States of Europe. This is in no small degree attributable to the *right* of the subject to be tried by his peers. The famous words of Magna Charta are, "Nullus liber homo capiatur, vel imprisonetur, aut disseisiatur de libero tenemento suo vel libertatibus vel liberis consuetudinibus suis, aut utlagetur, aut exulit, aut aliquo modo destruatur, nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus nisi per legale judicium parium suorum vel per legem terræ." This Charter of our liberty is the bulwark of our freedom. It is not only the pride of our people, but the admiration of all foreigners who take the trouble to understand it. Rather than dispense with trial by jury in a criminal case, against the will of the party accused, we had better adopt the system in vogue in more than one State of the Union, of summoning a jury on the spot, in the same manner as on coroner's inquests. The criminal law of England is merciful—that of France is arbitrary. We must not be induced by any admirers of the latter country to substitute cruelty for mercy, when liberty is at stake.

Though several clauses of this bill correspond with English enactments, it is not to be forgotten that there is a wide difference between the circumstances of the two countries. The magistrates of Canada are not to be compared with the magistrates of England. There might be no risk in allowing a magistrate in England, under proper restrictions, to deprive of liberty; whereas in Canada that power dare not be entrusted to one magistrate in one thousand. Owing to this difference, a measure which might be in England a blessing, in Canada would be a curse. It is not safe to trifle with the liberty of the subject, or to pass any law abridging it, unless in cases of clear necessity.

It is with pleasure that we have seen this bill since its introduction deprived of some of its most objectionable features. It is now so altered that, no longer a monster, it may become law and prove a really good law.

A Bill "for the protection of Hotel Keepers in certain cases," is upon the whole a prudent measure. It is now a rule that an innkeeper is liable for the loss of the goods of his guest, but it is also a rule that the guest may by his own conduct discharge the innkeeper from responsibility. Though the law casts its protection on a traveller who resorts to an inn (and *all hotels* are not inns), it does not discharge the guest from the exercise of all prudence. Were the law so, the effects of it upon innkeepers would be ruinous as well as unjust. This bill is nothing more than an extension of the sound and wise principle of protection to the innkeeper as much as to his guest. It recites, that it is expedient to limit and declare and place upon an equitable basis the liability of *Hotel* keepers to their guests, for the loss of monies, jewels or ornaments, belonging to or in the custody of such guests With respect to these things, the innkeeper may keep a safe for their safe keeping, and may notify his guests that he has such a safe, in which he is ready to keep their valuables, and if the notification be neglected, notwithstanding a loss, the innkeeper is to be discharged from liability. The liability of an innkeeper as regards all property of a guest, not above enumerated, is to remain as heretofore. We cannot say that the bill goes too far. Now that travellers are in the habit of carrying upon their persons costly articles of jewelry, and travellers are so numerous, it is, we think, time for the law to cast a little more of its protection over the innkeeper than it does. The rule, as to the responsibility of innkeepers, owes its origin to the reign of "good Queen Bess;" and Calyes' case was decided in 1584. Though the people of that day were famed for many good qualities; yet they were not accustomed to travel in the pursuit of health, wealth and information, as do the people of the present day. There might have been the disposition, but there was not the ability. The want of steamboats and railcars was a serious obstacle to universal peregrination. Times change, and so do we; and as we change, so must the law.

The bill "for the protection of the owners of saw logs and other timber, and to afford *them* (*qu.* saw logs and other timber) summary relief in certain cases," is dictated by a knowledge of the wants of the country. The transition from a bill to protect hotel keepers to a bill to protect the owners of saw logs is an easy one. Protection is, we think, as much needed in the one case as the other. One of the staples of this country is the timber trade. Many are engaged in the pursuit of it. The law of *meum* and *tuum*, though pretty well understood, is not at all times respected. One saw log very much resembles another. And where there are thousands braced together, it is no easy matter to distinguish "mine from thine." Hence the temptation to appropriate the property of another is in this business great, and to many persons irresistible. It is often the subject of wonder why the law of England is so severe upon horse stealers. One and the chief reason is that the animal is so easily stolen, that great is the temptation of stealing him. So in proportion to the temptation to commit the crime is the severity of the punishment. The same rule applies equally to saw logs. It is proposed that the owner of every mill shall have particular marks for his timber. These marks are to be exhibited in a conspicuous place. Any mill owner exhibiting marks not his own is to be made subject to summary conviction before a magistrate. Persons in the employment of mill owners, cutting logs bearing any marks other than those of the mill owner, or defacing marks, are also to be subjected to summary conviction and punishment. As in other enactments