who would in most cases have to return home and back again to the place of trial were the court prolonged beyond the first day, as there is generally no sufficient accommodation for strangers at the places where courts are held.

Increased jurisdiction would also mean more jury trials in Division Court cases and the employment of counsel, all of which would tend to make long trials and to do away with one of the chief objects for which Division Courts were brought into existence.

It is also not possible for a judge holding Division Courts (away from a law library and other means of reference as a general thing, unless he frequently reserves judgment, which is also against the spirit of the Division Court, the law in which is supposed under the Act to be administered largely according to natural justice) to decide cases according to the law bearing upon the same, and upon which one or other of the parties to the suit may have gone to trial; this may do little harm in minor matters, but would work real injury to suitors where any considerable sum was involved.

For these and other reasons, this Association, believing that to further increase the jurisdiction of the Division Court would, in a great measure destroy its usefulness, and the primary object of its existence, does not approve of any increase therein being made.

As to the idea of having certain cases at the Assizes or High Court Sittings disposed of by the Local Judge after the High Court Judge had disposed of the more important cases, this Association is not disposed to approve of same for the following amongst other reasons:

The trial forum would always be uncertain, a most undesirable thing, suitors and counsel would not know when or before whom a case would be tried, one High Court Judge would think many cases unimportant, another few, special counsel from a distance might be retained presuming that the case would be tried in its order before the High Court Judge, when upon its coming before such judge it would be sent to the foot of the list for trial by another judge, whom possibly neither of the parties desired to act as such; witnesses for the same cause would be in attendance and have to be kept possibly for days or even weeks while other cases later on the list were disposed of, in fact the uncertainty arising from ignorance of what the High Court Judge might do when the case came before him, would render the lives of suitors, their witnesses, solicitors and counsel a burden, and this Association knowing that the Honorable the Attorney-General, who has no doubt had experiences of a character somewhat analogous to what is referred to, will realize that what is stated is not a matter of fancy, but an actual reality.

This objection does not apply with equal force to the trial of criminal cases (if the sittings are for jury cases only so that jurors will not be kept in attendance while non-jury cases are being disposed of by the High Court Judge) as it would probably be known before hand what criminal cases would be tried before the County Court Judge and arrangements could, to some extent, be made to meet this; it might at times prove awkward for Crown Counsel from a distance, but possibly the idea would be to have the County Attorney act in these less important cases, that is those tried before the County Court Judge.

The fees of summoning jurors for the trial of civil cases in the County Court, might be saved if the summonses served on such jurors were for the sittings of both High and County Courts; this Association sees no special objection to this course, as the same jurors could attend both sittings and it thinks that as a general rule the extra mileage to jurors would amount to little, if anything, more than the extra days they would probably be kept