nine should not be binding at the first moment as well as at the end of three hours. With reference to precedents, he preferred taking the precedent of England, where the unanimity system was preserved in the face of the fact that a contrary system prevailed in Scotland, to taking the example of Jamaica or Tasmania. There was nothing to reform by this Bill; no grievance existed and no remedy was needed. During the past year only five juries in Ontario had disagreed, and during the eighteen years of his practice he had known of only two cases of juries disagreeing in the united counties of Leeds and Grenville, and he had attended every Assize in these counties during that period. He undertook to say that the expense of this new system would be enormous. Two or three jurors holding out against the rest would be a strong provocation to the defeated party to ask for a new trial, while the unanimous decision of twelve men would have a directly contrary effect. Whether the jury law were changed or not with respect to civil cases the same number of jurors as at present would have to be summoned for the trial of criminal cases, unless the Government at Ottawa chose to make a change. Before taking up a measure of this kind they should be sure that the people wanted it. There had been no particular discussion upon it, either among the people or in the newspapers, and he did not believe the people wanted this measure.

Mr. MASSIE moved, "That Bill No. 73 be not read the second time to-day, but that it be read the second time six months hence."

Mr. BETHUNE said he desired to get the House committed to some measure, so that the Government would be prepared to deal with it next session, but the practical effect of the six months' hoist would be to do nothing at all. He did not wish to embarrass the Government, but he wanted to get a statement from the House that some relief was needed. He contended that the Ontario Government had criminal jurisdiction, for in 1873 a measure introduced by the Attorney-General for the establishment of a Criminal Court had been passed. He gave a flat contradiction to the insinuation that he introduced this measure for the purpose of bringing practice to Toronto, and he thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) should have had more respect for the profession to which he belonged than to have made it. (Opposition cheers.) The Bill, if passed, would not put a dollar more into his pocket. He felt hurt at the insinuation, and he hoped his hon. friend would, so far as he (Mr. Bethune) was personally concerned, withdraw it.

Mr. FRASER said his argument was that the effect of the Bill would be as he had stated. He would be very sorry to say that the hon. gentleman had any personal motive in the matter, because anyone who knew him (Mr. Bethune) would know that he had too large a practice to care for any legislation for his own benefit.

Mr. CALVIN opposed the Bill.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) regretted that the motion for a six months' hoist was made, as he wished to vote on the principle of the Bill. He spoke in opposition to it.

Mr. CAMERON expressed himself in favour of that section of the Bill requiring motions for jury notices to be struck out to be made before a judge in Chambers, but he was opposed to the general principle, and intended voting with the Government. It ill became the Commissioner of Public Works, he thought, to raise a sectional feeling by making the insinuation which he did against the hon. member for Stormont.

Mr. FRASER contended that he had made no personal reflections on the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bethune), and that he had appealed to no sectional feelings. He merely proved that the effects of the clause referred to would be that the Toronto practitioners would gain and the country practitioners lose.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) said that there were two principles involved in the Bill, and hon. members could vote for it on the second reading without endorsing both principles. He regretted that a strong party whip should be put in force on this occasion, and that hon. members were not to be allowed to vote according to their choice, but were to be brought into line with the Government. He characterized such conduct as being discreditable.

Mr. SPEAKER—Order! Order!

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) heard Mr. Speaker calling him to order; but when he noticed such conduct he could not refrain from speaking of it in such a manner. He concluded by hoping that the Bill would pass a second reading, and be amended in Committee, so as so embrace the principle of his Bill.

The amendment was put and carried on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Bonfield, Bouiter, Broder, Calvin, Cameron, Clarke (Wellington), Coutts, Crooks, Dawson, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Hardy, Harkin, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Kean, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, Massie, Master, Miller, Monk, Mostyn, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (Essex), Rosevear, Sexton, Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—46.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bethune, Brown, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Code, Cole, Creighton, Deacon, Deroche, Flesher, Grange, Grant, Lauder, Macdougall (Middlesex), Macdougall (Simcoe), MacGowan, McMahon, Meredith, Merrick, Richardson, Robinson, Ross, Scott, Snetsinger, Tooley.—27.

The Bill was lost on the same division.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. HAY'S Bill respecting Municipal Elections was withdrawn.

THE JURORS' ACT.

Mr. MONK moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Jurors' Act; and he explained that it was to provide for an equal distribution of the jury list among the various townships of a county, which could not be done at the present time if the letter of the law was adhered to. Although the Bill might not be in a suitable shape at the present time, he firmly believed that the House in the exercise of its usual fairness would assist him in making it perfect.

Mr. ROSS, while concurring with the objects of the Bill, did not agree with the construction placed upon the law by the hon. mover, nor with the plan proposed. From the discussion which had taken place this evening it was evident that a reform in the jury law was needed, and he had no doubt that the Government would next year make it the subject of their consideration.

Mr. WOOD pointed out that if the Bill was passed in its present form and the jurors selected alphabetically, every few years the list would be commenced anew. As a result, the jurymen whose names commenced with one of the last letters in the alphabet would never be selected. He concluded by directing the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the Bill would require a degree of attention which it would be difficult to accord it at this late stage of the session.

Mr. DEACON had often wondered why so many jurors came from one or two municipalities, and now he learned that the townships were selected alphabetically in rotation and a selection of jurors made from those municipalities. He thought the Bill would meet the evil which had been experienced. Since the Treasurer had admitted the principle of the Bill, it would be as well to let it pass the second reading.

Mr. WOOD had not given the House to understand that the Government approved of the principle of the Bill, for they thought the principle was erroneous. The Government had only stated that no doubt the law required a change in the respect complained of.

Mr. BISHOP expressed it as his opinion that the Jury Law required amendment, and he referred to the experience of the county of Huron last session already referred to this day by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Ross). He hoped the Government would deal with the matter.

Mr. FERRIS thought that the purpose of the hon. mover of the Bill had been served in eliciting discussion, and he hoped the Bill would be withdrawn.