

1. The evidence fails to establish the charge that Mr. Travis dismissed Cayley, the editor of the *Calgary Herald*, from the office of Clerk of the Court, from personal motives. Sufficient grounds for his removal from office seem to have existed.

2. As to the suspension of Mr. F. P. Davis from practising as a lawyer, Mr. Travis claims, that there being (at that time) no Law Society, or any other authority, to regulate the admission of barristers or advocates to practise in the Courts in the North-West Territories, a Stipendiary Magistrate had a right to say who should be allowed to practise before him. Also, that in suspending Mr. Davis he did so, because while he described himself in an affidavit and in a card published in a newspaper, as a barrister, he was not one, because his private moral character was bad, and because, in a case pending in Court, he showed himself so ignorant of law that it became necessary to protect clients and the public against him.

Mr. Travis had permitted Mr. Davis for some time to practise as a barrister or advocate, knowing, as he says he did from Mr. Davis' own statement, when the latter came to reside at Calgary, that he had not then been called to the Bar. At the time he suspended Mr. Davis from practising, he had not before him any legal evidence that Mr. Davis had not in the mean time been called to the Bar in Manitoba, or some other Province. Neither had he any legal evidence before him, that the private character of Mr. Davis was such as to render him an unfit person to practise as a barrister. The ignorance of law shown by Mr. Davis was simply that, in a case pending in Court, he paid into Court for the Defendant a larger sum than Mr. Travis thought should, under the circumstances, have been paid in, and he pleaded two pleas which Mr. Travis considered could not be pleaded together, one of which he accordingly struck out when settling the issues to be tried, under the provisions of clause 17, of the North-West Ordinance, No. 3, of 1884.

The course adopted by Mr. Travis in summarily suspending Mr. Davis, without giving him any previous notice, and not allowing him to be heard on his own behalf, was exceedingly arbitrary, and wholly unjustifiable.

There can be no doubt, on the evidence, that the true reason for suspending Mr. Davis was, that Mr. Travis suspected him to be the writer of a letter signed "Justitia," which appeared in the *Calgary Herald*.

3. As to the proceedings against Hugh S. Cayley, the editor of the *Calgary Herald*, for contempt of Court, in publishing in his newspaper certain articles reflecting upon Mr. Travis, and his administration of justice, it seems exceedingly doubtful if Mr. Travis, holding the position he did, had any jurisdiction to punish for a contempt not committed in the face of the Court. In any event, the sentence passed upon Cayley was one of extreme severity.

It is apparent from the evidence given by Mr. Travis under the Commission, that as to what constitutes contempt of Court, and as to the manner in which it should be dealt with, he entertains extreme opinions, opinions not at all in accord with the sentiments generally entertained at the present day, nor in accord with the spirit in which the law is administered throughout the Dominion.

4. As to what have been spoken of as the Town Council cases, that is, the proceedings against the mayor and councillors for corrupt practices in connection with the revision of the voters list, and the subsequent proceedings to declare void, the election of Murdock, Lindsay and Freeze,