

infants were greater under the old system of local appointments, than by the appointment of one Master in the Court of Chancery. Each local solicitor made more costs than the one Master did in the parent Court of Chancery. There is no truth in the statement that the Master made more than five thousand dollars per annum, which was about one-third of the amount claimed by the hon. mover of the resolution.

Mr. GIBSON had gone through the "mill" personally, and knew of the exorbitant charges which were made in the Court of Chancery. Personally he believed that the revenue of Mr. Hoskins must be about ten thousand dollars per annum. He desired to know why an officer should not be appointed with a fixed salary, and the fees to go to the Province.

Mr. MOWAT thought that the last suggestion was a practical one, and worthy of consideration. The hon. mover of the motion had been imposed on by the person who wrote the letter. The costs were not large in that case, as nearly half a million of money was involved. There was no doubt whatever that the appointment of only one guardian or Master for infants had a very desirable effect in reducing the expenses, and in making that statement he merely stated that which he knew from personal knowledge. If the old system of local appointments were adopted the Province would revert from a good system to a bad and more costly one. In the special case referred to by the hon. mover of the motion, instead of complaining of the fees as excessive, the heirs of the estate were perfectly satisfied, and agreed to give the solicitor an increased percentage. This case proved the advantages of the present system rather than the disadvantages. While there was no objection to the motion, yet it was very vague in its language. The only actually "unclaimed moneys" consisted of \$401 11, made up of small sums like one or two dollars. He suggested that the motion read "unclaimed for five years."

Mr. LAUDER said that he moved for similar returns relative to all the Courts last year, and the returns had not been brought down.

Mr. MOWAT was not aware that the motion had been made.

Mr. PAXTON trusted that before another session the case which he had referred to would be fully investigated; and he entirely agreed with the suggestion that the Master of the Court of Chancery be paid by salary and not by fees.

The motion as amended was carried.

#### WITHDRAWN.

Mr. HARGRAFT asked that the following motions be withdrawn:—

Order of the House for a return of the number of qualified magistrates in each county of this Province.

Also, Order of the House for a return showing the number of magistrates who acted in their official capacity during the year 1877, as far as can be obtained from the returns to the Clerks of Peace.

Leave was granted.

#### LONDON AND PORT STANLEY GRAVEL ROAD.

Mr. HODGINS moved an "Address to the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he will cause to be laid before this House all Orders in Council and other documents authorizing the sale of the London and Port Stanley Gravel Road to the counties of Middlesex and Elgin; also a statement of the amounts paid therefor by the said counties, and the amounts, if any, unpaid; also, any correspondence, if any, relating to the claim of the county of Elgin to the sum of \$8,220, being moneys of the county of Elgin in the hands of the county of Middlesex on account of such gravel road, and still retained by the said county of Middlesex." In support of the motion he stated that the counties of Middlesex and Elgin had in 1850 purchased the London and Port Stanley Gravel Road from the Government of Mr. Hincks for \$18,000, but that no part of that money had been paid to Government. In 1853, when Elgin separated from Middlesex, she paid over \$20,000, of which \$8,220 was for the purchase money of the gravel road. This

sum Middlesex had ever since retained without either the consent of Elgin or the Government. The action of Middlesex was not just, and he made the motion with a view to have the matter sifted to the bottom.

#### THE FEES OF A PRIVATE BILL.

Mr. COUTTS moved, "That the fees on Bill, Tilbury East, be remitted, less the actual cost of printing."

Mr. FRASER contended that there had been negligence on the part of the municipality, and said it was opposed to the rules of the House to remit the fees. There was a principle involved in the motion, and he trusted the House would not grant the request.

Mr. MEREDITH thought this was an exceptional case.

Mr. PARDEE pointed out that it was a dangerous precedent to set, and might be applied to all private Bills.

Mr. DEACON suggested that a preamble be placed in the motion stating that it should not be taken as a precedent.

The motion was then put and declared lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Baker, Boulter, Broder, Brown, Calvin, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Mostyn, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Tooley—23.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baxter, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Cole, Crooks, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grant, Hardy, Hargraft, Hodgins, Suter, Tate, Lyon, McMahon, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Wood—34.

#### PUBLIC BILLS.

The following Bills passed through Committee:—

Bill to amend the Mechanics' Liens Act—Mr. Robinson.

Bill to amend the Line Fences Act—Mr. Bishop.

Bill to amend the Assessment Act—Mr. Calvin. (This Bill was also read a third time.)

Bill to amend the law respecting High Schools—Mr. Bethune.

#### THE PROTECTION OF GAME.

The House went into Committee, Mr. Baxter in the chair, on the Bill to amend the law for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved an amendment to the Bill, to make the close season uniform in the case of deer, elk, moose, reindeer, cariboo, wild turkeys, grouse, pheasants, prairie fowl, partridge, quail, woodcock, snipe, wild ducks, swans, geese, hares, or rabbits—that is, from the first day of January to the first day of September.

The amendment was lost, and the Committee reported progress.

The House adjourned at one o'clock.

#### SECOND SITTING.

The Speaker took the chair at three p.m.

#### LINE FENCES.

Mr. Bishop's Bill to amend the Line Fences Act was read a third time and finally passed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS.

The following Public Bills passed the final stages:—

Bill to amend the law for protection of game and fur-bearing animals—Mr. Mostyn.

Bill to amend the law for the protection of insectivorous and other birds beneficial to agriculture—Mr. Mostyn.

Bill to amend the Revised Statutes respecting ditching watercourses—Mr. Bishop.

Bill to amend the law respecting Building Societies—Mr. Meredith.

#### TRIAL BY JURY.

Mr. BETHUNE, in moving the second reading of the Bill to amend the law respecting trial by jury, said he had not been able to see that the present system, which allowed a judge to try a case without a jury, even though contrary to the wishes of the parties, was satisfactory. Two