

and I do not think it has any warrant in our law. Had this occurred in France I suppose Frenchmen would have said that the age of Louis Quatorze and the practice of lettres de cachet had returned."

Strong words, but expressions of opinion which will be generally approved.

The same writer in speaking on another matter closely allied with the proposition in *Scott v. Scott*, expresses the hope that no extension of trials in camera in criminal cases will be admitted. He says, "Our view is that the interests of justice are best served by legal proceedings in all courts being conducted in open court. Clearly the general publication of indecent details should be sternly suppressed, and power might well be given to exclude persons of tender years on the hearing of cases dealing with matters contrary to decency or morality. A full public hearing ensures the proper administration of justice."

SOVEREIGNTY OVER THE AIR.

Sir H. Erle Richards's public lecture on "Sovereignty over the Air" (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 27 pp., 1s. 6d.) is an opportune exposition of what may fairly be called the Common Law point of view. Continental jurists for the most part (not all, for Prof. Zitelmann at any rate goes with us, see the note ad fin.) assume that there is some objection in principle to allowing territorial sovereignty to extend upwards. They postulate an analogy between the air and the high seas which, as our learned colleague rightly notes, might be correct if the bottom of the sea were inhabited. At the same time, they contradict the analogy of municipal law, so far as existing and applicable. Sir H. Erle Richards's points are, in summary abridgment, as follows:

International law gives no support to the doctrine of "free air." States have exactly the same ground—namely, self-protection—for claiming sovereignty over the superjacent air as for claiming it over adjacent territorial waters. Nor can any