

CALENDAR FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY,
APRIL 5, 1873.

SUNDAY, March 30.—Fifth Sunday in Lent. Passion Sunday.	
MONDAY, " 31.—Charlotte Brontë, English novelist, born 1816; died 1855.	
TUESDAY, April 1.—All Fools Day. F. Denison Maurice died, 1872.	
WEDNESDAY, " 2.—Battle of Copenhagen, 1801. Richmond taken by Grant, 1865.	
THURSDAY, " 3.—Great Fire at Three Rivers, 1870.	
FRIDAY, " 4.—St. Ambrose, Sir J. Drummond, Administrator, 1815.	
SATURDAY, " 5.—Canada discovered, 1499.	

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS taken at 25 Beaver Hall, Montreal, by THOS. D. KIRK, for the week ending March 24, 1873.

	Mean Temp. 7 A. M. to 9 P. M.	Max. Temp. of day.	Min. Temp. previous night.	Mean Rel. Hum. 7 A. M. to 9 P. M.	Mean Height of Bar.	Gen. Direction of Wind.	State of Weather.
Mar. 17	30.2	37.5	22.5	80	30.01	N. W.	Clear.
18	26.5	31.5	20.0	85	29.85	Varia.	Cloudy.
19	31.4	36.5	24.5	84	29.79	W.	Snow.
20	32.5	39.0	23.0	86	29.78	N. E.	Clear.
21	31.0	35.2	22.5	82	29.59	N. E.	Snow.
22	30.2	35.0	23.7	81	29.42	W.	Snow.
24	15.0	26.2	4.5	75	30.06	W.	Snow.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The negligence of some subscribers to pay arrears and current accounts necessitates the adoption of severe measures. We have placed in our lawyer's hands a large number of overdue accounts. Those for the current year, if unpaid by 1st April, will share the same fate, and all unpaid names will on that date be struck off the list. We trust that our subscribers will not misunderstand our action in the matter. We have waited so long that in our case patience has ceased to be a virtue, and we are now compelled to use stringent measures.

CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS OFFICE,
Montreal, March 22nd, 1873.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Letters on business matters should be addressed to the Business Manager.

Communications intended for the Editor should be addressed to The Editor of the Canadian Illustrated News, and marked "Communication."

Rejected contributions are not returned unless stamps for return postage have been forwarded.

CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1873.

The question of juries is one that will agitate the public every time a great trial takes place. It has come up again for consideration in both England and the United States at the present moment, and bids fair to become the subject of legislation in the British Parliament. The idea of the Attorney-General, Sir John Duke Coleridge, is to reduce the number of jurors from twelve to seven, and even in that case to let the majority rule. There are other minor provisions in his Bill intended to affect the intellectual and moral standard of jurymen.

Experience has shown, we think, that the number twelve—an arbitrary one after all—is too great. It lengthens procedure, increases expense, gives unnecessary embarrassment, and in many peculiar ways thwarts the clear, direct ends of justice. In small communities, or sparse country districts, it amounts almost to a hardship or a nuisance to gather twelve intelligent men for judicial purposes. Of course, diversity of mind exists, and must exist, but in a good jury a certain homogeneity should be formed to arrive at a fair verdict, and in order to do this minds trained up to a certain normal elevation are required. These are not easily mustered in an emergency. Then there is no reason why the jury should consist of an even number. Nine would do just as well as twelve, and seven as well as nine. In deliberating on a verdict the object is unanimity of judgment. This is far more easily obtained with seven intelligent men than with twelve of the ordinary heterogeneous character. But this very unanimity is a knotty point. There is no philosophic reason why it should be exacted. Whoever has served on juries, as has happened to ourselves several times, knows how this unanimity is obtained, or how it is balked by the pig-headedness of a recalcitrant juror. There is such a thing as a mechanical unanimity, won by hunger, loneliness, and other appliances. In the jury-room, as elsewhere, the great number is ruled by the few. One or two members do all the talking and the reasoning, while the others are passive and give their verdict without troubling themselves to formulate an opinion. Now, instead of this unanimity, if the two-thirds majority rule were introduced in juries we should be disposed to regard it as an improvement. At all events, we should like the amendment to have a fair trial. But there is a *prima facie* objection even to that. In certain cases it would be found as difficult to get a two-thirds majority as to get unanimity, wrong-headed men being just as able to prevent the one as the other. Hence some have proposed the rule of mere plurality. For instance, in a jury of seven, if three are on one side and three

on the other, the seventh may have the casting vote and decide the verdict. This looks easy, expeditious and equitable, but in capital cases it would go hard to have an irrevocable doom sealed by the turn of one vote, the word of one mouth, the word of one feeble, fallible understanding.

We know not how far the action of the British Parliament on this question will affect public opinion here. We shall probably let the mother country take the full initiative before moving in the matter. But there is one point on which the popular conscience should be aroused—and that is the packing of juries. That the abuse exists is certain; that it produces unfortunate results is likewise beyond question. The only remedy for it is raising the standard of the Grand Jury and exacting from them revised lists for the petit juries. In the matter of justice, there can never be too much prudence, zeal and intelligence.

The fire at St. James Hotel has not yet ceased to be the main topic of public interest. A great deal of information has been elicited from writers in the daily press, while the Coroner's inquest over the bodies of Hyatt, Hilditch and Mary O'Connor, victims of that conflagration, has laid large measure of blame upon responsible shoulders. Indeed, the question of responsibility has awakened the susceptibilities of several of our citizens, seeing that the burden has been distributed on the shoulders of the Fire Brigade, the Fire Committee, the proprietor and the manager of the hotel. Whatever the remissness of the past may have been, it is a source of gratification to find that the authorities are determined to make ample provisions for the future. Two steam fire-engines will be purchased. Mr. Loranger, Chairman of the Fire Committee, wants even three—one for the upper portion of the city; another for the Quebec Suburbs; and a third for the commercial centre of the city, St. Paul Street. Fire Escapes will also be provided, along with ladders. Besides these outside appliances, every public building should be furnished with abundant and easy means of escape from the inside, for, let it be well understood that Hilditch came to his end before any succor from the exterior could possibly have reached him. If he had had a ladder in the hotel, he might have been saved.

We are not of those who would seek to make scape-goats of public servants in a great calamity. We believe that the Fire Brigade performed their duty with heroism and intelligence. Indeed, as Councillor Stephens well observed at the City Council on Monday night, any one viewing the comparatively trifling damage to that large building can have some conception of the great work which the firemen did on the occasion. But if the Brigade is comparatively blameless, the Fire Committees of former years must be charged with ignorance and supineness. No man should serve on the Fire Committee who knows nothing about fires or is unwilling to give all his attention to the demands of his post. As to the Finance Committee, it has no right to sit in judgment on the demands of the Fire Committee, and pare down every appropriation demanded by just one half. It did this, at its last meeting, and must answer therefor to the people. The Fire Committee asked for two steam fire engines; the Finance Committee accorded only one. The Fire Committee asked for several fire-escapes; the Finance Committee granted only one. The Fire Committee asked for four thousand feet of hose; the Finance Committee allowed only two thousand. This looks very much like tom-foolery. Money is and can be no object when there is question of the lives and property of the city. The Fire Committee makes these demands, not for the pleasure of spending money, but because they think the articles are imperatively demanded, and the gentlemen composing that important Committee are better able to judge of the wants of the city than the gentlemen of the Finance Committee. We trust this contest between the two Committees will be thoroughly sifted.

THE MAGAZINES.

The reader of Thackeray, on glancing over the table of contents of the current number of *Lippincott's Magazine*, will at once turn to a paper on "Grey Friars," by an old Cistercian, in which the writer pleasantly discourses of the old buildings lying in the heart of London, which are consecrated by the shade of Col. Newcome. We are given, at such length as a magazine article will allow, a history of the old charter-house—now, alas, no more as it was in Thackeray's day, for the school has been moved to Godalming—with an account of the "institutions" of the establishment, many of which date as far back as the days of the founder, Thomas Sutton. Dr. Wood contributes a very valuable paper on "Medical Expert Evidence," in which he comments severely upon the general ignorance of toxicology and medical jurisprudence prevalent among members of the faculty in the United States, and upon the careless manner in which analyses are usually conducted in cases of supposed poisoning. He cites as instances where this carelessness was more particularly glaring, the Wharton-Ketchum and Wharton-Van Ness cases, in both of which he shows the evidence for the prosecution to have been miserably weak. He suggests that a mixed commission of lawyers and eminent medical jurists could hardly fail to devise some practical remedy for the existing state of things, and cites as worthy of example the system in use in Prussia, which has resulted in giving that country the best body of medical experts in the world. Under the title of "The Mystery of Massabielle," is given, in narrative form, the history of the miraculous shrine at Lourdes. Mr. Black's "Princess of Thule," is continued, and forms one of the greatest attractions of this magazine. Rebecca Harding Davis

commences a new serial, with the title "Berrytown," which promises well. With the exception of Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen's "Glaciers of Paradise," and the second paper on "The Roumi in Kabylia," there is little else worthy of special remark. In the latter paper the writer makes a statement which we cannot pass over in silence. "France," he says, "imitates England's sanguinary policy in her treatment of rebellious and semi-civilized tribes." Without altogether denying the truth of the statement, we must confess it is intensely rich, coming as it does from a citizen of the Great Republic, whose fostering care of her own "rebellious and semi-civilized tribes" has passed into a proverb.

The feature of *Scribner's* this month is Saxo Holm's story, "The Elder's Wife," a sequel to "Draxy Miller's Dowry," a tender, touchingly beautiful tale, which stands at the head of all the current literature of its kind which has appeared during the past twelve months. By the side of it, such stuff as "Martin Len's Story," and "The Automaton Ear," make but a shabby appearance. The number opens with an illustrated paper entitled "Among the Greenbacks," in which the writer gives a very graphic account of the workings of the U. S. Currency Department. This is followed by a description—also illustrated—of Moscow and Southern Russia, by Edna Dean Proctor, with whose writings the readers of *Scribner's* are already familiar. "An Emperor's Vacation at Vichy," will be read with interest by all—be they admirers or not of the mysterious man of Selan. Two other illustrated articles, both possessing great interest for the general reader, are that on Clara Louise Kellogg, and that on "An Ancient American Civilization," with pictures of Peruvian antiquities. "Arthur Bonnicastle" is continued, and Prof. Atwater contributes an able paper on "Needed Modifications of our Currency and Banking System." George MacDonald has in this issue another of Novalis' Spiritual Songs.

BOOKS, &c., RECEIVED.

Hallam's Constitutional History of England. Students Series. New York: Harper & Bros. Montreal: Dawson Bros. Turning Points in Life. By the Rev. Frederick Arnold. New York: Harper & Bros. Montreal: Dawson Bros.

Notes and Queries.

All Communications intended for this Column must be addressed to the Editor, and endorsed "Notes and Queries."

19. PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.—Can any of your readers give me any information regarding the origin and rise of the sect known as Plymouth Brethren?

20. ORIGIN.—What countryman is the person whose father was French, his mother German, and who was born on the present site of Brownsville, while that place lay in the disputed territory between the United States and Mexico?

21. HARE-LIP.—Persons having a split and puckered upper lip are said to be hare-lipped. They say similarly in French *bec de lièvre*. As there is only the slightest resemblance between this deformity and the labial formation of the hare, may not the fancy be traced back to some of the old legends of antiquity, just as the absurd astronomical signs which are preserved to this day? I wonder if "hare-lipped" could not be found in Hippocrates or Galen?

18. NOT LOST BUT GONE BEFORE.—This saying originated with St. Cyprian, who says: "Scire non eos amitti, sed pre-mitti." I know that they are not lost but sent before.

OUR LADY.—This manner of addressing the mother of the Saviour is derived clearly from the ages of chivalry. In the earlier Latin fathers *Domina* is said not to be found; neither does it occur among the Greeks, whose epithets were always coupled with the idea of virginity a divine maternity. Curiously enough we say in English *Our Lady*, and the French *Notre Dame*, while the Italians say *Madonna*; or, *My Lady*.

SIZE OF ANCIENT AND MODERN MEN.—In reply to the letter on this subject which we copied last week from *Land and Water*, another correspondent writes: "Sir,—Your correspondent, 'Lilliput' is doubtless right in the main in his assertion that 'the men of the earliest times were smaller in limb and shorter in stature than the men of the present day.' But let me remind him that increase of physical strength does not necessarily accompany increase of stature, 5 feet 8 inches being the height most favourable to the full development of muscular power. Perhaps he will, however, permit me to supplement his arguments by calling attention to the superior diet of men of our own day, as compared with that which prevailed in former times; and better feeding of necessity brings with it better blood, brains, and muscular fibre. Believing, as I do, in the overwhelming importance of nerve-current, and having always found that, other things being equal, the strong man with cultured brains will beat the man with equal strength but less culture in an athletic struggle, I cannot but hold the general advance of education in modern days to have given this generation physically an immense advantage over any of those which preceded them. Besides all this, we enjoy better ventilated houses and improved sanitary arrangements. On the other hand, it cannot but be admitted that the advance of medical science has saved many weakly constitutions from early death, and so enabled them to become parents; in this respect, therefore, the doctors have probably done harm to the general physical excellence of their contemporaries. 'Lilliput' dwells upon the inferences to be drawn from the ancient armour, of which specimens have been preserved to us. No doubt this is important, but it is not quite true that there were no 'medieval giants.' Setting aside the ponderous helmets of the Knights of Malta, which are on view in the cathedral in that island, but which in all probability never sheltered a human head, we must still recall to mind the full suit of armour preserved in the Louvre, and which belonged to Francis I. of France. I should be afraid, speaking only from recollection, to say what the stature of the wearer of that armour must have been; but, at any rate, he was a man of truly gigantic proportions."