

reported on another page, which threatens to augment the difficulties, already somewhat formidable, that surround newspaper publishers. The Judge holds in effect that the publisher of a newspaper may, in an action for libel, be summoned in any district where a copy of the paper containing the alleged libel circulates. Thus, publishers in Montreal may be called to defend themselves in Gaspe, provided a copy is proved to have been sold in that district, or to have been received by a subscriber therein. So, we presume, the publisher of a journal, the office of publication of which is in Ontario, Manitoba or British Columbia, may be sued in any district of the Province of Quebec to which a copy of the journal may happen to find its way.

THE PARLIAMENTS OF FRANCE.

(Concluded from page 126.)

The number of judges necessary to pronounce a sentence varied in the different courts. In criminal cases, a majority of two was required to convict; in civil suits, a majority of one or two was required. The vote of every member of Parliament was of equal weight. The counsellors, as their name implies, had been originally advisers of the court, when it was composed of barons or officers of State not versed in legal lore. By the gradual process often seen, the adviser had acquired the nominal as well as the actual authority. The Parliament of Saint Louis seems to have consisted of twenty-four members,—three great barons, three bishops, and eighteen knights,—with whom were associated thirty-seven clerks, lay or religious, to draw up their decrees. The peers of France preferred fighting for the Holy Land to hearing long speaking claimants and hair-splitting advocates. It was not pleasant for a great baron, longing for a deer-hunt or an opportunity to break spears in a tournament, to listen to some wearisome trial, only finally to make himself the bewildered mouthpiece of some black-gowned student of Bologna, who did not know the first rules of the noble science of ventry, who was ignorant alike of the joyous art of the troubadour and of the weight of a coat of mail. The baron went slaying the Saracen, and the clerks became actual members of the great court of Parliament. The office of president was superior to that of counsellor in

dignity and emolument, but was of no greater weight in the decisions of the court.

Early regulations ordinarily present many of the features of paternal government. The faults and duties of judges were sharply looked to in the earlier days of Parliament. The ordinance of 1318 forbids the members of Parliament eating or drinking with parties who had suits before them. They were furthermore enjoined to attend the sessions, and not to leave their seats more than once in the morning. "It is a great disgrace," says the ordinance, "that while the court is in session, its members should be walking and frolicking about the halls of the palace." Age, weight, and gout, in our days, probably exert a more efficacious restraint in this respect than the admonitions of kings on beardless judges.

Despite strict instructions, perfect attention was not obtained. President de Harley remarked once, that, if the gentlemen of the court who talked would make no more noise than those who slept, it would be a great favor to those who listened. In 1681, the Chancellor Letellier informs some of the judges that the king has observed that they go to the palace with cravats, grey clothes, and with canes in their hands; and he directs them to assume a more dignified toilet. The *procureur général* of the Parliament of Rouen—an officer of enormous authority, and having a certain advisory power with the court—informs the judges that, although the gown does not make the monk, still judges ought not to clip their hair and wear beards. In 1347, the dauphin Charles forbid all magistrates having anything to do with commerce; and he also rates them for their idleness, and for the amount of time that they waste at their dinners. The judges of the present day may dine unreproved; but, if the statement be correct that advocates in France have been forbidden to plead with mustaches, the tendencies of the French mind seem unchanged.

The sessions of the court were held at early hours. The great chamber met on Mondays, Thursdays, and Fridays, at six in the morning, and continued until ten. During Lent, they sat an hour longer, for convenience of attending the sermon. From six to seven reports were made. The argument of cases began at seven, and continued until the judges adjourned for refreshments. At half-past eight, they met again