Between the sort of vessel built at Dorchester, N.B., or at Maitland, N.S., averaging 870 and 890 tons, and those of Digby and Shelburne, which by the list are not over 96 tons average, there is a great difference. The latter are coasters or fishing vessels, the former are for the foreign trade, or for timber and grain carriage. So while the craft with odd names owned in Arichat and Baddeck, are 50 to 60 tonners for fishing on the Banks, and the trim craft which hail from Port Hawkesbury, on the Strait of Canso, do not exceed 47 tons, the average of Pictou sail craft rises to 345, barques and ships being added to schooners. Halifax, with almost 1,000 ships and steamers upon her list, only averages 95 tons to each craft, steamers excluded ; this is because so many are small mackerel schooners and other fishing craft. Yarmouth, on the other hand, shows 365 tons to each vessel, and Windsor, 526 tons.

The port in New Brunswick which ranks next to St. John with her towering record of 650 sailers, is St. Andrews, with 184 sailing vessels. But while the number of St. John's vessels is only three and a half times that of her neighbor, their tonnage is fifteen times that of St. Andrew's, whose craft are of 97 tons average, used for fishing and for coasting about the mouth of the Bay of Fundy. Charlottetown's 288 steam and sail vessels comprise the whole shipping of Prince Edward Island, and the mean tonnage of her sailing craft is 152 tons. The average P.E.I. schooner is of 50 tons ; brigs and brigantines, 240 ; barques and barkentines about 560.

It would be difficult to distinguish between the ocean-going tonnage of the Province of Quebec and that portion of the list which plies upon the lakes and rivers. But we may remark, without being tedious, that out of 1,537 craft which are not steamers, 615, or nearly forty per cent. registered in Quebec and Montreal as barges, used upon the Ottawa or the St. Lawrence and the canals, and varying in capacity from 40 to 300 tons. There are 162 barges registered at Ontario ports, most of them employed between Kingston or Ottawa and Montreal. The ports to which these are allotted are as follow: Ottawa, 74 ; Kingston, 46 ; St. Catharines, 16 ; Wallaceburg, 8 ; Dunville, Napanee Chatham, 2 each ; Morrisburg, Brockville, Picton, Toronto, Hamilton and Goderich, 1 each. Winnipeg, Manitoba, possesses six, and we may soon expect to hear of that city adding to her list of these as well as of other steam and sail craft, which now numbers 21, of which 15 are steamers. By far the larger number of barges hail from the Quebec cities : Montreal claims 455 of them, and Quebec 160. British Columbia, out out of a tonnage of 5,049 tons, has thirty steamers, side-wheel, stern wheel and screw. She has 33 sloops and schooners, which with the schooners are all registered at the port of Victoria.

We learn from the *Statesman's Year Book* that the tonnage of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, *i.e.*, the shipping of the British Islands apart from that of their colonial possessions, includes 20,029 vessels, carrying 193,548 men and measuring 6,298,330 tons. These are the official figures of 1880.

THE JURY SYSTEM.

Lord Brougham declared, fifty years ago, that the man was chargeable with no exaggeration who once said that "all we see about us, King, Lords, and Commons, the whole machinery of the State, all the apparatus of the system (of law) and its varied workings, end in simply bringing twelve good men into a box. The English jury system is one of the national institutions, preserved in one shape or other since the earliest dawn of civilization. Our historians point with pride to the trial of an accused by his peers, as existing in the reign of Alfred the Great. The credit for its first establishment is accorded to that much praised king by some, while others believe he only made more perfect that which had a still earlier origin. Be that as it may, trial by jury, as it existed in England before the Roman conquest, differed in many respects from that of to-day. For instance, in the old Saxon times, those best acquainted with the parties to a dispute and most fully cognizant of the circumstances out of which it arose, were decreed the fittest to sit in judgment upon it ; while now, it is a good objection to a proffered juror that he has a personal knowledge of the suitors or of the matters to be adjudicated upon. In many other respects the institution has changed with the genius of succeeding ages. Still, it is essentially the same right that is now accorded litigants as they enjoyed a thousand years ago. The cardinal principle is the same, viz. : that no one shall, without his own consent, be condemned until after judgment upon his case has been passed by impartial persons, chosen from his own rank in life. Modern legislation on the subject though it has limited and restricted this principle in many ways, has not destroyed it.

To understand, even superficially, modern trial by jury, it is essential to bear in mind the line which the law draws so definitely between criminal and civil actions. In the former class of cases, the consequences to the accused are serious. His reputation—his liberty—his life may depend upon the result. Added to this the prisoner usually is comparatively without means or influence, while he finds arrayed against him the strength of the whole community represented by the crown. On these accounts our law has been wisely jealous of securing to all alleged criminals a fair trial, how weak or unfortunate soever they are. Hence the rule that no one shall, without his own consent, be convicted of any offence except by the verdict of a jury, still holds good in reference to all criminal charges except those of the most trifling nature. The provisions made for trial without a jury of important criminal cases all require, as a pre-requisite, the consent of the accused. They are intended not to take away the right to a jury trial, but to facilitate the speedy trial of cases in which that right is willingly waived. In some respects, modern legislation has increased rather than diminished the safeguards placed by this judicial institution about persons accused of crimes. An instance of this is the dual jury system which exists in our criminal courts. A subject about to be put upon his trial has the right to have his case brought first of all before a secret and irresponsible body known as the Grand Jury, whose duty it is to consider the evidence against him, and decide whether or not there is a *prima facie* case against him. When the grand jury has decided that such evidence is sufficient to put him on his trial, he may then insist upon all the evidence for and against him being submitted to the petit jury, whose verdict of guilt or innocence is conclusive, so far at least as the Crown is concerned.

To the grand jury part of the system strong objections have from time to time been heard in different quarters. This feeling of opposition is, in this Province, yearly gathering strength, though its growth cannot be said to be rapid. The main objection made is to the great public expense involved ; and it is strongly urged that all the purposes served by such a body might be as effectually and less expensively performed by skilled public officers. The object of the grand jury is to prevent persons, against whom there is really no substantial evidence, being put to the disgrace and annoyance of public trial upon ill-founded charges of criminal conduct. Whether this object may be as well secured at less expense to the public in some other way, is the question between the assailers and defenders of this particular feature of the administration of justice. Against the petit jury in criminal cases no voice is raised. The public, the judges, suitors, prisoners, and the jurors themselves, all concur in regarding it as an absolutely necessary part of the judicial system, and it is as firmly established as anything in this iconoclastic age can be.