

until they do not care to stem the current. Unlike many other evils it has no redeeming feature whatever; strip it of its gloss and it becomes a lie; rob it of its beauty and color and it degenerates into a canker; purge it of all three and nothing remains except a ghastly blank. How shall we meet it? Shall we put no trust in it and say, O well, its only a yarn; no harm to read it anyway. Too dangerous; it will not stop at that. Shall we then pass it over as not worth reading, again too careless; it requires a strong effort and considerable will power to do so. Neither plan works. Well we will "discourage" it. What an utterly contemptible phrase this "discourage" a thing has dwindled to; it implies half-heartedness, dish water warmth, hesitation, prevarication, foolishness, and usually a considerable portion of that which might be called rather-than-not-do-it-ness. It is like discouraging drinking by helping a drunken companion home after you have led him to the ale house; like suppressing card playing by suggesting dice; like starving a man by feeding him on beefsteak. Don't for mercy sake commence by this abominable "discouraging" it. What shall we do then, why cut it out? Crush it; annihilate body, breeches, and soul; stop your sensational paper; shut down on your sentimental, only another word for sensational magazine; burn your sensational novel. Perish the trio. That will settle, and that only.

### OUR LECTURE COURSE.

THE last of our regular course of lectures was delivered in College Hall on the evening of May 20th, by Mr. A. S. White, M.P.P., on the subject of, "Trial by Jury." The lecture was listened to with close attention by all present, but was of special interest to the Seniors, whose studies in constitutional history are in line with the Hon. gentleman's subject.

The lecturer fully understood how to mingle the dry abstractions of the law with amusing and illustrating anecdotes in such a way as to excite the risibilities and fix the attention of a mixed audience.

Below we give a few of the many fine passages in which the lecture abounded.

"Trial by jury has been eulogized as the great bulwark of our liberty; as the guardian of justice, as our undoubted birthright and our best inheritance. . . . "It has grown with and as part of that wonderful structure which has been reared and elaborated by the wisdom of successive generations of our forefathers—that British constitution we all venerate and love, and of which it has even been said to be the very corner stone." The lecturer then remarked that reform based the strength of an institution upon its usefulness, not upon its age. "The inquiry to-day is not how long this law or that custom has existed, but how much longer it ought to exist. . . .

Circumstanced thus, it is not then to be wondered at that Trial by Jury has not wholly escaped attack. . . . Already it has come to pass that in many cases when Trial by Jury was once considered essential to justice, it is now either wholly dispensed with, or allowed only at the special request of the parties to the suit. Yet, since under our law, Trial by Jury is still the most generally adopted, and indeed, essential mode of trial, —since it has come to us as the slow growth of centuries, expanding with, and as part of that wondrous system of the common law which has its root and growth in those eternal principles of right and justice implanted in the breasts of all men; since in that long struggle of our forefathers for the blessings of self government, when the principle of the divine right of the people to govern themselves was struggling with the once revered and accepted doctrine of the divine right of rulers to govern the people; trial by Jury was then a shield and buckler to the people. . . . Since to-day we hold our property, our liberty and our lives subject to the decision of its arbitrament, it behooves us to enquire how far we should reverently guard this institution, how far we can suffer it to be altered or have its powers lessened without danger to our liberties."

The lecturer then proceeded to trace the development and growth of the jury as it exists to-day, including in his sketch a full account of its history from the first appearance of the Jury in the old Hundred Court to its present form and place, and clearly showed how the conservative character of English common law was the chief hindrance to the rapid and steady growth of our well formed jury.

The hon. gentleman noted that, "of all those great results which followed the development of the Jury to its present form, the most important are found in the history of the English Bar. . . . To the character of the English Bar and the position it attained, Trial by Jury owes much, if not most, of its past success." In connection with the history of the English bar the lecturer mentioned the names of Clarendon, Heale, Somers Hardwicke, Mansfield Erskine, Stowell and Story, and remarked that,—"These names are indeed a rich inheritance to the people. It needs no marble to perpetuate their memory. Their monuments are found in the enduring structure of that expanding law into which they built their words and thoughts and very lives, so that being dead they yet speak to us in their judgments which we to-day hold in reverence and obey." After pointing out the close relation and gradual entanglement of the history of the English bar with that of the Trial by Jury, Mr. White said: "If we would seek among the achievements of Trial by Jury for facts which justify the eulogiums which have been placed upon it, we have indeed not far to go. There is no liberty we enjoy, no safeguard we more highly prize and wisely prize as at once a protection to our rights as citizens and to the security of government, than that freedom known as the liberty