

## SNIPPETS FROM TALKS.

# English Justice the World's Fairest

Suspects in Continental Countries Examined Long Before Trial —  
Policy Towards India Affects and Interests More Than  
Just the Empire.

MR. N. J. HUNTER (3YA).

I HAVE found myself using the word "law" as if it meant the same as "justice." That this is not necessarily so is illustrated by a story concerning Sir John Coleridge, who was a judge of the High Court in England. The story is that, on arriving in London by train, he called a cabby and said, "Drive me to the Courts of Justice." The cabby replied, "The Courts of Justice, sir? Where are they?" Whereupon the judge said, "What! You a London cabby and don't know where the Law Courts are?" "Oh," said the cabby, "the Law Courts! Why, of course I know where they are. I thought you said the Courts of Justice."

I DO not think we are boasting if we say that the modern English system of criminal justice is the fairest in the world. It may help you to understand the reports of criminal cases which take place in other countries than New Zealand if I explain the essential features in which our system differs from, say, France and Germany. In those countries, when a crime has been committed, an examining magistrate is entrusted with the investigation. He calls before him all witnesses who may be able to give evidence with reference to it, including the person who may be suspected of having committed it. He subjects the suspected person to a thorough questioning about the matter, and may call such person before him for further questionings. The questions and answers are recorded. Then, when he has investigated the case as far as possible, the police make an arrest, and the accused comes before a court for trial, when, of course, the questions and answers he made earlier are read to the jury, or the court, and form part of the case against him. That sort of thing is never done under the British system. If the police suspect a person of having committed a crime and intend to arrest him, they must leave him severely alone. They have to build up their case quite apart from him, and when he comes before the court, whether at the preliminary investigation before a magistrate or at his trial before a judge and jury, he is not bound to say a word, and if he refrains from giving evidence, no comment is to be made on that fact by either judge or counsel. In other words, the Crown undertakes to prove its case without assistance from the accused, and the jury are always told that, if there is a reasonable doubt of guilt, the accused should get the benefit of the doubt. The accused is even safeguarded with reference to the giving of a confession, the principle being that if the confession has been obtained by holding out to the accused some inducement or promise (such as

that he will be treated lightly by the court) in England, at all events, the confession will be refused as evidence.

ANOTHER way in which our system differs from the Continental system, as it is called, is that we do not admit what we call "hearsay evidence." Witnesses are allowed to give evidence only of what they themselves have seen, or what the accused has himself said, or what has been said in his presence, and are not allowed to repeat what somebody else said who is not before the court to give evidence on oath.

MR. LEICESTER WEBB (3YA).

IN New Zealand, we are, I think, liable to underestimate the interest which the attempts to find a new constitution for India are arousing, not only among the English people, but among the people of Europe, America, and the East. For instance, if you were in France at the present time, you would find that all those funny little handbills which the French call newspapers contained reports of the debates in the House of Commons on the India Bill. Why? Simply because, next to Great Britain, France has the largest overseas Empire in the world, and, in the French colonial empire there are millions of eastern peoples who are watching with profound interest what is happening in India. Shortly after the Simon Report was issued I met in Paris a very interesting Frenchman named Andre Siegfried, whose books some of you will have read. Siegfried had just been reading the Simon Report, and he said to me, "This is a dreadful document. You have no idea how much it will do to weaken French rule in Cochin China." The French feel that the great Imperial Powers should stick together in these matters. They feel that British concessions in India are weakening their own position in the East. Similarly, if you were in Peiping and could read the Chinese newspapers you would almost certainly come across rather garbled accounts of the progress of the India Bill. Why? Simply because the Chinese people, like the Indian people, are in search of a system of government, also perhaps because the problems the two countries have to overcome have many points of similarity. Then, of course, the Russians are keenly interested in the India question, because Russia borders on India, and because they hope that some day parts of India will join the Soviet Union. In short, the problem is, when you consider all its implications, commercial, military, social and political, one of the most important problems of the post-war age.

PART of India is, as you know, ruled directly by the British and is called British India. The other part is

governed by various princes who have treaties with Great Britain. It would not be far wrong to regard the principalities as British protectorates. Besides this political division there are important racial and religious divisions. But I think the tendency is, in popular discussion, to exaggerate the multiplicity of races and religions in India. As a matter of fact, the number of religions in India is not much greater than the number of religious sects in New Zealand. Two-thirds of the whole population of India are Hindus. About 70,000,000 are Moslems, 10,000,000 are Buddhists, but they are practically all in Burma, and the rest of the population are divided among various tribal religions.

AMBULANCE TALK (2YA).

OF course, the best manner in which to learn how to care for the sick is for us to get very ill and to take careful note of what is being done for us. In order to render efficient assistance at home, a nurse must be reliable in carrying out instructions given to her by the doctor, conscientious in the performance of her duties and observant that she may notice changes in the patient's condition and thus render accurate reports to the doctor. She must, above all, be loyal to the doctor by saying or doing nothing to lessen the patient's confidence in him, and loyal to the patient by carrying out the instructions of the doctor with true regard for the patient's welfare. She must exercise perfect self-control and tact, and be resourceful in an emergency without alarming the patient. A nurse must be sympathetic that she may give real comfort and encouragement to the patient, and must carry out her duties cheerfully and with good temper.

TO keep your body alive, two things are absolutely necessary. Without food we would starve to death. Without air we would be suffocated. Most of our organs exist in order to perform the duty of sending food and air to all parts of the body. After undergoing certain changes inside the body, the food and air are carried to their various destinations by means of the blood. When the heart is filled with blood, it contracts so that the blood is driven out of the heart into the arteries. The arteries are elastic-like tubes which carry the blood from the heart to various parts of the body. When the blood has done its work it returns to the heart and is then sent off again on another journey. At last the arteries become a network of extremely small tubes, finer than the finest hair. They are then called capillaries, which then gradually join together and become larger and larger until they become veins, through which the blood returns to the heart. If the heart is in good working order it contracts, or beats, about 72