Mr. BARR repudiated any idea of anything unjustifiable having been done by the magistrates of the county of Grey. He said that if they had leaned rather towards the side of justice than law it was creditable to them. He believed the magistrates of his county were as creditable to their profession as magistrates as those of Norfolk, or any other county. He thought the proposal contained in the Bill was a step in the wrong direction. He thought the law would be safer in the hands of the local magistrates than in the hands of stipendiary magistrates. As a rule they were an honour to the country.

Mr. ROSS thought as a rule the magistracy could carry out the law satisfactorily, but where there were wilful misinterpretations of the law and dismissals of cases the ruling of the magistracy might be overruled.

Mr. CAMERON said that with respect to the first clause of the Bill he was not aware that the judges of the higher courts, excepting those of the Supreme Court, were not already *ex officio* justices of the peace. He believed the clause to be quite unnecessary. He thought that as the persons to be appointed were not to be professional men, and who were not to be paid salaries, it would be difficult to find competent men who would accept the positions, more especially as they would have to travel about the country; but as they were to collect fees whether they secured a conviction or not, this would be an inducement for them to make fees, and pay themselves in that way. He said the member for Norfolk had paid a tribute to the old Family Compact in speaking of the magistracy of Norfolk. He said they were appointed because they were the men of intelligence and integrity in the county, and so the magistracy were respected. He did not accuse the Hon. Attorney-General of doing anything wrong, but he designated itinerant magistrates, who, he said, would go about as busy bodies and stirring up strife, as a curse to the neighbourhood in which they were. (Opposition cheers.) He presumed it was one of this class of men from whom an hon. gentleman had read a letter. The result of the proposed action, he said, was a direct insult to the local magistracy. If stipendiary magistrates were necessary, let them be appointed permanently and paid respectably, but without fees, or if fees were received then let them be funded; but this was quite a different thing from what was proposed, and he expected to see magistrates doing the dirty work of detectives. In reference to the cause of temperance, there was nothing more desirable than that they should have those principles carried out, but that was a different thing from using these officers as engines to the promotion of prohibition. He denounced the underhand detective system of founding charges against liquor-dealers as an outrage upon decency. By adopting measures of this kind they were making room for such things to be done. The Attorney-General was insulting the whole magistracy of the country by the appointment of these police magistrates. If the Attorney-General were advised of abuses or wrong-doings he should at once take steps to take their commissions from them, and not uphold the misdoings of a Conservative any more than a Reformer. He was entirely opposed to that one clause of the Bill, but in other particulars he saw nothing objectionable in the Bill. (Opposition cheers.)

Mr. SEXTON said that whenever any debate was before the House the hon. member for East Toronto took occasion to make a fling at the magistracy of Ontario, but he always took care to say that it was not the present magistracy, but the old magistracy of the Family Compact. He contrasted the action of the present Government with that of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's Government, who, he said, would not distribute a copy of the statutes to each magistrate without the payment of fifty cents each. He found that from that source the Government had received the magnificent sum of $271.

Mr. CREIGHTON, in referring to the dismissal of certain liquor cases in the county of Grey, denied that the majority of the Bench of Magistrates were Conservatives. He believed the opposite was the case. He said the Attorney-General had done his best to find a proper remedy for the complaints that had been made. He did not believe, however, that the new plan would work well, because it would lead to partisan strife. Magistrates of the kind proposed to be appointed would feel it to be their duty to give decisions favourable to the persons who appointed them. The result generally was that these stipendiary magistrates were appointed police magistrates. There was a danger of parties being appointed for specific purposes.

Mr. HARDY said the remarks of the hon. member for East Toronto would have come from any other member of the House better than from him. The Bill simply proposed that in rural parts stipendiary magistrates may be appointed temporarily for specific purposes, where the local magistrates were not doing their duty, and where the interests of justice were suffering. This could be effected by giving to one of the county magistrates the powers of police magistrates, having the usual authority to take charge of cases himself, and having cases laid before them they may go on and dispose of these cases as they see fit. The argument of the hon. member for East Toronto was that the local magistrates were to be ill-treated. He had said the proposed action would completely shut out the resident magistrates. He had complained that it would tie their hands and "roll their heads into the basket." He denied that such was the intention, and challenged the hon. gentleman to take this statement as a plank in the platform of his party, and go into his own county or into the neighbouring counties; he could nail that flag to their own masthead, and go to the country with it. He ventured to believe, however, that it would not be the platform the hon. gentleman would carry with him to the country. The Bill simply said that when proper representation was made to the Government one person may be appointed who would not interfere with other justices of the peace. This person could go on with any cases laid before him without any fear of any "packing" of the Bench. He denied that the representation of these men as travelling about looking for cases was a correct one. There were 88 ridings in Ontario, and if the proposition of the hon. member for East Toronto to appoint stipendiary magistrates in each county, even at $400 a year each, were carried out it would mean an expense of about $35,000 per year, but to carry it out liberally and pay these officers properly would mean an expenditure of $60,000. The present Bill proposed only to appoint one, two, or perhaps three magistrates temporarily, who would be paid according to the work done. He would ask his hon. friend what remedy he would offer supposing a case was being tried by one magistrate, and two or three other justices should come in, take possession, and dismiss the case as they saw fit? It had been asserted that the Bill was framed in the interests of the Dunkin people. The hon. member for North Grey had pronounced it a most pronounced temperance Bill, but had said that he was a most pronounced temperance man. Yet it was found that when any temperance measure was before the House that hon. gentleman had invariably opposed it, at least so he was told.

Mr. CREIGHTON—Who said so?

Mr. HARDY said he did not think he had a right to give the authority. He believed he had voted against every measure, and against almost every clause. The hon. gentleman had said that since the appointment of a police magistrate in Owen Sound there had been no peace at all, but singular to say that the very gentleman who was appointed police magistrate was appointed upon a recommendation of the town and council of Owen Sound—a Tory town council—they were the people who had petitioned for the appointment of the police magistrate, whom the Hon. the Attorney-General had appointed. (Cheers.) He said that it took Conservatives to make such disturbances as had been spoken of by