

of the press. And that liberty, it is safe to say, owes its birth and growth to Trial by Jury. . . . We have not to turn far back the pages of history to come upon times when men, who sought to benefit their country by publicly advocating reforms obnoxious to the Government, were arrested and tried as criminals. Then it was when Trial by Jury shone its brightest and did its noblest. Then it was that to jury after jury counsel pleaded for the liberty of free discussion with an earnest eloquence which was warmed and kindled into life by the justice of the cause for which they plead. Prominent in this noble struggle was Erskine the heaven-born advocate. It was indeed in advocating the liberty of the press in his first cause that he suddenly vaulted into fame." Touching upon the leading cases where men were tried on the charge of seditious libel in their bearing upon the manner in which the liberty of the press grew and strengthened, the speaker enumerated a number of arguments for and against Trial by Jury. "There are those who frankly avow all our debt of gratitude to the jury, who yet say times are so changed that the Trial by Jury is no longer suited to our altered circumstances.

. . . . That for the sole purpose of trying disputed questions of fact the jury is to-day old-fashioned, cumbersome, inadequate and expensive. That a saving would be brought about by the abolition of the Jury must be admitted." There is firstly a saving of jury fees,—secondly, a saving of time by "rendering useless those frequent addresses and arguments of counsel made ostensibly to the judge, but in reality to influence the jury,—thirdly, "there would be a check to that prodigal outpouring of eloquence with which counsel seek to inundate the jury." A second objection to the jury is,—"that business men unwilling to sacrifice their time, so evade service on the jury that at many circuits the panel is largely composed of men, who are, in short, a sort of jury parasite." Mr. White in answer to this objection said:—"This is undoubtedly a great evil, a disease attacking the very life of the jury system. . . . But it must be born in mind that this evil of professional jurymen is a disease and not normal to the jury system,—the very life principle of which is that they should be summoned from the body of the county." The third, and perhaps the strongest argument is made against the jury made by those,—"who urge that it is folly to submit the decision of questions often intricate, and requiring the nicest analysis of a voluminous mass of conflicting evidence to men who have no special training in such matters, when a means is at hand in the judge to have the cause decided by one skilled in the weighing of testimony, learned in matters of law, and able to grasp and master the most difficult case in all its details." It is argued by the supporters of the jury that jurymen will decide impartially from the very fact that they know not when they may sit as suitors, "and that a confidence invaluable to society is

thus engendered that justice will be fairly administered. Moreover, it is urged that this confidence is strengthened by a common feeling that juries do much to soften the cast iron rigor of the law and temper it with a common sense equity." The following are the concluding words of the lecturer:—"The force of these arguments is undeniable, but they are well met by the plan now in use in this province. Here you have so provided that in all cases where a jury is desirable it can be had, while in all other cases the judge alone decides. In my native province it is otherwise, and it was originally the humble effort of the lecturer to advocate that we, in New Brunswick, who are proud to work at your side with equal pace in all other reforms, should not lag behind in this. I trust the day is not far distant when we shall decide to follow your example. Glad indeed am I that the lesson we are to learn of Nova Scotia comes from a brother to whom we in New Brunswick are bound by such strong ties of respect and brotherly love. In criminal cases I trust the jury will be ever retained, for thus few intricate questions arise, and the having of a jury is ever to the side of mercy."

We cannot but remark that it has been impossible in this small space to justly represent this able and worthy lecture.

## THE RIGHT MAN IN THE RIGHT PLACE.

THE youth, standing on the threshold of manhood, with cultivated and developed powers, sees before him various useful and remunerative vocations. Naturally the question arises, "What shall I do? What will yield me the most material results in return for my labor?" A wiser question would be, "What can I do best? How can I best serve the interests of my fellows, my country, and my God?" It is only the wiser men who see that gold is not the chief good, that there are truer riches, things more to be desired. Socrates was content with his plain fare, while he enjoyed that privilege which money could not buy, of moulding the young Athenian mind, and leavening the current of national thought. The greatest of teachers scorned the empty pursuit of earthly riches, and taught that it would profit a man nothing if he should gain the whole world unless he gave heed to things of a higher and more enduring character. The shallow, shiftless, pleasure-seeking time-server is a curse to himself and everybody else. It is then highly necessary that every young man should cultivate integrity and earnestness in purpose and action, that he should have before him worthy objects of pursuit, and be impelled toward their attainment by an inspiration born of lofty ideals. The most enduring epitaphs are not inscribed upon iron or brass; they are impressed upon the characters of nations and individuals. The highest