"permanent" the words "or temporary," causing the clause to read:—"No member of the Senate of Canada or of the House of Commons of Canada shall be appointed to or hold any permanent or temporary office, etc., in the service of the Government of Ontario," etc.

The amendment was defeated on a division by 28 Yeas to 43 Nays.

Mr. MOWAT moved that the second clause be amended by inserting instead of the word "causes" the words "motions, rules, and other motions set down for argument," causing the clause to read:—"The Chief Justices, &c., shall, on the first day in each term, and from time to time thereafter as occasion may require, meet together and examine the list of motions, rules, and other motions set down for argument, &c."

The amendment was carried.

Mr. GRANGE moved that sub-section two of clause four be amended by substituting the word "four" for the word "one," causing it to read, respecting the jurisdiction of the Division Courts, that "All claims and demands of debt, account, or breach of contract or covenant, or money demand, whether payable in money or otherwise, where the amount or balance claimed does not exceed three hundred dollars."

Mr. MILLER, although favourable to extending the jurisdiction of the Division Court, would not, as the Attorney-General had promised to deal with the matter, support the present amendment.

Mr. DEACON had no sympathy with, and did not acquiesce in, any attacks made upon the Court of Chancery, no matter by whom they were made. (Cheers.) He thought that hon. gentlemen were somewhat to blame for the prejudice which existed against that Court; and believed the operation of the law abolishing trial by jury in Court actions had increased that prejudice The people were not familiar with the Court, they never saw its judges, as they took no part in the Assizes like other judges. The Court was an unknown Court, and seemed inquisitorial in its operations. The public felt the effect of its decrees, but were left uninformed as to the proceedings by which those decrees had been formulated. If trial by jury in civil actions had not been abolished, this Court would be more used and more popular. He felt that it was unwise and injudicious to interfere with or make serious attacks upon that Court without being able to lay before the House a scheme suggesting a substitute. (Cheers.) Such a substitute he did not think anyone was prepared or able to produce.

Mr. MOWAT had already called attention to the fact that the Bill was such a one as the House might reasonably have been expected to unanimously accept. A Bill in that form was not one to which any amendment should be made involving a difference of opinion and requiring considerable discussion. In common with the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Macdougall), he thought that such amendments should form the subject-matter of separate Bills. During all the time he had been in this House, up to last session not a measure had been introduced proposing an extension of the jurisdiction of the Division Court. This year the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Currie), had introduced a measure to that effect. It was, however, plain from the expression of opinion on both sides of the House that such an extension was desirable in the public interest, and he accepted that view; with the promise that if next session he occupied the position which he now occupied such a change should be made. Having given that explanation, he trusted the mover of the present motion, having confidence in the promise of the Government, would withdraw it. (Cheers.)

Mr. GRANGE—I have perfect confidence in the inactivity of the Government. (Laughter.)

Mr. PAXTON, as seconder of the amendment, accepted the promise of the Attorney-General, and withdrew his support from the amendment.

Mr. CREIGHTON was glad that the Government saw more clearly their duty upon this subject than upon many others; and he was glad that the Attorney-General had announced that this legislation was such as should only be initiated by the Government, and therefore opposed the amendment.

Mr. BARR, after the expression from the leader of the Government, hoped the amendment would be withdrawn.

Mr. HUNTER said it was possible to flood the House with petitions in favour of the extension of Division Court jurisdiction. He would be quite willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Attorney-General.

Mr. PAXTON, as seconder of the amendment, expressed his willingness that it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CURRIE could see no reason why cases of account amounting to as much as $200 should not be tried in the Division Court. The tendency since the union of the Provinces had been to extend the jurisdiction of that Court. This was a very important question, involving the cost of litigation, lawyers' fees, &c., and he was satisfied that the Attorney-General would bring down a measure well worthy of their acceptance. He would, however, be disposed to vote for the amendment if it were pressed.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk), was in favour of increasing the jurisdiction of Division Courts to $200, and allowing of no appeal. He thought something should be done to limit the credit system, which was doing a great deal of harm in the country. If any reform was needed in this Province, it was law reform; he thought some of the courts should be swept out of existence.

After a few remarks from Mr. Calvin in favour of the extension of Division Court jurisdiction

Mr. GRANGE withdrew his amendment.

Mr. LONG then moved that $200 be substituted for $100 in the section in question.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said himself and some other members had Bills to amend certain Acts, and he wished to know if there would be any opportunity of their being considered.

Mr. MOWAT said he was willing to afford all possible opportunity to hon. members who had public Bills to bring them forward, but he would not like to undertake that they should have such an opportunity.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said he was satisfied if the Attorney-General was not disposed to snuff out his Bill.

Mr. MOWAT said he did not propose to do anything like that.

Mr. DEACON said that by an Act passed last session, certain townships in the district of Nipissing were united to the county of Renfrew, while the Revised Statutes left them as they were before the Act of 1877 was passed. He suggested that the Attorney-General should put this right.

Mr. ROSS objected to the 13th section, requiring that the unanimous consent of the shareholders of a joint-stock company should be obtained before any preference stock should be issued. He thought it would render it impossible for some companies to obtain additional capital, although nine-tenths of the shareholders might be in favour of it. He suggested that three-fourths of the shareholders should be required to approve of the by-law for preference stock before it was carried into operation, and that preference stock should be offered to the original shareholders before being offered to the general public.

Mr. CAMERON said it would be unjust unless the unanimous consent of the shareholders was obtained, because the preference stock might wipe out the original stock altogether. There was no reason why a man who took stock in a company on certain terms should be forced to accept other terms, which would perhaps have the effect of depriving him of all his interest in the company.

After further discussion the Committee rose, and the House adjourned at one o'clock.

THE SECOND SITTING.

The Speaker took the chair at three o'clock p.m.

THE MAGISTRACY BILL.