

there would be no anomaly in equity law being expounded by more than one judge, any more than in common law being so expounded.

It may be added, in favour of our Court of Equity being composed of more than one judge, that, unless it is so, the judge is left to his own unassisted judgment upon every question, however difficult and important, which may arise before him; whereas in England, although the judges in equity do not sit together, yet there are several of them, and they have the advantage of consulting together if they think proper to do so.

Upon the whole, I think that in this country equity law would be better administered, and would possess more of the confidence of the people, if the court were presided over by three judges, than if presided over by one.

This further advantage would result from the change, that the mode of taking evidence might be greatly improved. The *issues in fact*, arising in suits, might, whenever either party desired it, be tried by a jury upon Circuit, before one of the judges of the court. The evidence is now brought before the Court only upon depositions; a mode of ascertaining the truth which is very unsatisfactory.

Before quitting the subject of the law and practice