

treasure may amount to larceny. Where this is not so, obvious difficulties arise as to proof of felonious taking, but an ancient judge appears to have felt no hesitation in laying down the rule that larceny may be committed by stealing goods, the owner of which is unknown, because, as he sagely remarked, the felony would otherwise go unpunished, "*que serra un grande mischiefe en le ley.*"

FRANCE.

THE SENATORIAL ELECTIONS.—A curious constitutional point, says the *Manchester Guardian*, is being raised in France with respect to the partial elections which are approaching for the refilling of seventy-five senatorial seats. The constitutional law passed in February, 1875, simply provided that a third of the Senate should retire every three years. The government, in virtue of this rule, have fixed the elections for the 5th of January, in order to have everything ready for the session which begins a few days later. Many of those, however, whose seats are thus affected, knowing that in the present temper of the country they have no chance of re-election, deny that the vacancies will occur so soon. It is true that they have sat for three parliamentary years—that is to say, for three sessions; but they will not have sat for three natural years till the 8th of March, that being the third anniversary of the meeting of the Senate.

CANADA.

STENOGRAPHERS' FEES.—In a communication from a "Stenographer" to a daily journal, the following are given as the rates of remuneration in the places mentioned. "Ontario:—Salary \$1,500 per annum for official reporters. When not regularly appointed, a reporter, when employed, is paid \$5 per diem and expenses, for note taking, and when notes are transcribed, for each copy he receives 10c per folio. As three copies are usually required in appeal cases, and manifold paper is used, the remuneration is practically 30c per folio and \$5 per diem and expenses.

Illinois—Ten dollars per diem and 25c per folio for transcribing.

California—Ten dollars per diem and 20c per folio for transcribing.

England—A guinea per diem (two guineas

if the sitting be a long one) and 8d per folio of seventy words for transcribing.

Nebraska—Salary \$1,000 per annum, and 10c per folio for transcribing.

New Jersey—District courts, salary \$2,000 per annum; Supreme, Superior and Common Pleas courts, salary \$2,500 per annum; Surrogate court, salary \$3,000 per annum; Circuit courts, \$5 per diem and expenses, and 10c per folio for transcribing.

New Jersey—\$10 per diem, and 10c per folio for transcribing.

Iowa—\$8 per diem, and 10c per folio for transcribing.

Wyoming Territory—Salary. \$2,500 per annum, and mileage at 10c per mile when reporting district courts, and 15c per folio for transcripts. The reporter must pass a strict examination, and be a thoroughly expert reporter before he can be appointed.

Ohio—Ten dollars per diem, and eight cents per folio for transcripts."

UNITED STATES.

THE STEWART REMAINS.—The curious assertion has been made by the newspapers that because the Stewart *cadaver* was stolen for purposes of blackmail, the law provides no penalty. Admitting the alleged purpose to have been the real one, the case would still fall within 2 R. S. 688, § 13, which imposes both fine and imprisonment for removing dead bodies, "for the purpose of selling the same" or "from mere wantonness." The purpose alleged was to extort money from the friends of the deceased, or, in other words, to compel them to buy back the *cadaver*, a "purpose of selling" within the statute. But aside from this, the wrongful removal of a dead body was an indictable offence at common law. In *Regina v. Sharpe*, Dearsley and Bell, 160, a man was indicted and convicted of a misdemeanor, for disinterring and removing, without authority, the body of his mother, and the conviction was sustained, although the removal was properly and decently made, and for the purpose of burying the body by the side of the prisoner's father, recently deceased. See also *Regina v. Feist*, id, 590; *Commonwealth v. Cooley*, 10 Pick. 39. In 4 Black. Com. 236, 237, stealing a corpse is mentioned as a matter of great indecency; and the law of the Franks is mentioned, which directed that a person who had dug a corpse out