stead of amending the false foundation, we cobble the superstructure, and enforce a nominal uniformity of twelve, when common sense would dictate, either the abolition of unanimity, or the reduction of the jury to such a number as would make real unanimity more easy of attainment.

We have been surprised to see a Canadian judge reviving the obsolete endeavor to compel a pretended unanimity in a jury by a species of moral torture. Some persons were indicted at Montreal for an attempt to kidnap one Mr. Sanders. The trial was very protracted, and on the 20th October the jury retired to consider their verdict. It was soon apparent to themselves that they were not likely to agree, and they sent to the Judge to say so, and held frequent conferences with him, hoping that he might convince the doubting. The day passed, the night came, and again morning; but no unanimity. The Judge then directed that the jury should be treated with food and fire. Day after day passed, and still no verdict. At length, on the 30th October, after being locked up ten days and nights, and all this moral torture failing to force them to violate their oaths and give a verdict contrary to their convictions, they were discharged, and the prisoners were remanded for another trial at the next sessions.

It would be impossible to find a stronger proof than this of the defects of the jury system as at present practised. It must be assumed that the difference of opinion was conscientious. Say that seven were for a conviction and five for an acquittal, or whatever might have been the actual proportions. Let us see what it was that the Judge sought to effect by torturing them. That might produce unanimity of verdict, but not unanimity of opinion. No man is master of his convictions. What the Judge wanted to effect by the punishment he inflicted was, that some of them should give a verdict contrary to their convictions, which means, that they should commit perjury. But say that the difference was not real, that it was obstinacy or partiality, and not conscience; can it be just to punish the just men of the twelve equally with the unjust? Look at the question in any light, there are overwhelming arguments against the requisition of unanimity of juries in criminal cases, save upon the one principle, that no man should be convicted of crime unless the evidence suffices to convince twelve other men chosen by lot. But, according to this principle, if the jury is divided in opinion, the prisoner would be entitled to an acquittal; and moreover, it raises the further question, whether twelve is the precise number whose simultaneous judgment is desirable, or if the ends of justice might not be better accomplished by the unanimity of a lesser number? —*Law Times.*

Sir C. O'Loghlen's Bill to amend the law relating to juries in criminal cases, proposes to give power to the judge to allow food and refreshment to the jury while considering their verdict; to discharge the jury if they cannot agree to a verdict within a reasonable time; to authorise the beginning of the trial again if a juror be taken ill; and to sanction a verdict being taken or a juror discharged on a Sunday. The judge is to be empowered, if he think fit, to discharge the jury on account of the sudden illness of a juror, or a witness, or the accused, and that when a jury has been discharged the accused may be tried again.—*Law Times.*

CATTLE PLAGUE LEGISLATION.

The Cattle Plague Bill (No. 1) has become law. It is but a fragment of the original Bill, the omitted parts of it being transferred to Mr. Hunt's supplementary scheme. Its outline may be stated in few words. It confirms all the questionable Orders of the Privy Council, and the still more questionable Orders made by the quarter sessions in pursuance of them, and continues them until altered or revoked. It constitutes as the local authorities, in counties, the general or quarter sessions; in the metropolis, the Board of Works; in boroughs, the town councils. The local authorities are empowered to form committees of their own members, or others, and delegate to them all the powers of the Act, except the making of a rate. They are to appoint inspectors and such other officers as may be necessary, with such payment by salary or otherwise as they may think fit, which officers are authorised by the Act to enter all premises where they have reasonable grounds for supposing that cattle are diseased.

It is then made *compulsory* upon the local authority to cause all diseased animals to be slaughtered and buried, and the sheds etc., in which they were to be purified, and their dung etc., to be destroyed. And *at their discretion* they may direct the slaughter of cattle that have been herded with diseased animals.

The local authority is to cause cattle so slaughtered to be valued, and to pay to the owner, in the cases of diseased cattle, compensation not exceeding £20, and not exceeding one-half the value; and for cattle slaughtered not being then diseased, a sum not exceeding £25, and not exceeding three-fourths of the value of such cattle.

The exceptions from the provisions of this Act, and the further regulations relating to the removal of cattle, and the Orders to be made by the local authorities, will be contained in the Bill introduced by Mr. Hunt.—*Law Times.*

But what shall we say to America, who permits a conspiracy against a friendly country to be openly organised, soldiers enlisted, funds collected, and the forms of a government to be conducted, in its principal city? What would she have said if we had so done? The lives and property of British subjects are imperilled by an organised party in another