minute of it) of verifying the fact than by means of affidavits. Apart from statutory regulations the law permits the justice to make a verbal conviction, which is subject to re-consideration so long as no conviction is drawn up: Jones v. Williams, 46 L.J.N.S. 271.

The conviction in this case is based on the personal admission of the defendant that he was guilty as to both illegal sales, and though there was no evidence taken, and no written record of what happened, credence must be given to the formal conviction now produced for the first time. The application is refused.

See Rex v. Goulet, 12 Can. Cr. Cas. 365, per Davidson, J.

ALVES v. KEARNS BROTHERS—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—APRIL 20.

Venue—Motion to Change—Preponderance of Convenience—Interpreter Required—None Available at Proposed New Place of Trial.]—Motion by the defendants in an action for malicious prosecution, to change the place of trial from Toronto to Sault Ste. Marie. The Master said that the facts of this case were in many respects similar to those in Seaman v. Perry, 9 O.W.R. 537, 761. Here, as there, all the proceedings which led to the action took place at Sault Ste. Marie, where all parties were then living. But after the Grand Jury at the Sessions on 8th November, 1910, had found "No Bill" on the charge for which he had been arrested and kept in jail from 12th to 24th June, the plaintiff came to Toronto and brought this action, without any delay, on the 14th December, and named Toronto as the place of trial in his statement of claim, delivered on the 13th March. The plaintiff is a Portuguese from the Madeira Islands, and came thence to Sault Ste. Marie as lately as July, 1908. He swears that he cannot, nor can his wife (who will be a necessary witness on his behalf) give evidence except through an interpreter. It is not denied that none can be had at Sault Ste. Marie. So far as can be gleaned from the affidavits on both sides, there does not seem to be any sufficient preponderance in favour of the motion in view of the cases from Campbell v. Doherty, 18 P.R. 243, to Macdonald v. Dawson, 3 O.W.R. 773, 8 O.L.R. 72. Here it cannot be said that the plaintiff has acted in any sense capriciously or vexatiously in laying the venue at Toronto. The fact of the necessity of an interpreter is not denied, and in view of