

some change in the tariff would seem to be advisable if the practice of paying witnesses at all is to be continued. Cases constantly arise where the present tariff causes trouble.

In a recent case a motorman of a street railway was the only witness, outside the litigants, to an accident as to which a suit arose. He refused to attend Court, although subpoenaed, saying it was a matter in which he had no interest and he would lose a day's pay and only receive one dollar. Cases of a similar character frequently arise.

As to payment to jurymen, history tells us that the jury system began by those who had personal knowledge of the event in question being called together to talk the matter over, and decide the dispute according to their idea of what justice demanded. By degrees outsiders were called in to hear the witnesses and give their opinion, and the present jury system became the law of the land. In those days it was considered an honour to be selected as a juror; time, moreover, was not as valuable as it is now. In these days there is a very practical difficulty confronting some of those who might, under other circumstances, be willing to do patriotic service in a jury room. One difficulty is that, notwithstanding laudable efforts on the part of judges to arrange a convenient time for holding courts, farmers are frequently called away from their farms at seeding time and other times when their presence at home is almost a necessity.

As long as the jury system remains, these and other difficulties arise. It may be that nothing can be done in the way of a remedy, but both these subjects are worthy of consideration.

---

#### CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT.

A writer in *Law Notes* (U.S.A.) refers to a matter which has been a subject of much comment in the United States in connection with the multitude of foreigners who have made that country their home. In the course of his remarks he says: "Our Government was not perfect at its foundation; it has developed