

first three names, Judge Taschereau, one of the ablest lawyers in Canada, and a man who, although of French origin, has produced the very ablest book on criminal law now in use—one that is a *vade mecum* in every court in Canada—is the first of those who are in favor of abolition. The next is Mr. Justice Gwynne, also a very able criminal lawyer, one who was engaged for many years as Crown counsel, and afterwards sat for years on the bench of the Superior Court of Ontario, and now occupies a place in the Supreme Court of the Dominion. Then, there is Chancellor Boyd, whom we in Upper Canada all know to be a most eminent jurist. While on the other side, taking the first three in the order that I received the list, I find that Attorney-General Mcwat, Chief Justice Hagarty, and Sir Thomas Galt, all able men, hold an opposite opinion, so far as I can make out. Perhaps I was not so much surprised with regard to one or two of the gentlemen named, but I certainly felt surprised when I saw the name of Hon. Mr. Mowat, Attorney-General of Ontario, opposed to this change; for he has been for many years (and I have admired his conduct in taking the course he did) a great law-reformer, and the obstacles in the way of justice which 'the wisdom of our ancestors' had placed in his way—all these technical absurdities, he bore down and toppled over without the slightest hesitation. He was most energetic in the way of reform—in fact, he was almost like a hippopotamus rushing through a cane-brake in his desire to make direct and plain the path of ready justice. When I see his views and the arguments he uses, I will perhaps be able to appreciate the reasons why he occupies the position that he does. At present all I can say is, I am somewhat surprised that so able a man and so valuable a man, as a law reformer, has taken the view that he appears, on this occasion, to have taken. What I ask is, that these papers be produced, and the reason I ask it is this: It is a very important question. It very seriously touches the administration of justice, and here we find one hundred men competent to form an opinion on the subject—men exercised in the office of justice, forming different opinions, some fifty on one side and some thirty-nine on the other, while some are doubtful. I have not gone into an analysis by provinces, but I find that in most of the provinces the judges are pretty equally divided, while in my own province the majority of the judges who have spoken on the subject is slightly in favor of abolishing the system. Now, while I admit, and, I think, would claim, that the greatest weight should be attached to their opinions, I must admit also that they are not infallible, and with the proper material before them intelligent laymen can as well dispose of such matters as perhaps the most astute lawyer. The condition being this, that a large number are for and a large number against, the majority, however, being in favor of the abolition of the grand jury, the material is there for every one capable of reasoning to form a correct conclusion on the subject. I do not intend to ask, nor do I expect, immediate action. I have the fullest confidence in the men who control public affairs, and I have no doubt that at the proper time they will take action. I do not propose to follow up this motion with any action this session, nor perhaps later, if I should be convinced that the reasoning is against me, but what I want is this: that that valuable contribution to the discussion should be within reach of every man, layman as