prosecutions, and I for one would be loath to see this institution abolished without the substitution in its place of some other equally efficient safeguard. The question of the expediency of the abolition of grand juries has recently been brought to the attention of Parliament, and it is now being discussed in the press. The question is one of importance and worthy of serious consideration, and opinions are divided on the subject. I call your attention to the matter, and I would like to obtain an expression of your views, whether it seems to you desirable to abolish or to continue the system of grand juries. This has been done by a number of grand juries in Ontario.

To bring a wrong-doer to trial, a written accusation of the crime or offence laid to his charge is drawn up. It must set forth with certainty the facts and circumstances essential to constitute the crime or offence, and it must directly charge him with having committed such crime or offence. This written accusation is called a bill of indictment.

To avoid a failure of justice, the crime or offence is sometimes charged or described in different ways; and each separate charge is called a count. Two or more persons may be joined in one bill of indictment, when they have all taken part in the commission of a crime or offence. The principal duty of the grand jury is to receive the bills of indictment which are laid before them and enquire, upon their oaths, and ascertain by the evidence submitted to them, whether there is sufficient cause to call upon the accused to stand their trial. As the grand jury have only to enquire whether there is sufficient ground for calling on the parties accused to answer the accusations brought against them, they hear only the witnesses for the prosecution. A grand jury may find that there is sufficient cause as to the charge in one count of a bill of indictment and may ignore that in another, or as to one defendant and not as to another; but they cannot find a true bill as to