Civil Servants in Political Contests.

MR. GARROW'S RESOLUTION.

Another Judge for the Court of Appeal.

Legislative Chamber, March 17.

The interference of civil servants in political contests engaged the attention of the House for the greater part of to-day's sessions. Mr. Garrow's resolution was passed after a lively discussion, and Mr. Gamey's bill was discussed in the evening but not voted upon. Mr. Hardy introduced a bill increasing the number of Judges of Appeal to five. The dismissal of Bailiff Thornton of St. Thomas was made the subject of a long debate.

ANOTHER APPEAL JUDGE.

Mr. Hardy introduced a bill respecting the Court of Appeal of Ontario. It makes provision that the Court of Appeal shall consist of a Chief Justice and four other Judges instead of a Chief Justice and three other Judges as at present. Four Judges are to constitute a quorum and may hold any sitting of the court, but appeals from the decision of a Divisional Court and appeals under the controverted elections act shall not be disposed of by a court of not less than four Judges, and all other appeals, including an appeal from a single Judge, may be heard and disposed of by a court of three Judges.

Mr. Hardy, in introducing the bill, said that it was well known that the Court of Appeal had been very much crowded for the past year, in fact ever since the new act had come into force. It had been arranged so that the Court of Chancery had done some of the work of the Court of Appeal, but for that there would have been some scores or even hundreds of cases behind. Under the new act, which rather opened the doors of the Court of Appeal, and other changes having been made which increased the number of appeals, the list had become so heavy that they could not pretend to get through it, and therefore they called in the aid of the Judges of the High Court, and the Court of Chancery had done a certain amount of the work. This arrangement was regarded as unsatisfactory even by the members of the Chancery Division. The Judges of that division had to go on circuit; the moment they were through hearing arguments they were compelled to start off. One-half the work in preparing judgments was the consideration and discussion among the Judges of their judgment rather than writing their judgments separately. Only in that way could judgments be given which would be entitled to that respect and have that weight which they should. The Supreme Court at Washington considered every case in that way. One Judge or a committee of Judges was deputed to write the judgment, and it was delivered in that way after having been revised and concurred in by the other Judges. In the same way in England one Judge delivered the entire judgment after it had been drawn up by one Judge and discussed. Something would have to be done, even with the Court of Chancery doing part of the work. One hundred cases had been left undisposed of at the end of last year, and in a little while the machinery of the court would be so clogged that it would be impossible to carry on the work. A Court of Appeal of four Judges might be in some respects found to be objectionable. Cases arose where they were equally divided and the result was abortive. In England the Court of Appeal was established with five ex-officio Judges. Others might be called in, as it was proposed in the present measure they should be called in here, and anything he proposed to do in the present act was intended to do away with this as far as required. Now no less than two Judges were called in from below, but that was not always practicable and