Fourth Estate," superior to the Courts of Justice. There is the ambitious desire to control, not only the public, but judicial opinion by the views of publicists, who not unfrequently rush to crude conclusions upon imperfect or one-sided information. A satirical suggestion for the amendment of the law was once made, that it be enacted that henceforth on trials for murder there shall be no judge, but the jury shall consist of upwards of five thousand volunteers who are not to be sworn, nor be allowed to see the prisoners or witnesses, nor hear the evidence, but shall be required to read every casual observation published on the subject, and write letters thereon to the newspapers. This is, after all, merely a somewhat exaggerated statement of the right which gentlemen of the press arrogate to themselves when they assume to control or regulate the course of judicial procedure. There may be cases where the Court can pass over in silence the impertinent observations of journalists upon pending suits, but there are other cases where the interference is so gross and insulting that the dignity of the Court requires to be vindicated. Of this kind was the slanderous article in the Journal Contempt Case.

Among analogous English precedents we may refer to the following, where the contempt to the court was rather constructive than actual, and consisted in acts and words of indignity spoken and done not in the presence of the Court. Many old cases are to be found in the books where contemptuous expressions and acts of the defendant, on being served with the process of the Court, have been punished by attachment: *Rex* v. *Crown*, 6 Mod, 67.

So in the "St. James' Chronicle Case," called *Roach* v. *Garvin*, 2 Atk. 470, the motion was to commit the printers of that journal for publishing a narrative of the facts of the cause, while yet pending, in the course of which they applied opprobrious epithets to some of the parties and witnesses. In *Charltors Case*, 2 M. & Cr. 316, the act of contempt was in writing a threatening letter to the Master of the Court of Chancery, to influence his decision in a matter then in progress before him. Contempt was also adjudged to have been committed in the *Tichborne Case*, L. R. 7, Eq. 55, by the printer of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in publishing an article commenting on affidavits filed in a cause which was about to be brought before the Court. Among other late cases of a like kind we may just note the following: *Robson* v. *Dodds*, 17 W. R, 782; the *Cheltenham Waggon Company*, L. R. 8 Eq. 580; *Felkins* v. *Hubbert*, 12 W. R. 241, and the recent case in this Province of *Wilkinson* v. *Belford*, wherein the editor of the *Daily Telegraph* was held guilty of a contempt in publishing the bill of complaint with certain depreciatory comments.

LAW STUDENTS AND DEBATING SOCIETIES.

[communicated.]

Heneage Finch, the "silver-tongued" Nottingham, used to advise the law-students of his day to read all the morning, and talk all the afternoon. Such advice would be lost on the Canadian student, for the way in which he shall spend his mornings and his afternoons, is not a matter upon which he can exercise much discretion. Acting in the many-sided capacity of apprentice to a solicitor, whose instruction is too often limited to an occasional reprimand, or in that of a paid clerk, a "small salary" being the one thing sought for—the routine of office-work must employ the best hours of his day. The student's reading must be accomplished in the hours he may snatch from the night, or, it may be, from the early morning. The student's talking, the exercise of speaking