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We have often heard expressions of regret for the victims of some deliberate or premeditated crime, which had been far better reserved for their own cases by those who had sympa-
thy. Such parties seem to forget that there is a criminality to which they are but the daily victims, though strange to say, but trivial, punishment usually falls to the lot of those who are the transgres-
sons. The crime to which we refer may not be cognizable by any of the codes in existence, but its reality, extent, and ruinous consequences are not the less.

There are many for premature predictions and pretentious charlatans who have done irreparable evil to their fellow-
ment, whose misdeeds are as safely beyond the pale of the law courts as if their existence were a myth. The polit-
ical trickster whose career may prove the destruction of thousands often obtains his position and influence under pretences so false that were the same law applicable to him as to others there would be a speedy termination to his practises.

Unfortunately our present state is but too pregnant with illustrations, and it must continue so until there be a healthy spirit infused into the whole of our population; this once obtained the natural constitutional right feeling which in the colony will speedily rectify the evil and place the specious impostors in their proper position in society.

What is a diplomatist? A compound of caution and speciousness. What are those gentlemen above hinted at who are given to practical joking on society? Precisely the same. For success in either of the above departments these qualifi-
cations are indispensably requisite, and not only should they be really possessed but rightly used; herein lies the whole secret: and His Excellency has failed, simply because he was too conspicuous.

He landed on our shores a total stranger to us and to our condition, unless so far as he could gather from his own experience.

We were scrupulously devoted to the worship of the orthodox Trinity of L. S. D as to care for none of those things which are so agreeable to new Governors, such as processions, &c., but to his aston-
ishment he found a reception more warm to the metaphysical process of a returning conqueror than might be expected, and illogical that he was, he believed that we had transferred our worship to the shrine of the coming man, the Demigod—His Excel-

For such unmerited devotion he considered himself indebted and begrudged too speciously—to declare when he should give in return for all the incom-
ence which had been offered to his duty.
But, alas! where had caution—the other necessary qualification flown to, that it did not keep him from promising more than he had the power to execute? Had this element been early introduced into His Excellency’s management all might have gone right.

His reception on his arrival was believed by some to be an apology—and it was a mistake though not on the part of the colonists; they gave the reception not to Sir Charles Hotham (as he has since turned out,) but to an ideal, to a creation of their own warm hearts and heads. This ideal was inapproachable removed from the present reality. Not understanding us he imagined that we gave him the reception for himself, or for his antecedents; of which we knew but comparatively little.

By his appointment the Colonial Office played us false, and he by his own conduct since, in not realizing our high hopes has followed suit. He led us to believe that he was about to introduce—changes of a most liberal character—if he made such promises knowing that he could not perform them—he obtained our confidence under false pretences, and if he made them in ignorance, the Home authorities are in no better plight as they should not have appointed a man so ignorant of the extent of his power. Were it not for serious consequences which have already ensued, the complication of misunderstandings might well be styled a comedy of errors.

Juries here get a very good character from the judges and crown lawyers, for they generally decide as they are directed. We have noticed this especially in all the late political trials. McIntyre and his friends were condemned, while Campbell and his companions were acquitted. And yet the evidence of guilt was as strong in the latter case as in the former. In both cases, also, the juries wished to acquit the prisoners. Why did they not do so? Because the judge in the one instance seemed unsteady, and, in the other instance, unprincipled. Two good cases have also been recently tried. Mr. Seckamp was found ‘guilty’ in plain law and plain fact, the one was as guilty as the other. Seckamp would have been acquitted by the jury had the judge not held out something like a threat or reflection upon their conscientiousness in the event of their differing from him. In Lach’s case, the judge observed something like neutrality, and he got off. This is not so creditable to juries as the judges would have us believe. It augurs
unfavorably for their intelligence and independence. The reason may be that many of those who figure on the jury-list here were not in a similar position at home, and are consequently strangers to the independent bearing of the juries which have so often defied the Bench and stung the Court to madness in the old country by their uncourtly verdicts. Some judges are honest enough to speak the truth on this point, and timid jurors may take courage when they hear the Bench itself acknowledging their rights.

To what end,” says Chief Justice Vaughan, “is the jury to be returned out of the vicinage whence the cause of action ariseth; to be scrutinized so scrupulously to the array and poll; if after all this they implicitly must give a verdict by the dictates and authority of another man?” This is as candid as it is reasonable. An honest judge has no fear of an independent jury.—Age.