

The bomb so dropped in this legal camp was no "dud." It burst and with full effect. The taxing master upheld the objection, and the solicitor who refused to lend £12 12s. 0d. to a professional brother was amply punished.

The curious may find the authority for the proposition relied on in Halsbury's Laws of England, vol. 26, p. 720, where it says: "The successful party to any litigation cannot recover any costs or disbursements from the opposite party if the solicitor acting for him was uncertificated, although the actual steps taken by the solicitor on his client's behalf are not invalid."

Temple, Oct. 19, 1916.

W. VALENTINE BALL.

At a hearing before a Commissioner appointed under a Commission to investigate certain alleged offences in the Province of Manitoba, the Commissioner, who happened to be a Judge of the Supreme Court of that Province, committed some witnesses for contempt of court for statements published in certain newspapers. In this he clearly exceeded his jurisdiction. It is old law that only a Judge who is a Judge of a court of Record has power to commit for contempt of court unless such power is given by statute. Certainly a Commissioner who is not sitting as a Judge and who is not holding a court cannot have any such power except under legislative authority, which was not given, it is said, in this case. We are not surprised, therefore, to hear that these prisoners were subsequently discharged from custody on the ground that the Commissioner had no such jurisdiction as claimed by him. This objectionable practice of appointing Judges to hold commissions of a general character and taking them away from their proper sphere of duty is not one to be commended, and is a parent of many harmful results.