

Correspondence.

COUNTY COURT SITTINGS.

To the Editor,

CANADA LAW JOURNAL.

Dear Sir,—The Ontario Act amending the Jurors Act, 2 Edw. VII. (1902) c. 14, has given rise to embarrassing trouble in various counties in the Province, and it is respectfully submitted that it shews the unwisdom of "local option" in respect to methods of legal procedure in connection with the administration of justice.

The power given to the selectors of jurors by that Act to determine that the General Sessions of the Peace and Jury Sittings of the County Court should be held immediately after the High Court Assizes, was exercised in some counties and not in others, and now (to still further complicate the matter) some counties who adopted it have rescinded their action. The profession do not expect to find their legal practice with regard to setting down actions for trial in an amendment to the Jurors Act. Nevertheless sub-s. 3 of s. 3 of the Act referred to above requires actions to be entered six clear days before the first day of the Sittings. This provision, lurking in an unsuspected place and passing unnoticed, wrought havoc at many county seats, but as though there were no limit to this exceptional Act of exceptions, the last section provides that it shall not apply to any county in which is situate a city. The ordinary practitioner would probably in time have become acquainted with what was thus laid down as the law—applicable to his particular municipality, but s. 19, of c. 10, 4 Edw. VII., amended this final section again by adding after "city" the words: "Of 20,000 or over." so that the Act, as re-enacted, applied for instance to the County of Hastings and Belleville, but is of doubtful applicability to the County of Frontenac and Kingston.

The Hastings selectors of jurors, having in view a possible municipal economy, passed the resolution authorized by 2 Edw. VII., but have not found the experiment successful. The County of Hastings Law Association unanimously adopted a resolution, expressing the view of the Association as to the position (see post p. 806), and a deputation of the officers of the Association, Messrs. W. N. Ponton, E. G. Porter, E. J. Butler, J. P. Thomas and George Denmark, attended before the selectors of jurors and had the obnoxious resolution rescinded.

But now a new legal entanglement presents itself for solution in the County of Hastings. Does the rescinding resolution take