

"Is it not lawful for me to do what I like with my own?" is a question that is very often asked by persons not accustomed to "exact thought." A man's wife is his own; therefore he may beat her. A man's house is his own; therefore he may make it a nuisance to his neighbors. A man's life is his own; therefore he may take it. These are some of the deductions which are made every day from the above maxim of popular law. And we find even well educated persons drawing conclusions hardly less valid than those given above. Thus it is the commonest thing for women who have jilted their adorers to endeavor to retain the household goods given them in contemplation of marriage. So, too, a man who has attached "fixtures" to the house he rents will often loudly bemoan his fate at not being allowed to remove them when he goes into fresh quarters. The law of the land is here altogether out of sympathy with the popular notion of what law ought to be. The tenant has paid for the fixtures; he considers them his own; and yet he finds it is not lawful for him to do what he will with them.

There arises from all these conflicts between popular and statute law a vague distrust of the latter, which is not without its good results, inasmuch as it discourages too frequent lawsuits. "The law," wrote Charles Macklin, "is a sort of hocus-pocus seance, that smiles in yer face while it picks yer pockers; and the glorious uncertainty of it is of mair use to the professors than the justice of it." The above view has probably more followers than that of Hooker, who declared that "of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage; the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power." Perhaps, however, Macklin and Hooper speak of different kinds of law.—*London Globe*.

---

## Correspondence.

---

### GRAND JURIES.

To the Editor of THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

In a late issue of your journal you invite suggestions for a substitute for grand juries, and I have put my ideas in the shape of a bill, which with a little more consideration might provide a substitute without much trouble, judging from the success attending the proceedings in the County Judges Criminal Courts, in which, as a County Crown Attorney, I have had over sixteen years experience. It will lie with the local houses to abolish grand juries as no longer needed; there is no necessity for a special officer, as exists in Scotland. My suggestion is as follows:

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, enacts as follows:

1. That sections 140, 173, 174, 175, 176, and 177 of cap. 174, R.S.C., are hereby repealed, and the following substituted: "140, No bill of indictment for