

I like to tell stories about Bishops. There are so few of them that there is very little fear of retaliation, and then it gives a theological and ecclesiastical flavor to one's discourse. It is for that reason—and not at all that it is apropos of anything I have to say this evening—that I should like to tell you the story of the Bishop of Ottawa who once went to a fishing camp. All went well till Sunday morning; when he got up he found nobody around but one man—and he had a sprained ankle. He asked for the rest of the men. He was told they had probably gone fishing. He said, "Why didn't they wait for me?" "Oh," the man replied, "Maybe they kind o' sort o' thought perhaps you wouldn't likely care to go fishing on Sunday." The Bishop said that reminded him of a circumstance, when he was an humble curate. A couple had come in from off the street for him to marry them. When he got so far in the service as to say: "Wilt thou, John, take this woman, Mary, to be thy wedded wife", the fellow broke in by saying, "What in h— are we here for?"

Then there are the barristers—I should of course say attorneys—my excuse is that attorneys do not appear in court in my country. The attorneys are not dressed in this state of "Weiss-nicht-wo" as at home. They may have pink or yellow boots; trousers and waistcoat of various colors, and a coat, "go as you please". There is no silk gown or stuff gown, no precedence except that given by superior ability or superior assurance.

The witness, instead of being obliged to stand, is seated; in a British court he is never allowed to sit down, unless on account of illness or physical weakness. It is wonderful what an advantage it is for a witness who is trying to evade awkward questions to be allowed to sit down, particularly if he has a chew of tobacco at the same time. But what amazed me most was the selecting of the jury. In thirty years' experience in Ontario I never heard a jurymen asked a question but once, and that was by a very young barrister. Once in an American court I heard counsel ask a jury if any were Canadians, there being an Englishman a party to the action. Counsel, I suppose, imagined that a Canadian would likely favor an Englishman, not knowing that a Canadian is no more an Englishman than an Iowan is a Yankee.

I have heard jurymen asked their religion, or whether they had any religion, their occupation, about their reading news-