

suggested. They are merely given by way of illustration, and my purpose has been attained if I have succeeded in convincing you of the possibility and desirability of nationalizing our jurisprudence.

You will not fail to bear in mind that the method suggested for realizing this object has nothing compulsory about it. It is founded upon the firm belief that persuasion is more potent than force in welding together communities. Much as we resent being dragooned into uniformity, we can hardly be so unreasonable as to refuse to give an attentive and sympathetic hearing to those who think that there is a great deal of good that we can learn from one another—much to borrow from every system and a great deal to discard in all.

It has indeed been contended by some writers that variety is desirable in a confederation, because it enables the component states to indulge in experiments which may prove instructive and useful to the whole country. The experience of the American Commonwealth is that in the field of law there has been too much experimentation at the expense of the litigant, and that so far from tending to the selection of the fittest among the tentative projects, the result has been to intensify defects and perpetuate unnecessary differences. The same problem faces us in Canada. Shall we by remaining in jealous isolation encourage the aimless and inevitable differentiation of our legal systems, or shall we not rather, in so far as our special circumstances will permit, fall into line with the movement in all great nations towards the goal which a great Belgian jurist called "the universality of the law."