

ment or order under which you claim to be entitled to costs.

Don't *præcipe* papers to the Clerk of Records and Writs in case of appeals to a Judge in Chambers. They should be *præciped* to the Clerk in Chambers.

Don't fail, however, to *præcipe* papers to the Clerk of Records and Writs where they are required for use in Single Court, no matter in what division the action may be.

Don't expect that Judge's Chambers are always held at 11 o'clock. A number of the Judges hold Chambers at 10.

Don't fail to enclose return postage when you *præcipe* papers to Toronto.

Don't offer the law stamp vendor American money, and don't ask him to accept your I.O.U.

Don't take books from the library without signing for them.

Don't attempt to interview a Judge without having the usher first announce your name to His Lordship.

Don't put in *præcipe* for cheque in Accountant's office, under order of the Master in Chambers or a local Judge, until you have first procured one of the Judges to initial the order.

---

#### EXCERPTS FROM EXCHANGES.

---

##### *Sham Insanity is Actual Contempt.*

A SAD blow at "journalistic enterprise" has been dealt by an unfeeling judge in California. An ambitious young reporter on the Los Angeles *Herald*, who had wearied of ordinary assignments, conceived the idea of winning fame by getting up a sensation. So he feigned insanity, was brought before the court for examination, was pronounced a subject for the asylum, and was sent to the state institution at Highlands. After

staying long enough to get material for a good "story," he wanted to get out, but in order to secure his release was obliged to tell the whole story of his deceit. The judge who had committed him cited him to appear to answer the charge of contempt of court, and sentenced him to pay a fine of \$200 or serve 100 days in jail. The judge accepted the plea that no disrespect for him personally had been intended, but explained that contempt of court was not an offence against the person of the judge, but against the government, because it is an unlawful interference with the orderly administration of justice by the tribunals created for that purpose. In this case the reporter, by deceit, had caused the machinery of justice to be set in motion, involving considerable public expense, and when brought before the court acted in a disorderly and insolent manner to induce the court to make an improper and illegal order. The judge proceeded to express these views that the journalistic criminal ought to be treated more leniently than one not in "the profession."

"Possibly from the standpoint of a reporter, such conduct may seem right and proper. It is possible even that in some quarters an attempt to deceive a court of justice, and by deceit to procure an improper and illegal order—an order involving the expenditure of considerable public money, and resulting in sending a sane man to an asylum—may be looked upon as a legitimate journalistic enterprise. I hardly think, however, that, upon sober second thought, any citizen would so regard it. One who embarks upon such an enterprise—an enterprise which involves a violation of law, an enterprise which involves the commission of a public offence—must abide the consequence."  
—New York *Evening Post*.