

into the hands of the Government. The inspectors were powerless for any good purpose, and therefore unnecessary. He moved that the items be struck out.

Mr. MOWAT said it was small consolation to a debtor after he had at great delay and expense obtained a judgment against a debtor to be informed that any wrong doing by the bailiff and clerk with regard to the funds of the suit could be set right by going through all the trouble again in a suit against these officers. What they wanted to do was to prevent such wrong doing, and the trouble and expense entailed upon suitors in consequence. With regard to placing the duty of inspecting the books and so on in the hands of the County Judges, the returns which had been received showed the inconvenience and in some cases the impossibility of their doing so in addition to their other duties. The office of Inspector had been shown by experience to be a most necessary and valuable one, one which could not yet be advantageously dispensed with.

Mr. MEREDITH, said the Attorney-General was mistaken in saying that the present remedy of suitors for wrong doing on the part of bailiffs or clerks was troublesome or expensive. On the contrary, the process was a summary one. He regretted very much that the hon. member for South Grey had made a remark upon a member of the judiciary of the Province which was totally unjustifiable. He (Mr. Meredith) had no sympathy with attacks upon the judges, such as attributing to them political motives.

Mr. FRASER said that the two judges who had tried the Lincoln election case had used much stronger terms of condemnation of the lower judge than any language employed by the hon. member for South Grey. He had as high a respect for the judiciary as anyone, but it would be a sorry day for Ontario when the conduct even of our judges should be above criticism. (Hear, hear) The conduct of the judge in the case referred to by the hon. member for South Grey was such as, in his opinion as a responsible Minister, to merit the strong disapprobation of the House. (Hear, hear).

Mr. CAMERON asked what acts of the county judge of Lincoln were referred to. He (Mr. Cameron) had been engaged in the case as counsel when the matter was discussed, but he had noticed nothing of the kind.

Mr. FRASER said that if the hon. gentleman was counsel in the case he ought to know what the judgment of the Court had been. The judgment substantially said that the judge had delegated his authority to one of the political candidates.

Mr. CAMERON—Then if the judges said anything of the kind they said what was not warranted by the facts. (Decisive cheers) He proceeded to say, that as he understood the matter, notice of appeal had been given in the different municipalities of the County of Lincoln, that Mr. Rykert, one of the candidates, had been asked by the judge to draw up a list of the cases of appeal, that he had drawn up such a list, and that the other party had drawn up their list in exactly the same way. He could not see that the judge had shown any more favour to Mr. Rykert than to the other party, and could not be said to have delegated his powers to that gentleman.

Mr. HODGINS said the hon. gentleman was not quite correct in stating the facts of the case, probably because he had not been present when the evidence had been taken upon which the judges had based their conclusion. The county judge had stated in evidence, after his (Mr. Hodgins) having urged him not to go into the box, that he handed the original documents under which he had revised the voters' lists, along with private memoranda and minutes of evidence, to Mr. Rykert; that he had not got them back again, except the document which he signed as his revision of the voters' lists, and that it was in Mr. Rykert's handwriting. The learned judges had said that it was reprehensible and improper for a county judge to hand to one of the leaders of a political party any such document; that it was, in effect, a delegation of his judicial authority to political partisans, and that they thought his conduct should be cognisable before another tribunal, though technically they could not give effect to the opinion.

Mr. FRASER said that he had found during a long experience in Division Court proceedings that, with all due respect to the County Court Judges, they did not in many

cases do their duty.

Mr. HUNTER wished to correct the hon. member for London. He (Mr. Hunter) had not used the words "political motives" in speaking of the judge for London.

Mr. HAY pointed out that, if it was only necessary that the kind of books kept by Division Court clerks should be examined, the inspection would be a farce. The continuation of the office of an inspector was highly necessary.

Mr. SCOTT contended that there might as well be inspectors of Sheriffs' offices as of Division clerks' offices.

Mr. FRASER pointed out that a lawyer was generally behind the suitor who put a writ into a Sheriff's office, while in Division Courts there was generally no lawyer concerned.

Mr. CURRIE said he intended to vote for the amendment. What was wanted was good County Judges. Division Courts had existed in this country for forty years, and for 37 years the Province had been able to get along without Mr. Joseph Dickey, the present Inspector. He did not see that this motion would embarrass the Government. What would embarrass them and their supporters was useless expenditures. The County Judges should not be deprived of any of the power which they were entitled to.

Mr. HARDY said, if it were true that the Inspector was originally appointed for the purpose of looking after the stamps, the operations of the Inspector had shown a necessity for continuing the office at all events for the present in the interest of the great bulk of the people. He did not believe any \$2,000 was better spent than the amount devoted to this office. He considered that the appointment of the Inspector had done more than anything else to restore the public confidence in the Division Courts. How was it that hon. gentlemen opposite did not propose to strike out the item for the Inspector of Registry Offices? There was nothing like the reason for inspecting Registrars that there was for inspecting Division Courts. He would probably introduce a Bill this session to repeal the Act appointing the Inspector of Registry Offices, and he hoped these gentlemen who were supporting this amendment would stand by him.

The amendment was lost, Yeas, 31; Nays, 44.

The item then passed.

The Committee then rose and reported progress.

Mr. MOWAT moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CAMERON moved that a new writ be issued for the county of Frontenac in the room of Mr. P. Graham. Carried.

The House adjourned at 11:40 p. m.

#### NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr Ferris—On Friday next, address for copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario relating to the transfer of the Trent River Works to this Province by the Dominion Government.

Mr Wills—On Friday next, Select Committee to inquire into losses sustained by the late John O'Carroll, of Belleville, in the rebellion of 1837 and 1838, with power to send for persons and papers.

Mr. Wills—On Friday next, an order of the House for a return respecting timber licenses, shewing (1) the names of the several licensees; (2) the number of acres respectively held by said licensees; (3) the amount of license dues now in arrears by each licensee, if any; (4) all other dues or fees now in arrear on account of timber, or saw logs, or other materials taken from said lands by each of said licensees, and also shewing the amounts respectively due on the 31st December, 1875; (5) the amount respectively paid in on account said licenses, dues, &c., during the year 1876; (6) the nature and amount of the security taken for dues, &c., or arrearages, if any.

Mr Graham—On Friday next, will move that the name of Mr. Waterworth be added to the Select Committee on Agriculture and Arts. (Bill No. 80)