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An irreverent Englishman once said that the Americans were the greatest "law making" and "law breaking" people in the world. The more laws made, the more there are to break of course, might have been an answer to the witticism. But the fact is that we believe "Unwritten Law" no people in the world rush to the law making power for more remedies for all possible evils, than do the people of these United States, and no people more calmly disregard many of the laws they have demanded. The secular press has lately been devoting some space to a proposition to incorporate into
When juries begin to *convict* for lack of a defense in cases of this sort, and public conscience is shocked at such convictions, then let us seek a safeguard for the unfortunate slayer in legislation. Until then let us be satisfied with results, which do not seem to call for legislative interference.

One of our subscribers has called us to task for our full report of the case of the Commonwealth v. Strother, made in our last number. In our judgment a law periodical is the only one in which such a report should be made in full. To the general public the details of such a case, published in the daily journals, are attractive or repulsive, as one may choose to look at it. It appeals to one class of readers in a prurient way, to another in a painful one. And in addition to this it goes into the hands of a mixed multitude, large in extent, incapable of wise discrimination, and liable to be more hurt than benefited by such a report. In the pages of a law periodical it reaches only a limited public, but a class of men who read it for information and use—not from idle curiosity. The details of many a valuable surgical operation, if given in the daily press would be horrible and indecent. In the pages of a medical journal they prove helpful to the profession of medicine and useful to humanity. So the report of the Strother case, in a journal read almost, if not entirely by lawyers, is of great value to them in finding out the views of the courts, calling their attention to many questions both of law and evidence and better fitting them for the practice of their profession and the benefit of their clients. We took this view entirely into consideration in publishing our account of the case. We were at a considerable expense to get an accurate report from a purely legal standpoint and not from mere chance reporting. We made it for insertion, and for their use and their own, and we feel entirely justified in our own minds, not only as to the usefulness, but the "offensiveness" of the Rawler's action in the case. We hope our friends will consider it in that light.