

JURIES.

- Mr. Justice Johnston. To make the minor-jury system compulsory
- Mr. Woodward. That the number of jurymen on each jury is too large. A less number could work better together.
- Mr. Ollivier. That the jury system adds greatly to expense by forcing the party to collect all his witnesses in one day.
- Mr. Stout. That a jury should only be granted if requested, and in all actions under £500 the number of the jury should be four.
- Mr. A. E. T. Devore. To abolish Grand Juries.
- Mr. Forwood. Civil juries seem to be too large, and of the wrong sort of men.
Common juries ought not to try Supreme Court civil cases.
Civil juries, as now struck in the District Court, are a farce.
To have juries of seven, four to be entitled to give a verdict, but that either party might have a jury of eleven, six to give a verdict.
To do away with common juries altogether in civil cases.
In criminal cases, that if the prisoner demanded it he should be entitled to have a special jury.
All criminal juries to be thirteen, seven to find a verdict.
To abolish Grand Juries.
- Mr. Brandon. All cases under £ to be taken before minor juries, and all above likewise by consent.
- Otago District Law Society. That juries be optional with either party, as in the District Court.

PROCEDURE.

- Mr. Woodward. That the issues put to the jury be simplified. A jury, by answering questions the bearing of which they do not understand, frequently give a verdict opposite to that which they intend.
- Mr. Ollivier. In certain cases there should be an appeal on fact. Appeal on law a matter of right. Appeal on fact on giving security for costs.
- Mr. Stout. There should only be two kinds of actions—(a.) Actions for wrong; (b.) Actions for relief, and for specific property. The (b) kind of actions would include what are termed equity suits, and actions for land or specific personal property.
There should be no interlocutory proceedings except for the following purposes:—
1. Further particulars of claim or defence,
 2. Postponement of trial, or fixing another place of trial;
 3. Leave to take evidence of witnesses about to leave place of trial, or absent from place of trial in or out of the colony
- Canterbury District Law Society. That the whole of “The Law Amendment Act, 1878” (N.Z.), be brought into operation, and that rules of practice and procedure be made by the Judges of the Supreme Court, following as nearly as possible the English Judicature Act, the rules of Court and orders made thereunder
- Mr. Devore. That the rules relating to cases in equity in the Supreme Court should be amplified, and forms found in English precedent-books adopted.
That it should be unnecessary for plaintiffs to appear in undefended cases in action of debts, and they should be allowed to obtain judgment on proof of affidavit of service and that the debt is still due.
That there should be provision for the attachment of debts, similar to the provisions of “The Law Amendment Act, 1856.”
That there should be power to issue distress three days after judgment entered.
- Mr. Forwood. That the plaintiff should only be required to deliver a short statement of claim with the writ, and should deliver his declaration afterwards, with liberty to enlarge his claim and cause of action.
Trials in actions for specific relief should only be by direction of a Judge. In many cases they are unnecessary, and greatly add to the expense of the suit.
That a plaintiff should be allowed to give notice of trial after replication, instead of after settlement of issues. Ten days’ notice to be sufficient.