

and if so, which, are in arrear in respect of the payments to have been made on the reduced indebtedness and the amounts in arrear.

This was passed without debate.

A HASTINGS COUNTY LICENSE.

Mr. Hudson—Order of the House for a return of copies of all correspondence between Mrs. M. H. M. Davidson and the Government, or any officer thereof, relating to her application for a license in the years 1892 and 1893 for the Albion Hotel, in the Village of Shannonville.

Mr. Hudson in moving this said that the owners of the house could get no reason for the refusal of the license; there seemed to be some mystery in the case. The house was a good one, there were no irregularities, and the commissioners assigned no reason. He would like to find the reason.

Hon. Mr. Harcourt said there had been no correspondence, so far as he knew, between Mrs. Davidson and the Government or any officer of the Government. He promised to find out if the inspector of the county had had any correspondence with the lady in question. Meantime he asked that the motion might stand.

REEVES AND DEPUTY REEVES.

Mr. McKechnie—Order of the House for a return of the number of Reeves and Deputy Reeves comprising the several County Councils of the Province for the year 1893.

This was carried without opposition.

LOSS BY FIRES.

Mr. Ryerson.—Order of the House for a return showing (1) the actual loss over and above insurance sustained by the Province by the burning of the Toronto University building; (2) names of each insurance company, amount paid by each, amount insured in each at the time of the fire, dates of payment; (3) the present amount of insurance held by the Government on the new Parliament buildings, University and Upper Canada College, giving names of each company and the amount each carries, and the rate per \$100; (4) what loss was sustained over and above insurance on the burning of the Central Prison?

These matters were of great importance, Mr. Ryerson observed, and the House would be glad to be in possession of the information for which he asked. The motion was carried without remark.

COURT OF APPEAL CASES.

Mr. Meredith—Order of the House for a return of the number of cases now standing for argument in the Court of Appeal, and the number which were standing for argument on the first days of January, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1894.

Mr. Meredith said he intended no reflection upon the court named by this motion, but he feared the condition of things existing in it in regard to litigation was really alarming. The last case on the present list, it seemed to him, could not be heard within a year. This must be most disastrous to many litigants, some of whom had their entire property involved. Behind the Court of Appeal lay the Supreme Court. The difficulty was not confined to Ontario. The same thing, he remembered, existed in New York until a rearrangement had taken place. He could not suggest a remedy for the evil that would perhaps cover the whole case, but he thought something could be done in the way of division of courts, each division to sit and try cases until the arrearage was worked off. There were other people who had looked into the matter who advocated the abolition of the Court of Appeal. Passing between the two ideas a remedy could be found. Possibly an increase in the number of Judges might be necessary, temporary or permanent. He was convinced that under the present system there was a great waste of judicial energy. The system, he thought, was too elaborate for the results desired. He thought nothing was more desirable than that there should be speedy justice. Some people preferred a bad decision at once than a good decision deferred, and there was something in it. He did not say the Attorney-General was wholly responsible for the state of affairs of which he had spoken, but he must be held to have some responsibility for the evil while he had the power of applying a remedy and failed to do so.

The Attorney-General said his attention had not been called to the matter referred to, either by suitors or by members of the profession, as involving serious grievances. Still it might do so. He recognized fully the immense importance of speedily disposing of matters that came before the courts. He greatly doubted, however, whether the suggestions of his hon. friend would become practicable, with a view to diminishing the delay or even the expense of the present system. He did not know that it would be practicable with the present staff of Judges to make any changes that would

enable business to be transacted more quickly than at present. As to increasing the staff of Judges, as Mr. Meredith suggested—

Mr. Meredith remarked that he thought, perhaps, only a temporary increase would be sufficient.

The Attorney-General said he thought that would be quite unsatisfactory. It would, he was sure, be unsatisfactory to the profession to have a man taken from their ranks and place temporarily on the bench. Moreover, he did not think a leading member of the bar would consent to take such a position for a few months, and thereby run the risk of losing a large portion of his practice. He ventured to say his hon. friend himself would refuse such an offer. But as to the idea of increasing the staff of Judges, there was a good deal of difference of opinion in regard to it. One Judge had expressed the opinion that there were too many Judges, and that one of their number might be dispensed with. He did not think this opinion was general, but the fact that it was held by one Judge, and perhaps by more than one Judge, was sufficient to show that it was not generally agreed that there were too many Judges. The Attorney-General concluded by remarking that the subject was one of extreme interest to him. He desired nothing more than that justice might be administered in the Province with all possible speed and power. He would look carefully into the matter. Of course there was no objection to the motion.

Mr. Whitney suggested that even if it was necessary to increase the number of Judges to remedy the evil to which Mr. Meredith had called attention, and he was not sure that such a necessity existed, he was sure it would be in the interests of the people that such an increase should be made. He suggested also that it might be possible to change the law in such a way that cases which County Courts are not now allowed to dispose of, and which have to go to the High Court, should be tried in the County Court. Mr. Whitney thought the arrangement of the courts of New York one that worked well and that deserved some investigation.

Mr. Meredith remarked that he was surprised that the Attorney-General had not had his attention called to the matter or had not noticed the facts as they had been discussed in the press. He had been spoken to by many members of the bar in regard to the matter.

The motion then passed.

TO ABOLISH GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

Mr. Marter then rose to move his now well-known motion. It ran as follows:—“That in the opinion of this House the maintenance of Government House and the establishment connected therewith at the expense of the Province should, after the expiration of five years from the appointment, or other earlier determination of the term of office of his Honor the present Lieutenant-Governor, be discontinued.”

Mr. Marter first referred to the similar motion which he had brought up in the last Parliament, and which he had supported on the ground that the expenditure was unjustifiable. His views had not changed, and he still thought that the expenditure was totally unnecessary and one that the Province could not afford. He remarked that the terms of his motion merely specified the end of the term of the present Lieutenant-Governor, so as not to be unfair. He had no feeling against the present incumbent of the office, who had done all he could to popularize the office, who had gone over the whole country to various meetings wherever invited, and who had commended himself to all. His opposition was based on principle, on what he conceived to be the interests of the Province.

His first reason was that the Province at present does not meet its expenditure out of its income, and all that was useless should be cut off. He would not then cite the figures, but he would before long show his reasons for making this statement. Secondly, the expenditure was useless. He did not know who was benefited by it, and could not see what bearing for good it had on the community; and in this connection he quoted Principal Grant's opinion, expressed in his paper of November 4, upon the Lieutenant-Governor's residence. The only defence made before had been that the entertaining was necessary. He took exception to that. All those in public places were obliged to entertain more or less, and if this allowance was made for one, why not for all? In his opinion, a salary of \$10,000 should be sufficient for such purposes. Again, the system was bad. It was in accord with the Government's usual plan of furnishing perquisites, which were so hard to trace, and which ran up so high. He quoted Mr. Edward Blake's maxim that he who spends should pay; otherwise there will be extravagance, and held that there had been great extravagance in this case. The cost of the buildings had been