any sittings of Assize and Nisi Prius for the county in which the venue is laid; all issues of fact and assessments of damages shall in the absence of a notice to the contrary be heard, tried and assessed by the presiding judge without the intervention of a jury; and lastly, the City of Toronto is re-united for judicial purposes to the County of York.

Some of the changes introduced by the Act will meet with approval, and the expenses of criminal justice may be lessened; but, upon the whole, we venture to assert that the opinion of the judges, the bar, and practitioners generally, is largely opposed to the Act.

Upon the County Judges in those Cities where Recorders Courts have hitherto existed will devolve increased work with reference to criminal business in their capacity of chairmen of the General Session in their respective Counties. But the other changes introduced by this Act will, as we shall shew hereafter, much decrease their civil business. On the other hand, the criminal business in the Sessions throughout the country will as a rule be reduced, for much of it must necessarily (as there will be only two Sessions in the year and prisoners cannot be kept lying in jail untried) be sent to the assizes to be disposed of. The effect of this will be of course incidentally to swell the calendars at Assizes.

It has been thought by some, that the provisions of this Act respecting the alterations in the Quarter Sessions are unconstitutional, as beyond the powers of the Local Legislature. But we do not pause to consider this at present; nor need we here discuss a variety of alterations in matters of practice which are only interesting to the legal profession.

It is not, however, because some of the clauses in this Act are, in our opinion, defective in detail and crude in form that we object to it. It is because we think the effect of its principal provisions will work injuriously to the Superior Court judges, to the County Court judges, to practitioners and to the public. This is a sweeping assertion, but we nevertheless think that argument certainly is in our favour, whether experience will prove us to be wrong we know not, but time will tell. If we are wrong we will be the first to note the fact, and be only too glad to do so.

It will scarcely be denied that this Act will largely increase the duties of the Superior Court judges; if they had not enough to do now there would be no harm in this, but such notoriously is not the fact, rather the contrary. Litigation may be less in quantity than formerly, but the special business will increase with the wealth and business of the country, and is increasing. There is, therefore, no reason to suppose that the work of the Judges will decrease. This Act, we contend will both directly and indirectly increase the duties of the Superior Court Judges, and that not in simple cases only, but in special cases. *Directly*, because there will be two courts less for the trial of civil cases than formerly, and so of necessity County Court suits, where speed is of any object and can by that means be obtained, will be brought down to the assizes for trial.

Indirectly, the business of the Queen's Bench and Common Pleas will be increased, because the inclination will in all special cases be to take cases before Superior Court Judges, and for various reasons—

1. The expense is not thereby increased.

2. Parties will be saved the costs of appeals which might be necessary if the cases were tried in County Courts.

3. There is not the same confidence, as a rule, in the County Judges as in the Superior Court Judges, and clients as well as practitioners will doubtless make their selection in favor of the latter. And this will be especially the case in certain Counties that need not now be specified.

If then the duties of these judges are increased, some part of their work must be neglected, or arrears will accumulate. In either case there will be public dissatisfaction which must eventually bring about a cure, either by a return to the system before the "Law Reform Act," at which time the County Judges will necessarily be less competent for the work than now, or by increasing the number of Superior Court Judges, which would be unobjectionable except on the score of expense, or by increasing the jurisdiction of the Division Courts, a measure which would only make bad worse, for it is absurd to imagine that cases would be *more* satisfactorily disposed of in the hurry of a Division Court, than when they have the safeguards of written pleadings, &c., and the presence of counsel to assist the Judge, combined with the more deliberate investigation in a County Court—clearly, vastly *less* so. It would necessitate some mode of appeal and destroy the advantages of the present system without