

would make a cheap remedy and would save the costs of recognizances, etc. There might also be given an appeal to the Divisional Court from the Local Judge. I would also suggest an amendment to the Criminal Code to permit either party before or after the Justice had intimated what his finding would be to ask the Justice to reserve his decision and send the proceedings to the Local Judge of the High Court for the county, in order that such Judge might review the proceedings and say what the finding should be, and that the finding of the Justice should conform thereto, and that in order to obtain such review the party asking it should deposit the costs and five dollars and postage on the proceedings both ways. Either party having the right to notify the Local Judge of his wish to be heard on the review, and with the privilege to the said Judge to ask either or both parties or the County Attorney to appear before him to be heard generally or on some point to be stated. Also that no conviction or return of conviction, for publication should be made until after the report of the Local Judge, and the result of the appeal therefrom. The latter to have the right to award five dollars costs to the party successful before him, and either party to have a right of appeal from him to a Divisional Court. The effect would be that no conviction would be recorded against a man's good name unless some reasonable ground existed therefor. As it is now, once a conviction has been made, no matter how unreasonable, and although afterwards quashed, the justice must return it for publication, and a man's probably good name is tarnished. The advantage of this is that everyone would have a cheap and speedy remedy against an improper conviction. I only make the suggestion. The details could easily be worked out by the lawmakers.

ANOTHER SUBSCRIBER.