upon the Government for a considerable time, and it was recognised by the judges themselves and everybody who knew anything of the requirements of the legal business. In 1837 there had been two additions to the number of Common Law Judges, and since that time —a period of 36 years—there had been only another one added, notwithstanding the enormous increase in the wealth, business, and consequent litigation of the country. The addition to which he had referred was made in 1849—25 years ago. The population of the Province at the time these judges were thought sufficient for its legal business was between 800,000 and 900,000, and now, according to the last census, it was 1,600,000. The wealth of the Province had increased in a corresponding proportion during that time, and there was also a large increase in the number of counties, which required additional labour on the part of Superior Court judges. Another test was the number of cases coming before the Court of Appeal, which was a very good test of the comparative labour required of judges now and at the time referred to. From 1848 to 1855 the number of appeal cases a year varied from two to five. The Court of Appeal, for various reasons, was a somewhat expensive court, and during the last four years the number of cases which came before it varied from 15 to 31, so that the amount of appeal business had been between fourteen and fifteen times greater during the last three or four years than at the early period refered to. In 1849 two judges were added to the Court of Chancery. The intention at the tme was that the three judges should sit together, the business not being very large but since that the business had so increased that they have had to sit separately. Nearly three times the amount of business had, therefore, been done that would have been gone through had they been sitting together. To show the comparative increase that had taken place, he might state that, in 1849, the number of Bills filed in Toronto, where all suits in Chancery had to be tried, was only 192; in 1850, 175; and in 1851, 205. In 1851 Bills could be filed in the country for the first time, and they were not included in the number for that year, it being impossible to ascertain their number. However, they must have been exceedingly few. During the last three years, the following was the number:—1871, 1,351; 1872, 1,535; and 1873, 1,661; thus showing the increase which had taken place and the ratio which it was maintaining, and showing an increase as compared to 1849 of something like eight or ten times. Another test was the importance as well as the number of cases. In 1849 the total amount paid into Court by executors, trustees, etc., was $4,118; in 1850 it was rather less; and in 1851 rather more, being $6,587. The difference shown during the last few years was extraordinary, not only in that it exhibited an enormous increase of business, but also the very great confidence that was felt in the decisions of the Court. (Hear, hear.) In 1870, the amount paid into Court in the shape of cash, and Dominion Stock, and debentures, was $392,740—about one hundred times the amount paid in during 1849-50 and '51. In 1871 there was a still further increase to over $515,000; in 1872, to over $670,000; and in 1873 to over $679,000. Hon. gentlemen would see from this extraordinary increase that a much larger staff was necessary for the discharge of the work. He pointed out, also, that a portion of this work came before the Referee; but yet it could not have been done except for the judges sitting separately. In the Common Law Courts it had been notorious that for several years back there was a very great deal of difficulty in getting on with the business as rapidly as was required, and a large number of cases were left over from one Court to another. At the last Toronto Assizes they were unable to try even the whole of the cases that remained over from the previous assizes, and this difficulty seemed constantly increasing. He had been anxious to be quite sure that this blocking of the Court had not arisen from temporary causes; but the more he had examined into the matter the more had it been forced upon his observation that the increase had been gradual, and that we must expect the blocking to increase instead of diminishing. The number of writs issued from the Process Office in 1870 was 670; in 1871, 753; in 1872, 828; and in 1873, 950. In 1871, the number of cases brought down for trial at the Spring Assizes was 373; in 1872, the number was increased to 543; and in 1873, it had still further increased to 658. In regard to the Autumn Assizes, the same conclusion was inevitable. In 1871, the number of cases brought down for trial was 473; in 1872, 481; and in 1873, 696. There had also been a corresponding increase in the number of County Court cases. On the whole, the increase of business, steady and growing as it had been, showed that there must also be a corresponding increase in the staff, if anything like efficiency and despatch were to be insured. But the number of cases brought down for trial was not a proper index of the numbir of cases tried, and he proposed to give a statement which would show the state of business in this latter respect. The number of cases tried at the Toronto Spring Assizes in 1871 was 297; in 1872, 425; in 1873, 484. In the fall of 1871 the number tried was 380; in 1872, 326; in 1873, 510. The number of remanets from the Spring Assizes of 1871 was 47; of 1872, 66; and of 1873, 80. From the Fall Assizes of 1871 the number of remanets was 58; of 1872, 70; of 1873, 88. As a matter of fact, the whole year was taken up, and no margin left for the two extra assizes at Toronto and the one extra at Hamilton, appeals in Chambers, appeals for *habeas corpus*, controverted elections, and various other matters. One pressing reason for the change proposed in this Bill was the controverted elections. He believed there were already some thirty petitions filed, and there would doubtless be more, and they all knew how much time it would take to dispose of them all. He had some experience personally in the matter, and he assured the House it was the hardest work he had got during all his experience as a judge. There was really no margin whatever for this business, and next year he supposed our own elections would contribute considerably to this sort of work. These considerations appeared to him to demonstrate that we could not delay any longer the procuring of some additional Judges for the Superior Court. With regard to the number required he had heard various schemes, none of which involved the appointment of less than three or four extra Judges. As to what disposition to make of these judges, the Government had done their best so to dispose of them as to be of the best advantage to the country. Some change was necessary in our Court of Appeal, and, after consultation and conference with some gentlemen in whose judgment he had the most perfect reliance, he had though it most advantageous to procure three judges and re-constitute the Court of Appeal. Of the judges who already constituted this Court, one was not engaged in the original Courts; but the other three were, and their own business was quite enough for them. If they were not engaged in the Court of Appeal their own original cases could receive greater attention, and he proposed, therefore, to constitute the Court by making it consist of the Chief Justice and the three judges proposed to be appointed under this Act. He also proposed that none of these judges should sit in judgment upon cases in which they had been previously interested as exercising original powers, and they should thus come to the matters to be disposed of with fresh minds. There being four judges it would be necessary for three of them to concur before any reversal of judgment could be made. The business of the Court of Appeal, however, would not be sufficient to occupy their whole time, and he proposed to utilize them by requiring them to aid in the circuit work of the various Courts. There would be a great advantage to themselves in this, as it would give them fresh and enlarged experience of the character of the cases they would have to deal with in appeal. He did not propose to deprive the nine Judges who presently were connected with the Court of Appeal of that connection, but they should occupy any places vacant in consequence of the absence of any of the regular judges, either through illness, or his having had an interest in the case originally, or any other cause. The Judge could sit in appeal even if the case were tried in the Court to which he was attached, unless he had himself taken any part in the proceedings. He proposed to make some changes in the administration of justice in the Superior Courts, and to give one of the three Judges the power of hearing an appeal from the decision of one Judge at Common Law, with the authority to bring it before the full Court in certain cases; and also that there should be no appeal until after a re-hearing. He further proposed, also, that all the