

CONTEMPT OF COURT—OBSTRUCTION TO PUBLIC JUSTICE—ABUSE OF JUDGE IN NEWS-PAPER—POWER OF CROWN TO REMIT SENTENCE.

*In re Special reference from Bahama Islands*, (1893) A.C. 138. This was a matter specially referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the committee was constituted of eleven judges, including the Lord Chancellor. An editor of a newspaper in the Bahamas had published a letter from an anonymous correspondent containing a libel on the Chief Justice of that colony, but it was not in the circumstances calculated to obstruct or interfere with the course of justice or the due administration of the law. The Chief Justice summoned the editor before him, and required him to give up the letter or to disclose the name of the author of the letter, both of which the editor refused to do, whereupon the Chief Justice fined him £40, and committed him to prison during pleasure for the publication, and also sentenced him to a fine of £25 or imprisonment for the refusal to disclose the name of the writer of the letter. The governor of the colony released him. The questions the Judicial Committee were called on to decide were: (1) Whether the publication of the letter was, in the circumstances, a contempt of court? and they decided it was not; (2) whether the Chief Justice had any legal right to require the editor to give up the manuscript of the offensive letter or the name of the writer? and they decided he had not; and (3) whether the governor of the colony had, under his commission, power to remit the sentence which had been imposed? and they decided that he had. The committee abstained from giving any reasons, and confined themselves simply to answering the questions propounded for their consideration. The conclusion of the Privy Council in this case seems rather to favour the view taken by Morrison, J., in the celebrated case of *Regina v. Wilkinson*, 41 U.C.R., 47.

INTERNATIONAL LAW—FOREIGN JUDGMENT—PENAL ACTION—DISTINCTION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PENALTIES.

*Huntington v. Attrill*, (1893) A.C. 150, is a decision of the Judicial Committee upon an appeal from the Ontario Court of Appeal, the judges of that court having been equally divided in opinion. The action was brought upon a judgment recovered in the State of New York. The action in which the judgment was