

In the case of Mr. Arthur R. J. Sullens, recommending that his notice be ordered to stand and remain posted in the usual places prescribed by the Rules until the first day of next term, and that further consideration of his case be deferred until the completion of his papers and production of proper proof of his having passed the prescribed examination.

The Report was adopted and ordered accordingly.

Mr. Moss, from the same committee, reported on the special petitions of Messrs. L. M. Lyon, C. C. Hayne, D. S. Storey, recommending that their notices be allowed to remain in the usual places prescribed by the Rules until the first day of next term, and that, provided no objection be made in the meantime, their applications do stand for consideration until next term.

In the case of Mr. Nassau Brown Eagen, recommending that his notice do remain posted until the first day of the next term, and that he be then called, provided no objection appear in the meantime.

The Report was adopted and ordered accordingly.

Dr. Hoskin, from the Discipline Committee, reported, in the case of Mr. T. B., who has advertised himself as a barrister, although not actually such:

That the complaint had been considered, and, in view of a statement and explanation made by Mr. B., the committee suggest that they be excused from further proceeding with the investigation at present.

The Report was adopted.

The gentlemen named in the minutes were then presented and called to the Bar.

Mr. Watson, from the Special Committee on the Fusion and Amalgamation of the Courts, reported as follows:

(1) In pursuance of the direction made in Convocation on the 15th inst., your committee has considered the resolution passed by the Judges and submitted to Convocation, and, with regard thereto, begs to present a further Report.

(2) Your committee regards with satisfaction the fact, as indicated by the resolutions, that the Judges of the High Court of Justice recognize the necessity of the fusion and amalgamation of the three Divisions of the court, and are disposed to co-operate in completion.

(3) Your committee is of opinion that further recommendations should be made as regard to the resolutions, first, that Rule 211 should be abrogated, and that provisions should be made for a daily sitting of a judge in court for the hearing of all court motions, whether by way of appeal, petition, or otherwise, and that a judge should also sit separately each day for the hearing of Chamber motions.

(4) With regard to the second resolution, your committee would respectfully call attention to the fact that the official staff of the various Divisions is apparently abundant, and, it is believed, quite sufficient to perform the official duties consequent upon the reorganization referred to, and that if such reorganization was directed it would be a matter of detail only reassigning the several officers and fixing their respective duties, and that such change is quite practicable, and when made would be much more convenient, and, for the reasons suggested in previous reports, your committee would urge the necessity for one Divisional Court, with fortnightly sittings, constituted of three judges.

(5) Your committee also regards with particular satisfaction the resolution to amalgamate the circuits, and suggests that provision should be made for determining, prior to the Commission Day, the rights of the parties to have a trial with or without a jury.

(6) Your committee desires to urge its previous recommendation with regard to the number of sittings of the court, especially in Toronto and other cities, for the trial of non-jury cases. At the last sitting of the court in Toronto the learned judge was unable to dispose of any of the non-jury cases entered for trial, numbering in all about one hundred.