

his attention, this criticism of his action on that occasion is offered with much diffidence. It is difficult, however, to see what other effect his treatment of the facts as then elicited could have than to induce the panel to give a sinister complexion to the matters canvassed.

While exhorting them, more than once, to exercise their own judgment, his comments on the evidence likely to come before them would, it is submitted, tend to influence that judgment; and any prejudicial utterances would scarcely be neutralized by his admonitions. In *Reg. v. Coleman*, 30 O.R. 93, damage from the improper calling of the attention of a jury to the neglect by a prisoner to testify on his own behalf was held not to have been rectified by a subsequent mention of the error.

Ad quæstionem facti respondent juratores; ad quæstionem juris respondent judices is maintained by Sir Michael Dalton, in his elaborate work on Justices of the Peace, to be as true with regard to the grand, as the petit jury.

J. B. MACKENZIE.

Correspondence.

TORONTO, March 11, 1904.

To the Editor CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

DEAR SIR,—It should be unnecessary to call attention to the ridiculously inadequate telephone accommodation at Osgoode Hall. A little money spent in making this more complete would be a great boon to the members of the profession who have to do business there. There should be a switch board to connect with the principal departments as is usual in all up-to-date business establishments. Surely this convenience is not still too modern to commend itself to the highly respectable but somewhat conservative element that has charge of such matters in that venerable institution.

Yours truly,

SOLICITOR.