

EDITORIAL ITEMS—CONTEMPT OF COURT; THE QUEEN V. WILKINSON.

correspondent of the same journal also says, that "a more worthless good-for-nothing work was never inflicted upon the profession." He might have made the same remark as to the Digest at the end of each volume of these reports. The compiler, if a lawyer at all, is singularly devoid of the organ of analysis. It is not given, however, to every man, even to make the simplest index, and many books, in themselves mines of learning, are in a great measure useless from incapacity on the part of the subordinate to whom the making of the index is often thoughtlessly entrusted.

THE Attorney, Solicitor, Notary Public, Conveyancer and Commissioner, (also a B. A.) whose card, published in a Paisley paper, some time ago attracted our attention, still implores the public to believe of him, that, "N.B.—All suits in Superior Courts of Law attended to with promptness" (*sic*). We really must ask our brother to be at ease in his mind. Even if he has heretofore (of which we are ignorant) been dilatory in suits in the "Superior Courts of Law,"—we are sure it must have been forgotten by this time; why perpetuate the memory? Besides, he can comfort himself with the thought that he does not seem to have been accused of want of promptness in suits in the "Superior Courts" of *Equity*. He should, however, not forget the maxim "*Expressio unius, &c.*" What about the Inferior Courts of Law, or Equity? There is a hideous silence in the advertisement on this point.

WE have seen many unprofessional advertisements, and have never failed to express a decided opinion upon them. We have also heard of attorneys advertising coals for sale; but it has remained for a firm of attorneys in a western city in Canada to aid an official assignee to

"run off at once" the stock of an insolvent, "at prices regardless of cost." Surely the attorneys in question, who are said to do a large and respectable business (to a great extent collections) are not aware that their names are appended to a printed notice, said to have been addressed to a debtor of the insolvent, which reads as follows:

"INSOLVENT ESTATE OF JERRY ROBINSON.—"London, December, 1876.—The stock of the above Insolvent is now selling at prices regardless of cost, as it must be run off at once. We find you are indebted to the above estate to the amount of \$56.59. You are requested to settle at once with Mr. D. McMonnies, at the old stand, so as to save costs, as all accounts not paid by 31st December, will be placed in court.

"Yours respectfully,

"&c., &c.,

"Attorneys."

CONTEMPT OF COURT—THE QUEEN V. WILKINSON.

We would fain make no reference to a suit which is said to bring up questions of party politics, but it would be affectation in a legal journal to ignore the judgments recently delivered in *Regina v. Wilkinson*, by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Morrison, involving as they do matters of great professional interest which it is our duty to notice.

It must always be a subject of regret, to see—as we have seen—the Court of Queen's Bench divided against itself in a matter so important on public grounds and of such vital interest to the welfare of the Bench. We must regret that on every material point the opinions of the two learned Judges were in direct opposition; and we must still say this whether we accept the judgment of the Chief Justice, powerful in its reasoning on the legal points and facts involved, and true to judicial traditions in its assertion of the majesty of the law and the dignity of Bench; or the judgment of Mr. Justice Morrison, who held—and we