

## REGULÉ GENERALES—FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

reserving the question or questions of law, and three copies of such case, one for each Judge, shall be delivered to the Clerk of the Court at least four days before the day appointed for the argument, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

2. That every case transmitted for the consideration of the Court shall briefly state the question or questions of law submitted. If the question or questions turn upon the indictment, or any count thereof, then the case must set forth the indictment or the particular count.

3. That every case must state whether judgment on the conviction was passed or postponed, and the execution of the judgment respited, and whether the person convicted be in prison or has been discharged on recognizance of bail to appear and receive judgment, or to render himself in execution.

4. That whenever a case is sent back for amendment the same shall be re-argued as regards the matter amended, unless the Court otherwise order.

5. That the original case as amended, and three copies thereof, or only of the amended portion or portions thereof, if the Court so order, shall be delivered to the Clerk of the Court at least four days before the day appointed for the re-argument, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

6. That on every such argument or re-argument as aforesaid, the counsel for the prisoner or defendant shall have the right to begin and reply, unless the Court otherwise order.

7. That these rules shall take effect forthwith.

Osgoode Hall, Hilary Term, Monday, 7th February, 1876.

(Signed)

JOHN H. HAGARTY,  
ROBT. A. HARRISON,  
JOS. C. MORRISON,  
ADAM WILSON,  
JOHN W. GWYNNE,  
THOMAS GALT.

## FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

A CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTY.—The people of the Isle of Man are profoundly agitated. They say that they are about to be deprived of liberty of speech, and that the press is to be muzzled. The liberty of the subject is in imminent peril. *Magna Charta* is to be a dead

letter, and the *Habeas Corpus* a useless enactment. The terrors of the Inquisition and the iniquities of the Star Chamber are to be revived in the Isle of Man. If the Queen in Council assents to the Tynwald Court Bill, Manxmen will be slaves until they are delivered from the abolition of Home Rule.

As some of our readers may not know the Isle of Man system of government, a few words of explanation are desirable. There are two branches of the Legislature. The Council is the Upper House, and its members are Crown nominees. The meetings of the Council are private. The House of Keys, the Lower House, is elected by the people, and its meetings are not private. We may here remark that the Executive is permanent, and independent of the vote of the Keys. The Tynwald Court is constituted by the members of the Council and the members of the Keys. A Bill "to regulate certain proceedings in the Court of Tynwald" has been passed, and section 5, which provides for the punishment of contempt of Court, runs thus: "The Court and each House shall have power to punish contempts by fine and imprisonment, or by both, in like manner as any superior Court of Justice has power to punish contempts. Any contempt of a committee may, in the discretion of the House, be deemed to be a contempt of the Court or House by whom such committee may have been appointed: provided always that, in the case of a contempt of either House, the cause of contempt shall be set forth in the warrant or order awarding the punishment for such contempt; and provided, also, that no fine to be imposed shall exceed the sum of £300, nor shall any imprisonment exceed the term of six calendar months." We gather from a report of the proceedings in the Keys that the maximum fine is reduced to £100, and the maximum term of imprisonment to three months; but the clause is given as above in the memorial presented, or about to be presented, to the Home Secretary. It is this fifth clause that has alarmed and incensed Manxmen.

By the House of Keys Election Act, the House has authority to punish for contempts committed in its presence. We are disposed to agree with those who think that it is an improper limitation. A flagrant contempt might be committed not in the face of the House. Suppose it was stated in a newspaper, or at a public meeting, that the House of Keys was corrupt, and that it was selling its votes. Is that a contempt to be allowed because it is not committed in the face of the House? The news-