

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

more space than we have at our disposal. Suffice it to say, that every department of study, and every branch of literature receives the attention in a greater or less degree of the best writers in the British Isles. If the public read these Reviews more and the trash of the period less, they would be immensely the better for it.—The articles in the last *Blackwood*, are: "Giannetto," the beginning of a new story; "Idas: an Extravaganza"; "Alice Lorraine," Part X. "The Abode of Snow"; "The Story of Valentine and his Brother," Part XIII. "The Life of the Prince Consort"; "The Great Problem: Can it be solved."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT ACTS OF 1869 FOR THE DOMINION OF CANADA, WITH NOTES, PRECEDENTS, &c. By Judge Taschereau. Vol. I. Lovell Bros.: Montreal.

THE SCIENCE OF LAW. By Sheldon Amos. M. A. Henry S. King & Co.: London, Eng.

WOMAN BEFORE THE LAW. By John Prof- fat, LL. B., of the New York Bar. G. P. Putnam & Sons: New York.

These books will be noticed hereafter.

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

THE GERMAN CRIMINAL LAW.—A German paper says that a singular instance of the working of the German criminal law was brought out by a case which was tried before a jury the other day at Hamburg. The case in itself was very simple. A house in Hamburg was broken into, and a quantity of silver plate stolen from it. Some time after a pedlar, who had already been imprisoned several times for theft, was apprehended at Ratzeburg, and the stolen property was found upon him. Being accused of the robbery, and put upon his trial, the pedlar denied that he was guilty of the burglary, and accounted for his possession of the property by saying that he had stolen it from the real burglar, whom he had met while travelling upon the high road between Eutin and Schwartzau; which, if true, would have reduced his crime to simple theft. Two questions were, therefore, put to the jury—(1) whether the prisoner was guilty of burglary and theft, or (2) whether,

according to his own statement, he had merely stolen the things from the real burglar. The jury pronounced him guilty of the burglary and theft, but only by seven votes against five; whereupon it seems, by the German law, the ultimate decision of the question devolved upon the Court. They acquitted the prisoner upon this count, and the jury were then required to give their verdict upon the charge of simple theft contained in the second question, which remained still unanswered. The result was that the prisoner was declared guilty by more than seven votes, and condemned by the Court to five years' imprisonment. But, of course, this last verdict could only have been obtained by the concurrence of several of the jurymen who had previously pronounced the prisoner guilty of the burglarious theft in Hamburg, but now found him guilty of stealing the property from the real burglar on the high road between Eutin and Schwartzau. Obviously, however, only one of the two charges could have been true. The result would have been more singular still if the seven jurymen, who had pronounced the prisoner guilty on the first charge, had adhered to their verdict; for the decision of the majority which pronounced him guilty of the burglary having been set aside by the Court, he must have been acquitted on the minor charge, and thus, notwithstanding his confession, would have escaped scot-free.

"DEVILLING" AT THE ENGLISH BAR.—According to the London *Law Times*, the English Bar is in great danger of falling into disrepute and degradation from the practice of what our contemporary calls—not altogether euphoniously—"devilling" at the Bar. The practice complained of is that of taking cases and fees and employing a clerk, or an unknown and briefless barrister, to do the work. This has a public and professional aspect. "The public have a distinct and absolute right to the services of a professional man who consents to act for them," and, "in common honesty, work ought to be done by him who is engaged and undertakes to do it." Our contemporary "ventures to predict that a system which recognizes constant breach of faith by barristers cannot last," and that "if the professional career is made one simply of a race for wealth, then the public must look to its own interests." In its professional aspects, our contemporary thinks that the practice of "devilling" is calculated to support a "monopoly" among the busier and more famous barristers, and it is asserted that, "without the assistance of the briefless barristers, the mo-