

committed a heinous crime; the evidence is strong against the prisoner; we will convict, and if we are mistaken the Court of Appeal will set us right?" Is there any certainty that in seeking to correct an evil which is rare we should not introduce one which would be common, and that criminal appeals, becoming frequent, would not gradually deteriorate the verdicts of juries? We say nothing as to other objections.

To the power of revising sentences which the bill proposes to confer there are serious objections. . . . A Court of Appeal powerless to revise sentences would lose much of its value. But we contemplate with apprehension the results of such a system if, as is proposed by the bill, the Court is not competent to increase as well as diminish sentences. The convicted offender does by no means now always get his deserts. In these days, at all events, sentences are sometimes over-lenient. To prevent almost universal appeals convicted prisoners must know that they may fare worse above.—*The Times*.

Senator Ferguson has again introduced a bill with reference to the extra judicial employment of judges. This provides that judges appointed to act under a commission issued under the authority of a statute, or under any power possessed by the Governor-in-Council, or by a Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, shall not receive any remuneration in respect of services under such commission, other than salaries payable by law to him as a judge, except such necessary travelling expenses as are actually incurred. Senator Ferguson's previous bill (introduced in 1903) was to prevent a judge acting on a commission such as above referred to. This present bill is a modified provision, and will meet some of the objections to the present practice. We have already expressed our views on this subject.