

diction of County Courts. He suggested that if the Government press the bill this session they should include a plan for a series of circuits, which would group two or three counties, so that the County Judges could go on circuit. It would have a good effect on the Judges themselves, and would be agreeable to the legal profession.

Mr. Hoyle (North Ontario) said that when lawyers disagreed it was necessary for the public to fall back on the old line of common sense. (Laughter.) He declared that the public expected a law reform measure this year. Giving County Courts power to quash by-laws was but a fresh pasture-field for lawyers to bring municipalities into court.

The Country Lawyer.

Mr. Gross (Welland) in his maiden speech before the House, a vigorous effort, thought the legal system was not in as bad a position as was pointed out. Speaking from the standpoint of a country practitioner, what they had to complain of with regard to High Court Judges was that they came to town at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, like a gale of wind, and wanted to get away at 3 o'clock, and if the lawyers were not ready their cases were dismissed.

(Laughter.) The bill might be left over until next year. The statutes were amended too often, and there were now about seventy-five bills before the House to amend the municipal act. That act should be amended only, say, every five years. The profession had no idea what the statute meant until it had been through the courts, and had been interpreted—(laughter)—and after that it was changed by the Legislature again, and there they were. (Loud laughter and applause.)

Mr. Graham's Fears.

Mr. Graham (Brockville) thought there was no great demand for law reform. He gave instances illustrating his contention that the placing of libel and slander suits in the jurisdiction of the County Courts would tend to encourage a vicious kind of law suit. Under the present act there were not too many suits for libel and slander, while at the same time he did not think that any suffering or hardship was caused by the restrictions. The proposed change would open the way for many prosecutions based on slim foundations, because, if for no other reason, the costs would be greatly reduced, and a direct inducement thus held out.

Mr. Wardell (North Wentworth)—I move the adjournment of the debate. I think that the Attorney-General would like to sleep on the bill. (Laughter.)

The Attorney-General—I have not the slightest intention of withdrawing the bill, notwithstanding anything that has been said.

The bill passed its second reading without division.

A Fine Point.

On motion to go into supply Mr. Carnegie (East Victoria) moved in amendment that free grant land settlers should have the pine on the lands, subject to reasonable dues. He spoke briefly to the resolution.

The Premier expressed the opinion

that the motion was out of order, as it interfered with the revenues, and his Honor the Lieutenant-Governor or the Government must decide on that.

The Speaker was of opinion that the motion was out of order, but owing to the manner in which it was written he must have time to consider it, and, therefore, he reserved his decision. He took the opportunity of asking that hereafter such documents be type-written.

A desultory discussion followed as to what should be done. Finally it was suggested that Mr. Carnegie move for leave to change the motion. This was done, and the debate continued on the second motion.

Conditions Have Improved.

Hon. Mr. Davis contended that the interests and conditions of the settlers had been improved greatly of late years. The number of acres to be cleared had been reduced, and the settler was allowed to cut all timber on his land except the pine, of which he gets enough to erect buildings and fences. The settlers were now able to take off their land timber which brought them considerable revenue. The present regulations were really more liberal than those proposed in the resolution, and more favorable than existed in Michigan.

A lengthy debate followed, concluding in speeches by Premier Ross and Mr. Whitney, the former pointing out that the settler was well provided for in having all the pine he needed and all the other timber that existed on his land.

The amendment as redrawn expressed regret that the Government regulations for settlement in licensed free grant townships did not give the settlers the pine timber at a reasonable rate of dues, also that the Government had not in licensed lands given the settlers all the wood other than pine.

The Premier pointed out that the latter part of the amendment regretted a condition which existed only prior to 1887.

On a division being taken the amendment was lost on a vote of 31 to 39. The vote was on straight party lines, except that Mr. Beatty (Parry Sound) voted with the Opposition.

The House adjourned at 12.35.

Good Roads.

The Committee of Highways yesterday heard further views as to the best manner of giving the country a system of good roads. F. Moyer of Wellington and J. S. Dickson, Warden of Perth, while favoring the Government grant, did not approve of the counties controlling its expenditure, as they thought the townships would use it to the best advantage. Ex-Mayor Johnson of Belleville favored control of the roads by Councils. He agreed with Messrs. Moyer and Dickson that cities should not have to pay anything to support rural roads.

Municipal Committee.

The Municipal Committee yesterday decided to take a vote to-day as to the advisability of reconsidering the bill approved of on Wednesday, and which provides for the freeing of Toronto