

an inquiry, which often is not an easy one, whether the law of America on the subject on which the point arises is the same as our own.'—*Solicitors' Journal* (Eng.).

* * *

Criticism of Courts.

No Court in the United States is exempt from criticism, but to have any criticism on it fair and just is the right of every Court. The matter is chiefly important, not to the Court or Judges, but to the people of the nation. The respect of law which all concede to be the very foundation of civil government, is tested largely by respect for the Courts which administer the law. Captious and chronic critics of the Courts do more than they could possibly do in any other way to teach hatred

of the law itself. The insidious notion that law means tyranny, which is all the time fermenting in crime-diseased and morbid brains, is quickened and intensified by every charge of corruption or unfairness in the administration of law. The criticism of judicial decisions as unsound or wrong in law may be the privilege of every citizen, whether he be capable of judging the matter or not, and if criticism of this sort is in any case worthless, it is likely to be also harmless. But when Courts are attacked as corrupt or unfair, the falsity of the accusation, and even the recklessness or malice of the libeller, does not prevent the charges from finding lodging in the minds of many who have no means of knowing the truth of the matter. —*Case and Comment.*

FINDINGS' KEEPING.

Perhaps the exceeding brevity of this proposition has prevented it from ever having been accepted as correct in law; for brevity, though it be the very soul of wit, goeth not so often in company with a wig. Or, perhaps, if this saying were as much a maxim of the law, as undoubtedly it is an article of belief with the few who find, the number of these unfortunate people would be mysteriously multiplied, so that it would become even unsafer to temporarily relinquish one's hat and umbrella than it is at present. Be this as it may, two humble holders of the finder's faith have recently been before the Law Courts, where their errors were duly pointed out to them, and, perhaps, the brief consideration of those errors here will be, as the consideration of other peo-

ple's errors usually is, gratifying, if not instructive.

Res nullius cedit occupanti says the law, which, of course, is a different thing from the English at the head of this article. Res nullius may be something that never belonged to anyone, as a wild animal, or it may be something that has been voluntarily abandoned by a former owner. But wild animals (outside the game laws) are scarce, and people who throw even halfpence into the sea for the fun of the thing are scarcer still. There is barely a living to be got out of finding things in these days, and the places where it is advisable to carry on the business are not many. Highways, market squares, and shop-floors seem best for the finder who wishes to retain what he finds; but even here, if there be