

an enormous amount of business. In small places it would not, of course, be necessary, but in large places it was desirable, in order to facilitate the despatch of business.

The clause was then adopted, as also were clauses 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29.

With regard to clause 30,

Mr. DEACON thought the jury should be able to give a general verdict. There were cases in which juries would not be able to answer some questions put by the Judge, while they would be able to give a general verdict.

Mr. HARDY said the more he looked at the clause the more he saw its danger, and until they were prepared to take the strong ground that juries went wrong, he thought this section could not safely be made law. Judges might put questions to juries in a manner it would be impossible to answer.

Mr. MEREDITH said it was not to be supposed that the judges would wrongfully use the power placed in their hands by statute. He was satisfied that this section would lead to the doing of substantial justice in many cases where justice had not been done in the past.

Mr. DEACON thoroughly agreed with everything the member for South Brant had said, and thought that the clause would lead to unseemly controversies between counsel and the Bench.

Mr. BOULTBEE agreed in the views expressed as to the inexpediency of adopting this clause. He looked upon the clause as an insidious blow at the jury system, intended to pave the way for doing away with juries altogether. This, he thought, was a evil which should not be placed upon the statute book. It was true that a skilful judge could pretty much procure any verdict he wished. He maintained that the verdict of juries in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred were correct.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said he had an amendment to propose by way of a compromise. He proposed to restrict it to cases other than cases of libel, slander, seduction, false imprisonment, and similar offences; and he further proposed to omit the provision by which a judge should find a special verdict in those cases in which the jury did not give an answer.

Mr. CURRIE was in favour of striking out the clause altogether, and while he was a strong advocate of fusion, he was opposed to this indirect blow at the jury system.

Mr. McCALL considered it would be a dangerous innovation to place the decision so completely within the control of one man.

The clause as amended was carried.

Clause 31 was struck out, and a clause proposing that the jury fees should not be charged in advance of certain cases to be tried by jury, was adopted instead.

Clauses 32, 33, and 34 were adopted without amendment.

The 35th clause was passed with slight amendments.

Clauses 36 to 53 were passed, some with verbal amendments.

An additional clause with regard to County Courts was inserted, providing for the adjournment of the Court if rendered necessary by inconvenience to the Judge, or any other casualty.

Clauses 54 to 80 were also passed without important discussion.

On the 81st clause

Mr. DEACON objected to the threat it contained against Attorneys for the non payment of Sheriff's fees.

Hon. Mr. Currie, Mr. Hardy, and Mr. Meredith supported the objection, and Hon. Mr. Mowat agreed to strike it out.

Clauses 82, 83, and 84 were passed; and clause 85, relating to the appointment of a Sheriff as *ex officio* coroner of a county, being objected to by all the doctors in the House, was withdrawn.

Clauses 86 and 87 were passed; and clause 89, relating also to the payment of sheriff's fees by attorneys, was struck out.

Clauses 89 to the end were then passed, and a clause added, to the effect that sections 1 to 14 and 21 to 27 should come into effect immediately, and the remainder on the 1st July.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill as amended.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS moved the second reading of the Bill relating to Municipal Institutions. In doing so, he said that the

greater number of clauses were for the purpose of making plain the existing law. Those which proposed to make any change were with reference to towns over a certain population, and the appointment of Police Commissioners and Police Magistrates; and the proposition was that they should be under the control of the Municipal Councils.

Mr. RYKERT objected to continual tinkering with the Municipal law, and reminded the Government of their promise of last year in this reference.

Mr. GOW supported the measure.

Mr. MEREDITH opposed it, and said that several very stupid mistakes in the Bill of last year had not been noticed by the Treasurer.

Mr. DEACON also opposed the Bill, on the ground that it was unwise to re-open the question. He pointed out several cases where he thought the existing law was unfair and not very explicit.

Mr. WOOD pointed out that some of the objections made by the hon. member for North Renfrew were met by the Bill before the House; but he also saw great objections to section 10, which would work great hardship.

Mr. CODE was opposed to the changes proposed by the Bill before the House with regard to the power of Town Councils over Police Commissioners.

Mr. HARDY thought the provision with regard to Police Commissioners should make the appointment of such officials optional with the Town Council.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said he had nothing to do with the framing of the Bill, and had taken it out of the hands of the hon. member for South Wellington in order to have it discussed.

Mr. BAXTER supported the Bill, and hoped the Government would make it law this session.

Mr. GOW pointed out that the difficulty referred to by the hon. member for South Victoria, with regard to bridges, was really one of importance.

After a few words from Mr. HARRINGTON, the Bill was read a second time, and the House adjourned at midnight.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Hon. Mr. Crooks—At the first sitting of this House on Saturday next—Resolution—That this House doth ratify the Order in Council approved by his Honour on the 19th day of March, 1874, with reference to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, which Order is to the following effect:—

The Committee of Council have had under consideration the application of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, that it may receive aid from the Railway Funds for their line of Railway.

The Committee advise, that subject to the ratification of this Order in Council by resolution of the Legislative Assembly (in default of which ratification this Order in Council is inoperative) payment be authorized to be made out of the Railway Subsidy Fund to the Company of the sum of two hundred and forty-three dollars per mile for that portion of the line of the Company's Railway between Hamilton and Barrie, and between Clarksville, in the township of Tecumseth, and Collingwood Harbour, such sum to be payable by even half-yearly payments of one hundred and twenty-one dollars and fifty cents each, on the 30th day of June and the 31st day of December in each and every year, during the period of twenty years, to be completed from the first day of January, 1872, and to the full end thereof; and the Committee further advise, that in respect of forty-four miles of the said railway, where the cost of construction will be exceptionally increased, that the said grant be increased by the yearly sum of forty-eight dollars and sixty cents payable as aforesaid, and for the full period of twenty years as aforesaid, and that such grant of aid be under and subject to the requirements of the Railway Act, and also to the following further conditions, that is to say,—First—On condition that the Company do, on or before the first day of December next, furnish proof to the satisfaction of His Honour in Council of a *bona fide* and sufficient contract for the completion of the works of the railway (exclusive of track-laying) for the said portions of their line of railway. Second—On condition that His Honour in Council may direct that payment be made to the said Company out of the Railway Fund (should the same become applicable thereto) at the rate of two thousand five hundred dollars per mile of the said portions of railway with the increased grant in respect of the