

at once to see into the "outs and ins" of the question; instead of being, as I have elsewhere seen, troubled for half a day to find out what were the circumstances surrounding the alleged crime. If a man refused to make any statement before the Court, it was looked upon as the action of a criminal who feared to speak lest he should point to his own guilt. Of course, I was prejudiced in favor of the British *dictum*, that every man is to be considered innocent, till he "is proved guilty." But the Vetulian jurists contended that their axiom was better, that "The law is neither to presume a man innocent nor guilty; but accepts the facts as they come out in evidence." The jury had almost complete control of the sentence. Murder was either in first or second degree. The first involved capital punishment; the second did not. If the verdict was unanimous, the full penalty, whatever it was, was inflicted. If two-thirds of a jury were for conviction, a two-third penalty succeeded. If a jury stood eight to seven, the case was left in the hands of the judge and the two magistrates who acted as associate judges.

The almost world-wide principle, that "a man has a right to be tried by his equals," was very strictly carried out here. A dweller in the country could not be tried by a city judge; nor a business man be compelled to plead before a jury of farmers. There were in all, six classes of juries recognized by the law. I exclaimed against the intolerable expense attending so many jurymen, but I was told that they received no allowances whatever; and that there was so little crime and quarrelling in the country, there was not much to do. Seldom more than two kinds of jurymen were summoned; thirty of each: and they considered it a kind of "holiday" to attend Court for two or three days.

At one time hoarding of money had become a great public grievance, and so it was abated. For once I had the satisfaction of telling the public men of Vetulia, that they had followed British practice, to remedy an evil when it became a grievance—overlooking it as long as it was merely an anomaly. They admitted the fact, but would not admit the principle.

So many stocking-legs full of gold and silver had been hidden away, that business became seriously affected. Midnight robberies were frequent; and no money was in circulation but paper. "Shinplasters" and "Greenbacks" were as plentiful as in the United States during the Civil War, and about as many counterfeits on the former euphoniously-named tokens for money, as in the great Republic. The crisis was precipitated when one old government official, whose duty it was to sign these issues of paper, "went on strike." He said he had signed his name eight thousand times

a day, for six days in the week, and fifty-two weeks in the year; and thus put through his hands, two millions and a half (only allowing himself half a day for "holiday") in the year. That he was worn out and could do it no longer. That if he invented a *die*, ever so cunningly fashioned, to *stamp* his name, the rogues would be sure to imitate it. And that if the Premier would have paper-money any more, "he must just dress the rag-baby himself!"

As it was known the Mint was active, and there must be an immense amount of coin in the country somewhere, a "principle" was passed against hoarding; containing the reasons on which it was condemned: and a specific Act was levelled against the *stocking-legs*. A few confiscations were made, and sundry old misers banished "to the Island." A few others were "defeoffed" some years sooner than they expected, and the evil was in time abated. A radical-minded Judge, bent on carrying out the *principle* against hoarding to its legitimate conclusions, ordered the confiscation of the lands of a nobleman. The country was dreadfully excited. No such thing had been heard of for many generations; indeed, since the country had enjoyed a settled government. The case was appealed to Parliament, and debated for a whole session. But the "principle" that "hoarding was against public policy," could not be set aside by any argument. The dictum was a sound one, and this man was guilty of "hoarding." It was proved that this person bought up all the land that was offered for sale in his part of the country, irrespective of price. That he never sold any of his property. That he already possessed the lands of thirty-five former proprietors. That in every essential respect he was guilty of hoarding up land, just as others had been guilty of hoarding up specie. And that it was against public policy that anyone should absolutely withdraw from circulation and from open market, either great amounts of money or of land, and make no use of them, but to keep them. To the answer that "the lands were rented out, and so were made use of," it was rejoined, "that they were acquired in *fee simple*," only by "forestalling the market," which was illegal. That if these men were to send his agents into all the towns around, to buy up at any price necessary to secure it, all the bread offered for sale in these towns, in the same way as he sends them out to secure land, all men would see at once where the offence lay; and that a man who had money to buy land, ought to find a possibility of doing so. But now they were prevented from obtaining land, just as they would be prevented from obtaining bread."

In the end, the sentence was confirmed in respect of all the lands he had acquired in his own lifetime. And a sweeping "land law" was passed. A former "principle" that "no *dead man* has power!" had already made an end of entail, which