to remove some of our relative disadvantages. It is a disgrace to us as a people, in my opinion, that we should so long have permitted ourselves, in glaring contrast with you, to have a double system of jurisprudence, one conflicting with the other, one to correct the errors into which the other fell. I admit all that, and while I say we are now engaged, and have for a long time been engaged, in endeavoring to overcome that difficulty, and to bring our system in theory and in principle into something like the advantageous position in this particular which yours enjoys, I go further, and say that we are perhaps more and more building, year after year, as new and untried cases arise, on the foundation of the Roman law on which yours is based. But I may be permitted, perhaps, to suggest that in the practical working of a system much more defective in theory than yours, we have found some methods which are not wholly unworthy of your attention. I may be permitted to suggest that there are some things in practical work in which we have achieved greater success for our people, in spite of our defective system, than you have yet done. Your civil code is one thing; your code of procedure is quite another. There are things which are well worthy the ambition and energies of law reformers everywhere. While we are endeavoring to make our system in theory and practice more perfect, we have gone far already to practically simplify our procedure. We have got rid of your *exceptions dilatoires*, your *exceptions à la forme*, your system of *enquête*. We do not hear any longer these demurrers, these technical objections, these lawyers' difficulties which go so far to confuse and mystify the real question at issue between parties, and substitute for it some question in which only the lawyers have any interest at all. Our rule is that the Judge is bound by the law to make such amendments in the pleadings as will enable the real question at issue between the parties to be decided then and there in the case before him, and that he is bound to give his decision according to the very right and justice of the case. These are the fundamental principles towards which we work in a practical use of the more defective system under which we are living, and thus it is that we have shortened procedure very much. We are sooner in coming to an issue, we are shorter in trying the issue, and shorter in reaching a determination. We find no man turned out of Court, to commence again another suit for the trial of the same question. We find the whole thing settled, and quickly settled, in one suit; according to our system as it is worked, there are no public grievances, as in Quebec, with regard to delays. But I think that everybody who looks at the procedure in that Province must be cognizant of the fact that there are most serious delays which, in many cases, are equivalent to denials of justice; and there is a class of cases in which the slowness and tardiness of justice in Quebec crops out in a way which makes it conspicuous sometimes to the members of this House. We but need to look at the election trials and the length of time it takes for a Quebec Judge first to try an election case and then to make up his mind after a slow trial, we need but to compare the returns which come from Quebec with the returns from Ontario and other Provinces, to see there is a habit of slowness and retardation which is very fatal indeed to efficiency. While such is our practice, we have also, I think, even in the matter of carrying out our laws, advantages which the Province of Quebec does not possess, and which touch closely the topic which we are now discussing. We have combined to a very great extent the advantages of centralization and decentralization, because there are advantages in both. What have you got? I say that half the time of your Superior Court Judges is occupied with the discussion of trivial affairs which ought to be dealt with by local Judges of an inferior Court altogether. I say the adoption of the system of inferior Judges or magistrates, appointing, of course, men of ability, probity and integrity, while still not of the standing required for high class work, would enable you, without increasing the public charges, to increase the efficiency of the administration of justice. It does not suit to have high class Judges, who have to decide complicated and knotty legal questions involving long arguments, and which are to be settled according to the settled rules of laws, engaged half their time in petty affairs which have to be decided according to some sort of rough justice, to what is called equity and good conscience, and not according to law. The mere labor, irrespective of the character of such work, is enough to divert the ability of the Judges from the special work for which they are needed, the high class work. We have, therefore, local Judges which reside in the localities where they officiate, and who have a very considerable civil and criminal jurisdiction, under which they perform a large amount of work; and, I believe, under some of the amendments contemplated in the Ontario Legislature, our local Judges are to have a very considerable amount of work to do in questions that arise in the progress of suits, in the Superior Courts, with questions of pleading and other interlocutory proceedings. We do not centralize to any avoidable extent: we do not require writs to be issued in only one locality. Writs are issued anywhere in the locality in which the suitor lives, the intermediate proceedings are largely conducted there by local bars, and the trial takes place in the most convenient place; all inferior matters of justice are managed by the local Judges in the different districts, and all more important matters are also managed largely on the spot by high class Judges, who make their circuits, and who are constantly engaged in the different parts of the country doing the same class of important work, and who come practically to every man's door to dispose of his litigation. Now, the improvements which have taken place in locomotion from the increased number of railways and other facilities for travelling, by which the Judges can go to distant parts of the country, are not to be left out of consideration. When your system was adopted originally, the condition of all the Provinces in this respect was entirely different, and it would be extremely easy now to make arrangements, which would then have been quite impossible, for utilizing the Judges more extensively, and enabling a small number of high class Judges to do the work all over the Province. In this way legal facilities can now be supplied at little cost in all cases, both great and small. You might thus get justice administered on the spot, and local judges in every district where there was sufficient business. Thus one County Judge might do all the ordinary and inferior business of a considerable district. He or some other legal officer would attend to all the matters of pleading. The trial would take place on the spot, and for any important trial you would have a high class judge. By this system you might use your Judges more, and distribute them better than now. You would then require fewer Superior Court Judges. You would be able to pay them a compensation more worthy of their work and larger than you can now propose; and that is one of the evils of the present proposition, that it would defeat any readjustment otherwise practicable by the creation of new offices of a character which ought not to continue, and would defer that justice which might be done the Judges were a proper system adopted. I believe there need be no increase of charges to the public. I believe the ultimate adoption of this plan, which might be adopted gradually, by putting into the local districts, as Superior Judges were removed, local Judges of inferior jurisdictions at smaller salaries, would enable you to accomplish great results without any increased charges. But if there were an increase, I would cheerfully vote for any reasonable amount which would be productive of truly beneficial results in the adminis-