paper proprietors, in their memorial to the Home Secretary, say that the existing criminal and civil law of the island is perfectly adequate to deal effectually with any possible offence which the press can commit. But that is not the point. The memorialists do not object to the House of Keys having jurisdiciton to punish for contempts committed in its presence, and it is for them to show why there should be a distinction between the contempts committed in the face of the House and those committed not in the face of the House. In the debate in the Keys, Mr. W. Farrant proposed as an amendment that, in case either House is libelled or aggrieved, the matter should be referred to the Tynwald Court, and the judgment given and the sentence awarded by that Court. This amendment was rejected, on the ground that, inasmuch as the House of Lords or the House of Commons did not allow its dignity to be compromised by having to consult each other about a contempt, it would be undignified and dangerous for the Keys to be in the power of the Council, or the Council in the power of the Keys. An amendment to leave the amount of the fine and the duration of the imprisonment to the discretion of the offended House, was rejected; and certainly it is better for offenders that the discretion should be limited. Mr. La Mothe delivered a speech that is calculated to alarm the press. He objects to the press commenting on pending bills. He says that if there is an objection to a bill, the objector should present a petition to the House, and that comments in the press should not be permitted. If the Tynwald Court Bill is passed, and the House adopts the view of Mr. La Mothe, the Manx press will not be able to discuss any political question. That would be an absurd and reprehensible interference with the liberty of the press. What is the remedy? The memorialists ask that Her Majesty may be advised to withhold her assent from the bill until clause 5 has been expunged; but that would be rather a strong violation of constitutional etiquette. The bill is approved by the Executive, it was adopted by the Council, and it was passed in the Keys, with clause 5, by a majority of sixteen to three. Fancy the Queen being asked to veto a bill introduced by the Government, passed by the Lords, and also passed in the Commons by a four-fifths majority!

The proper remedy is in the abolition of the attempt to adapt an Imperial system of government to the government of an island thirty miles long by twelve miles broad, with a population of 50,000. A number of people, about the fifth of the population of the borough of Finsbury, have two Houses of Parliament and a High Court—the Court of Tynwald. We agree with the memorialists, who say that "it would be indeed dangerous in the extreme to invest a subordinate legislature, in a small place like the Isle of Man, with such a power as is now claimed." But if there is to be a legislature, it should have the rights and privileges of a legislature. What is now happening in the Isle of Man has happened in Greece and other small communities, where the British Constitution has been tried. The machinery of government that works well in an ancient and populous kingdom will not do in other places. We see the practical objection to clause 5 when it is read in connection with Mr. La Mothe's views of contempt. But we could not, as lawyers advising on a constitutional question, support the request of the memorialists, that the Queen should be advised to refuse her assent to a bill approved by the Executive and passed in the House by overwhelming majorities.—*Law Journal.*

An Aged Suit.—Some scientific inquirers have doubted whether any man or woman has ever lived for one hundred years. Whatever scepticism may exist as to the duration of human life, no one can contest the possibility of a suit in chancery lasting for 135 years. The fictitious suit of *Jarndyce* v. *Jarndyce* has been eclipsed by the real suit of *Ashley* v. *Ashley*. This glory of equity jurisprudence first saw the light in 1740, when Lord Hardwicke held the Great Seal. The Master in Chancery reported on it in 1792, the year in which Lord Thurlow was finally driven from office, exchanging the Chancery and the mace for Bath and the gout. From that memorable epoch the suit slept; but, as in Rip Van Winkle's case, the spark of life was not extinct, only dormant, and the suit reappeared in the year of grace 1875, on November 19, before Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins. The long torpor under which it had been oppressed had given it new strength, and when it awoke its giant form so affected his Lordship that, in passing judgment, the Vice-Chancellor recommended that the suit should at once be removed into the Court of Appeal for final adjudication. In looking back upon the history of this suit the greatest marvel is that Lord Eldon had no hand in promoting its longevity, and the next greatest marvel is that the Judicature Act will prove the weapon of its