

the Superior Courts, and the jury tribunal: the suggestions also are open to objections, but we have not space at this time to enter into the discussion, and would in any case prefer eliciting the well considered opinion of others in the first instance. We have however come to the deliberate conclusion that Mr. Baldwin's jury scheme, fair in theory in its practical application, has proved an entire failure; that the first wheels are defective, and operate consequently to destroy the value of the whole machine; and moreover that it was modelled on a principle which in its provisions it essentially ignores. The principle was *distrust!* distrust in an individual officer, one permanent and responsible, deliberately chosen by the Crown. The palpable repudiation of this principle was the delegation to an everchanging body of totally irresponsible persons—persons out of the reach of public opinion and independent of the Crown—of a duty requiring not only honesty and care, but trained intelligence for its right discharge.

Herein we believe is the great fundamental error which has given rise to many existing evils, and unless some cure be applied even what is good and excellent in the jury system will be wasted by degrees under the pressure of internal malady.

#### THE NON-POLITICAL CHARACTER OF LEGAL PERIODICALS.

The only safe rule for the Conductors of a Legal Periodical is—Editorially, no politics. Following the course of the Law publications at home, *The Law Journal* was commenced on that basis, and it has been uniformly preserved. In the *Law Times* of the 11th April last, the position of law journal is clearly put thus: As lawyers we have no politics, as lawyers our business is only to watch the law while it is being made, with design to make it as perfect as possible, and then to interpret it, after it is made. The *Law Times* is of no party; it knows no party, and supports none; cares not what ministers are out or in; asks not whence any measure comes—regards only the measure itself—and endeavors, with what success its readers must say, to look at it and treat it from the legal point of view, and that only.

One of the admirable results of legal education is, that it trains men to the discussion of all kinds of topics upon their own merits without importing their own passions into the conflict. Hence it is that the legal mind can more readily arrive at truth than others who cannot so readily pass, as it were, out of themselves, and can look at things only from their own point of view. As usual when you cannot share a man's notions and prejudices, he calls you insincere,

and protests that you have no opinion at all. In this he is wrong. You can see more clearly than he can; you look at both sides of the question when he looks but at one, and consequently yours will be the sounder judgment.

#### BOOK NOTICE.

THE CANADA EDUCATIONAL DIRECTORY AND CALENDAR FOR 1857-8: Containing an Account of the Schools, Colleges, and Universities—the Professions—Scientific and Literary Institutions—Decisions of the Courts on School Questions, &c. Edited by THOMAS HODGINS, B. A. Univ. Col., Toronto. Publishers—Macleay & Co., Toronto.

This is a useful publication, and one in which a mass of information, not easily attainable, is aptly included. The List of Local Superintendents of Common Schools throughout the Upper Province will be most useful to County and Municipal Township Officials, as well as the Decisions of the Superior Courts on School Questions. As a hand-book of the educational institutions of the country, it will be interesting to the general reader. The Editor has performed his task with efficiency, and the work is altogether creditably got up. Its very low price (1s. 3d. cy.) should ensure a large circulation. If it were only for the value of the Decisions collected at the end of it, School Trustees should possess themselves of the Manual.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

BEAMSVILLE P.O., May 25, 1857.

To the Editors of the U. C. Law Journal:

SIRS,—Has a man a right to vote in more than one School Section? If he holds freehold in three different sections in one Township, can he vote and take part in each section at the same time?

In regard to Union Schools, has the Council full power to alter the boundaries of the section, so far as the Township is concerned, without any reference to the Reeve and Superintendent of the adjoining Township?

An early answer to the above questions will much oblige

Your obedient servant,  
JOHN S. WALKER,  
Reeve of Township of Clinton.

[Query 1.—Every freeholder or householder has a right to vote in a School Section, wherein he has the necessary qualification. The declaration required on challenge at a School Election is, that declarant is a freeholder or householder in such section. Residence is not mentioned in any part of the Act as a requisite of a voter.

Query 2.—The Township Council has no such power: 13 and 14 Vic., cap. 48, sec. 18, subsec. 4, states explicitly that Union School Sections may be formed and altered by the Reeves and Local Superintendent, out of parts of which such sections are proposed to be formed at a meeting appointed for that purpose by any two of such Town Reeves.

In *Re Ley and the Municipality of Clarke*, 13 Q.B.R. 433, the Chief Justice in his judgment made the following observations: "It is further objected that the Municipal Council had not the power of altering the boundaries of a Union School Section.