649, decided in 1849, when the question of the power of a justice to commit for trial on a charge of forgery was discussed at considerable length.

1 or

nis-

for in

at

ons

anted

gaol

, in

ion

ing

is ble

s I

eld

nat ne-

me

be

 \mathbf{of}

icin-

ıat

of ist

ss'

nd he

to

ıte

nd

et-

iis ist

1.

This reasoning seems to be adopted and approved of by Chief Justice Wilson in the case of Regina v. McDonald, 31 U. C. R. 339, when he says perjury and forgery not being attended with a breach of the peace, the Courts of Quarter Sessions cannot try them.

Assuming then that the Court of Quarter Sessions in Upper Canada had the same jurisdiction as these Courts in England, and consequently jurisdiction over all cases of felony and misdemeanour except perjury and forgery, and such new offences as by the Act creating them were directed to be tried at the Courts of Oyer and Terminer and general gaol delivery; it remains to consider the changes effected by Canadian legislation and the decisions of our own Courts.

The Statute 7 William IV. chapter 4 abolished the distinction between grand and petit larceny, and enabled the Sessions to try all cases of simple larceny (under certain restrictions when they were not presided over by a barrister). This statute seems to follow substantially the English Act 7 & 8 George IV. chapter 29, sections 2 & 3, although in the English Act the Court of Quarter Sessions is not mentioned, but every Court whose power as to the trial of larceny before was limited to petit larceny was given the power to try every case of larceny, the punishment of which could not exceed the punishment therein mentioned for simple larceny.

It is said in Dickenson's Guide to the Quarter Sessions that in England prior to this Act the Courts of Quarter Sessions only professed to try petit larcenies.

The various enactments in force as to the Sessions were consolidated in chapter 17 of the Consolidated Statutes for Upper Canada, and most of those are now in chapter 44 of Revised Statutes of Ontario.

No definition or limitation of the jurisdiction of the Court is to be found in either of these statutes, although in the Consolidated Statutes, chapter 17, section 3, is to be found