

LAW SOCIETY, MICHAELMAS TERM—THE JURY QUESTION.

Ordered that it be forthwith considered. The report was adopted.

Mr. Maclellan moved that Mr. Waddell be required to pay the sum of \$200, in addition to the usual fee, as required by the rules under which he was examined, and that he be thereupon called.

Mr. Robertson moved that Mr. Waddell be called on payment of \$150, the usual fees in ordinary cases.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. Maclellan's motion was carried.

Mr. Leith moved second reading of rule as to Examiners and Examinations.—Carried.

Mr. Leith moved third reading of same rule.—Carried.

Mr. Leith moved that the usual advertisement, under the direction of the Legal Education Committee, be published, intimating that Convocation will, on the 30th December, appoint four Examiners, pursuant to the above rule, and that notice be given to each Benchers of such meeting.—Carried.

The debate on the first reading of Mr. Crooks' proposed rule was resumed.

Mr. Crooks proposed to further amend the rule by inserting the words "Presented for call and admission respectively for the final examination, may, upon payment of the fees required in ordinary cases," immediately after the words "Passed an examination before this Society in the subjects."

Mr. Crooks moved the adjournment of the debate till the next meeting.

Mr. Crooks gave notice that he would, at the next meeting, move for the authority of Convocation for the institution of such legislation as may be necessary to give Convocation further power to deal with the subjects referred to in the rule.

Mr. Irving moved his resolution as to Attorneys' certificates, which was carried.

Mr. Irving also moved that a copy of the roll be printed, for the purpose of carrying out the above resolution.—Carried.

Mr. Waddell was called to the Bar.

Convocation rose.

SELECTIONS.

THE JURY QUESTION.

The jury system has suffered in public estimation from excessive adulation on the one hand, and excessive denunciation on the other. Like every other social system, it is probably susceptible of improvement; at all events, it demands modification to suit the changed circumstances of society. *First*: It is our firm belief that the jury is invaluable as a political system, in educating the citizen to feel a personal responsibility for government, in dividing the responsibility for legal decisions, and in standing between the individual and great monopolies, such as banks, and railway and insurance companies. *Second*: The system as it stands has not worked ill. Wrong verdicts and disagreements are exceptional. The public always hear of disagreements and wrong verdicts, while little is said of the vast majority of just verdicts. The ablest judges in this country have assured us that they have rarely known an absolutely unjust verdict. *Third*: Disagreements and wrong verdicts are very frequently the fault of the judge rather than the jury. Disagreements are often produced by excessive refinements and balancings in the charge, and wrong verdicts sometimes are the result of the judges usurpation of the advocate's office. *Fourth*: Except in large cities the intelligence and honesty of jurors is much underrated by the public. *Fifth*: We can conceive nothing more ill-advised than an unchanging bench of judges to decide all questions of fact arising in a community. Such centralisation of power is certainly extremely inconsistent with republican institutions. If two suitors desire to have their differences decided by one man, they have the privilege, but the right of either to demand a jury is inestimable. *Sixth*: The single change we would make in the system is to allow nine to pronounce a verdict in all cases but capital cases and those punishable with imprisonment for life; in the latter, unanimous verdicts should be required. But with all its imperfections, we should as little think of pronouncing the system a "nuisance" as