trifling larcenies, any reader of common judgment may imagine the effect. The criminal classes know that for ill-treating a woman, beating a man, or breaking his facial appendages, they are not half so likely to get severe punishment as for stealing bread and coals. It is almost impossible to write with patience on such an idiotic mal-administration of law—a mal-administration which protects primarily insensible property, secondarily sensible and sensitive human frames. The infliction of grievous bodily harm always carries consequences. It may entail heavy medical expenses, loss of income, impaired health, the prosperity of a family, and the sapping of a life. Therefore, it is a mockery—more than that, is a gross public wrong—when any functionary, be he judge, chairman, or magistrate, punishes the brute who smashes flesh and bone—the flesh and bone perhaps of the supporter of a family—lightly or weakly. Long terms of penal servitude—the sharp, bitter slavery of the convict stations and the lash—ought to be the portion of every man convicted of savage attacks, which mutilate and impair the frame and constitution. We say the lash, and we here avow our conviction, that if by the addition of a few words to the statute, the judges were empowered to add a maximum sentence of fifty lashes with a cat to every person being a male convicted of assaults that mutilated or inflicted grievous bodily harm, it would have the best and happiest effect.

And be it remembered, while the lash is used in the army and navy, no one can logically object to it for felons. While you punish crimes against discipline with flogging, there is every reason in favour of so punishing crimes against morality. What pity is there for the brutes, without a brute's virtues, who attack women, who mash and pound faces into jelly, who bite off ears, lips, and noses, who put children on fires, who cut open heads with pewter measures, who kick their victims savagely in the most vital parts, and who beat women to death's door? Is any one so really an example of "maudlin sentimentality" as to have one word to say for malefactors like these? Savages as they are, without any of a savages' redeeming points, they merit the only punishment they understand—the sting of a lash. If pity be evoked, let it be so for the inoffensive people maimed, bleeding, racked with pain and stayed from their daily occupation by the attacks which merciful magistrates seem to consider far less henious than paltry robberies.

Even as it stands, the law is strong. Why is it that in all cases where grievous bodily harm is proved to have been occasioned, a long term of penal servitude does not fall to the offender's lot? Why is it that watches and purses are guarded more sternly than heads and limbs? What in the name of common reason is their relative value? And when will the administrators of the law learn to deal their sternest measure out to the foes of life and limb, rather than the foes of the pocket?

4. Manslaughter. Making all allowance for the vast difference between murder and manslaughter—between homicides committed in cold and in hot blood—there is still a certain amount of severity to be shown towards any one convicted of homicide under the influence of evil passions. Now it cannot be denied that of late years, several instances have occurred of strange lenity towards persons convicted of this offence. Perhaps, one of the strangest instances (with all respect to the learned judge who tried the case) occurred at the last gaol delivery for Maidstone. A man was convicted of the manslaughter of his wife. The evidence proved that he repeatedly kicked the wretched woman (with threats and curses) till she fell insensible, and shortly died. A surgeon deposed that she had apoplectic tendencies, and might have died—or did die—from that. A sentence of three months' imprisonment was passed. Now, granting the surgeon's opinion to have been correct, it is certain that an assault was proved in evidence, which was about as aggravated as any could be. At petty sessions, the perpetrator would have been liable to six months' and before a judge, to twelve months' imprisonment for an assault simply. And the witnesses deposed to expressions of the convict, which conclusively showed a brutal and savage intention to injure. This case was commented on severely by the press, and it seems in our humble opinion an inexplicable one.

It is all very well to draw and preserve a keen distinction between murder and manslaughter; but in all cases where any bad blood is shown, there should be a long sentence of imprisonment; I except cases of defence and gross provication, of course, but in all others there ought to be a long term of imprisonment. Trivial sentences are very injurious to the estimation of the law in the eyes of people generally. The object of all the criminal sentences should be to show that life, limb, and property are to be protected, but the former much before the latter. Discrimination of this kind, properly carried out would be a most valuable social improvement. What then are the suggestions to which the foregoing brief remarks are prefatory? They are four in number, and very brief, but the working out is respectfully recommended to the present Home Secretary, for the writer naturally feels confidence from the tried legal reforms which have emanated from his own party.

1. A circular from the Home Office to every bench of magistrates, pointing out to them the punitory powers of imprisonment, given by the 24 & 25 Vict., c. 100; and the heinousness of bad assaults over larcenies.

2. A clause in such circular recommending full terms of imprisonment wherever slight personal mutilation has been inflicted.

3. An Act of one section empowering the judges of assize to sentence all persons convicted of effecting grievous bodily harm, where there is permanent serious mutilation certified by a surgeon, to the penalties of the lash.