an enactment might in a few cases accomplish a rough sort of justice, shall the safeguards of female purity be removed and the descent into vice be rewarded and encouraged from mere sentimental considerations? Women under 21 are often more mature than those of the opposite sex whom they allure, but who in this bill are treated as the only offenders. There is no limitation of age on the side of the male. A woman of 20 may figure as the prosecutor of a verdant youth of 17 or 18. There was a case of rape a few days ago before our Courts, in which the complainant was a girl of only 13. Yet it appeared on cross-examination that she was a consenting party to the connection; the prosecution was an afterthought; and the medical evidence indicated that she had lost her virginity at a period long antecedent to the date of the alleged crime. Such girls ripen fast in profligacy, and they would have ample time before the age of 21 to entrap a victim with the convenient aid of the Seduction Act. It might possibly be difficult to prove the previous unchastity, yet in reality they are as the women "whose lips drop as an honeycomb and whose mouth is smoother than oil."

No good practical result can come out of such a law. When its aid is invoked by *soi-disant* "chaste characters" the mischievous tendency of the provision will be more apparent to the public mind. We look, however, to the Senate to give the measure its quietus, if it gets so far. The Minister of Justice, it will be remembered, last year spoke vigorously against the bill, and quoted from letters which he had received from some of the most eminent judges in Canada, protesting against the legislation contemplated. The Senate will doubtless be slow to disregard the deliberate opinion of those who have had the greatest experience in administering the criminal law.

U. S. LEGAL JOURNALISM.

Like the lean kine in Pharaoh's dream, the *Southern Law Review*, which was only a bi-monthly, is eating up its contemporaries, which from their rank as monthlies may be likened to the fat kine. First, the *American Law Review* in the "Hub" of the far north was gathered in, the devourer, however, taking the name of the devoured. Now the *Western Jurist*, of Iowa, is absorbed and completes a trinity. Our anthropophagous contemporary even hints at further engorgements. "Perhaps the *Montreal Legal News* would like to open negotiations with "us," is the insinuating style of our contemporary's address. We feel flattered, but we think not. We prefer the calm skies and sunny slopes of our native haunt, our regal mountain, to the cyclones, floods and tornadoes of the far West,—not to mention those little death-dealing instruments, which lie hidden in hip-pockets, ready to be used against guileless editors who have more candor than complaisance. Seriously, however, we heartily congratulate our contemporary upon his prosperous—we won't say "bloated"—appearance. There are three times as many good things as of old, and we may, as a far-away outsider—an Arctic bear or anything else you choose—say that the *American Law Review*, the *Albany Law Journal*, the *Criminal Law Magazine*, and one or two more, are a credit to the profession. There can be no doubt that the atmosphere of the law is all the clearer and purer for a good stamp of journalism. Editors sitting in their chairs may help to frighten away a great deal that is mean and sordid and pettifogging. And more than that, it is true to some extent that they hold, so to speak, the magic wand which vivifies the dry bones of the law, and imparts a savour to what would sometimes be as unpalatable, to borrow an old simile, as "sawdust without butter."

NOTES OF CASES.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

[Crown Side.]

MONTREAL, March 6, 1884.

Before RAMSAY, J.

THE QUEEN v. ALEXANDER MAHER.

Neglecting to provide wife with necessaries—Evidence—32-33 *Vict.* (*Can.*), *cap.* 20, *sect.* 25.

1. *On trial of husband for neglecting to provide wife with necessaries, the evidence of the wife is admissible on behalf of the Crown.*