

VICE-ROYALTY AT OSGOODE HALL—TRIAL BY JURY.

arbitration as being two of the greatest cases in which Mr. Evart had been concerned. He continued as follows :—

As a statesman he is as distinguished as he is as a jurist. The address to which your Excellency has so graciously responded refers to the fact that the members of the Bar have always taken a deep interest in the political history of the country. To this rule, Mr. Evarts has been no exception. He now holds the chief office in the department of State, a post made illustrious by such occupants as Jefferson, Marshall, Adams and Livingstone. From the ranks of the two great departments to which I have referred have commonly been recruited the chief justices of the United States Supreme Court, the most important judicial position to be found among civilized nations. This Province is necessarily deeply interested in the life that passes along the other side of the border. For many hundreds of miles our land is continuous with that of the United States. It is an invisible and impalpable line, and serves rather as a means of communication than as a line of demarcation. Although all the powers of the greatest empires could put no obstacle to the passage of that line, yet a little printer's ink and some paper had been able to place serious impediments in the way of trade. I hope that this will not be for long, and that from neither side will tariff wars be kept up. Our guest must have inferred from the references in the address to your Excellency that the sacred fire of freedom burns as purely and is attended by as fervent a warmth under a monarchical form of government as under the Government from which he comes. I would ask him to reflect upon the points in regard to which all English-speaking people are alike, rather than on the points on which they differ. While in our country the form of Government is monarchical, and in the United States republican, yet there appears that marked resemblance that both countries may emphatically be called commonwealths, inasmuch as the rights of the people, to have a voice in the making of the laws by which they are governed, is recognized by the constitution. These are the points of resemblance which surely outweigh the points of dissimilarity. I hope that the great mass of the English-speaking races in this continent may work together in harmony by virtue of the common bond of brotherhood, rather than by one of parchment paper. I congratulate the members of the Bar upon the opportunity they have of becoming acquainted with so distinguished a gentleman as Mr. Evarts.

Mr. EVARTS, in reply, remarked that he could see no difference between the people on this side of the line and those on the other. It would be quite obvious to all here that lawyers were kind to each

other. Not until he had heard the sound of the eloquent speech of the head of the legal profession here had he heard of anything to be said, and he had neither expected a speech to be made nor that he would be called upon to reply to so many compliments. Mr. Blake had very kindly referred to some of the celebrated cases in which he had been engaged, some of which had determined issues such as heretofore had been referred to the arbitrament of the sword. He had been very fortunate that, in the great cases to which reference had been made, he had always been on the winning side ; and some of them were great examples of the power of law in our generation as compared with war. The settlement of the differences between Great Britain and the United States—which in early times would have been submitted to the arbitrament of arms—by the generosity of the British nation and the prudence of the American nation had been submitted to a civil tribunal, which had been left to determine between the two most powerful nations of the world—a very great triumph, indeed, for law. He thanked them for the kind wishes expressed towards himself.

The Vice-Regal party then, after seeing some of the courts, took their departure, leaving, as usual, a very pleasant impression in the minds of those whom they had honoured by their visit.

TRIAL BY JURY.

CL. OF AR. Gentlemen, are you agreed.

OMNES. Yes, my lord, we are all agreed now.

Trial by Jury has recently been the subject of much lively criticism, owing to the revelations regarding the verdict in the Mainwaring murder case in England. Mr. Cross, the Home Secretary, produced before the House of Commons a letter from the foreman of the jury, in which the writer stated that, after the jury had retired, it was ascertained that they were equally divided as to the verdict. Six were for manslaughter, and six for wilful murder, with a strong recommendation to mercy. They, therefore, balloted for a chairman, and agreed that the vote of the majority should carry the verdict, and that, if they were equally