

being committed on that frontier, which were frequent a few years ago, and he thought a similar system might be adopted in other parts of the Province, especially in his section of the country, on the Detroit River, to which criminals came from the other side and committed depredations with more or less impunity.

Mr. MOWAT said it was extremely desirable something should be done for the better detection of crime in the rural parts of the country. Many crimes went unpunished through want of an efficient police force in the locality. He had received a great many replies to the circular alluded to from various officials connected with the administration of justice. The answers had been copied and bound and the suggestions mentioned in them might prove of service, but at present he had no definite suggestion to offer.

Mr. MEREDITH referred to the conduct of some magistrates, who, instead of settling disputes, were hot-beds of strife in their neighbourhood. It might be well to have stipendiary magistrates appointed in certain districts to deal with crime, instead of leaving it to ordinary magistrates. The motion carried.

It being one o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

#### HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Mr. FRENCH moved that it is desirable that the attention of the Government be drawn to the discriminating legislation passed by this House against High and Model Schools in municipalities separated from counties for municipal purposes. And that it is unjust where such schools are made free to the public generally that they should not be assisted by the county councils.

Mr. BALFOUR could not agree with the motion. This matter was generally a matter of agreement when the municipalities separated. It was not fair that the whole county should be taxed for the sake of the towns when a portion only of the county was benefitted by the school. Again, the townships immediately surrounding could assist if they chose.

Mr. MULHOLLAND supported the motion. The High Schools in towns could be assisted by the Government giving a grant. A lump sum might be given by the County Council, or a sum in proportion to the number of students from the counties.

Mr. METCALFE supported the motion.

Mr. PRESTON considered it would be very unfair to ask counties to contribute to High Schools in the towns when they had their High Schools to support.

Mr. FERRIS said it must be remembered that the towns withdrew from the counties voluntarily to escape general taxation in the counties.

Mr. BREKTON opposed the motion.

Mr. ROBILLARD suggested the remedy was in the hands of the towns, as they could charge a fee.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) said in towns not separated from the counties the county was obliged to contribute an amount equivalent to the Government grant, but otherwise the counties were not obliged to contribute. The counties, however, looked upon the matter with more liberality than the law compelled them, that of Elgin being much more than the amount of the Government grant. There was some force in the argument of the member for Leeds and Grenville, as a high school did more than local work. It had been suggested that the counties should be divided into high school districts, and this could be done even now.

Mr. FRENCH—Could we compel the separated towns to contribute?

Mr. ROSS said he did not see why they could not put certain portions of a county to a town just as well as make a whole county a district. The only question was whether they should make the formation of High School districts obligatory. He suggested that the motion should not be pressed at present and he would consider the matter.

Mr. CARNEGIE asked if a county could, according to the law as it now stood, leave a part of the county out of a High School district altogether.

Mr. ROSS said his impression was, as the law stood, County Councils were compelled to divide the whole of the county if they did anything in the matter. It was obvious that if it were otherwise they would make the town in which the High School was situated the High School district and nothing more.

Mr. FRENCH then withdrew the motion.

#### THE BANK DEPOSIT.

Mr. MEREDITH moved in the absence of Mr. Kerr for a return showing the amount of Provincial money in banks on the 1st day of January, February, March, 1884, and the interest it bears.

The motion was carried.

#### THE SPECIAL DEPOSITS.

Mr. ROSS (Huron), in reply to Mr. Carnegie, said that since the 1st of January \$716,784 71 had been deposited in banks on special deposit. On January 4th there was deposited in the Bank of Commerce \$100,000; the Imperial Bank, \$150,000; Federal Bank, \$150,000; Dominion Bank, \$150,000; Ontario Bank, \$116,784 71; and on the 5th Feb., in the Bank of Commerce, \$50,000, making the total of \$716,784 71.

Mr. MEREDITH asked whether the deposits were still there or had been withdrawn.

Mr. ROSS stated that at the present time the amount on special deposit at interest was \$889,410.

#### DITCHES AND WATERCOURSES.

The House in Committee of the Whole re-

ported the bill to amend the Act respecting ditches and watercourses. The bill provides for the carrying of a drain to a proper outlet, and it was amended so that if the owner of land through which the drain passes does not wish to go to the expense of the drain he may consent to the drain stopping on his land.

#### EXTENSION OF COUNTY COURT JURISDICTION.

Mr. MEREDITH moved the second reading of his bill to amend the County Courts Act. The object of the bill, he explained, was to restore to the County Courts the equitable jurisdiction they formerly possessed, and also to enlarge their present common law jurisdiction. The Superior Courts were now practically one, and they had jurisdiction in equitable and common law cases indiscriminately, and he favoured bringing the County Court into harmony with the system. Since the extension of the Division Court the business of the County Courts had greatly decreased, while there was a great block in the Court of Appeal, and for this reason it followed there should be an extension of the county courts' jurisdiction. There was, besides, a strong feeling in favour of decentralizing the administration of justice, that as far as possible the transaction of all legal business should be brought home to the locality. It was, therefore, the object of the bill to make a very considerable extension of the jurisdiction of the County Court. It was proposed to increase its jurisdiction in personal actions for debt from \$200 to \$500. In cases relating to debt, covenant and contract, where the amount is liquidated or ascertained by the signature of the defendant, it was proposed to increase the jurisdiction from \$400 to \$1,000. Actions of replevin were to be raised to \$500. Then it was proposed to restore to the court its old equitable jurisdiction, such as relating to partnership, accounts, creditors in the estate of deceased persons, legatees, and equitable relief generally when under the sum of \$1,000. The County Court Judges were becoming more qualified to deal with these cases, and they had much leisure on their hands. The fourth section provided for injunctions to restrain, waste, or trespass, somewhat similar to the old Act. Another provision provided for the framing of rules by the Chancery Judges. In term instead of there being a single judge to hear cases it was proposed to have both senior and junior judge to sit together when practicable. The next provision was one in force in England, permitting parties to allow the county courts to have jurisdiction in any matter by mutual consent, and to permit any jurisdiction to lie when the defendant did not dispute it. These provisions in the English Act had worked very satisfactorily. The bill, in the speaker's opinion, would tend to the decentralization of the legal business, to cheapen litigation, and relieve the judges of the High Court.

Mr. MOWAT said he didn't suppose his hon. friend expected them to deal with so important a matter during the present session. Considering the late stage it was brought down, it was almost impossible to do it. He had no feeling against extending the jurisdiction of the County Court. Numerous representations had reached him as to the desirability of amending the law, but so far as he knew no practical grievance had arisen from the present state of things. One of the reasons urged by his hon. friend in favour of the bill was that it would remove the block of cases now before the Court of Appeal. The fact was the bill would tend to increase that block, because the appeals from the County Court were to the Court of Appeal. There was, no doubt, a block of cases before the Appeal Court now, but he expected a few months would remove it all, or at most another year. His hon. friend suggested the object he had in view was to have litigation transacted in the locality. To a large extent suits brought in the High Court were disposed of in the locality. The papers were all filed there, and the County Court judges had jurisdiction in Chamber motions. Mostly all Chamber applications were made before the County Court judge, though the suit was nominally in the High Court. This argument of his hon. friend, that cases would be tried in the locality, had more of the appearance of force than it had of the reality of force. What additional burden the proposed changes would impose on the County Court judges was a matter that must be considered before any change be made in the laws. His hon. friend had not collected information of that kind, nor how much business it would be prudent to add to the present duties of county judges.

Mr. MEREDITH said it was patent the County Court judges had nothing at all to do at present.

Mr. MOWAT said they had been complaining too much was being given them to do. He had several times had it represented to him that by reason of recent legislation of this House a great amount of work had fallen on them, so that they had now more duties to perform than they had some years ago. He didn't say but that they had time to attend to more business, and if they had not enough to do it was the duty of the Government to employ their time more if practicable. The equitable jurisdiction formerly given to County Courts had never been exercised, because there was not a familiarity on the part of county judges of equitable matters, which was, however, gradually being acquired by them since; there was not a familiarity with the procedure in equity suits. He didn't know of half a dozen suits being brought in the Province under the equitable juris-