

time, to continue his warfare on society? Is not this one great reason for the formation and growth of the criminal classes? Is not society justified in protecting itself against this tremendous menace by providing for the permanent segregation or imprisonment of the incorrigible criminal? These are questions which deserve the most careful and serious thought.—Hon. J. B. Winslow in *Case and Comment*.

---

A curious situation was revealed in a case which came before the Court of Criminal Appeal last month. Upon an indictment charging an appellant with feloniously having in his possession without lawful excuse a mould for coining, a plea of guilty was entered, the appellant stating, when arraigned, that he had the moulds in his possession. When called upon to state whether he had anything to say why judgment should not be pronounced, the appellant, for the first time, said that he had possession of the mould for the purpose of making medals. Upon an appeal against his conviction and sentence, the court held that the appellant had not completed his plea, and that the sentence passed was therefore not a legal sentence, and the indictment was sent back to the Central Criminal Court, in order that the appellant might again be called upon to plead to it. At first sight, it might appear that the court had in effect sent the case back for a new trial, to do which it has no power under the Criminal Appeal Act, 1907. It will be seen, however, that this was not the case, as the trial upon the indictment was bad ab initio, inasmuch as no plea was properly entered upon it, so that even the court of first instance would have had power to re-try the case upon the same indictment.—*Law Times*.