

upon to exercise their jurisdiction, but cases do, unhappily, arise.

The last case, within the memory of the writer, when the Benchers had to intervene because of a dispute between counsel in court occurred some years ago. Two of His Majesty's counsel were engaged in the Lord Chief Justice's Court. During the luncheon interval, a wrangle took place as to where they should sit. The wrangle, unfortunately, developed into a kind of wrestling match. Other members of the Bar present intervened, but it was the usher of the court who saved the situation. With great presence of mind he prevented the learned Judge taking his seat until the quarrel came to an end, so there was no brawling "before the court itself." But the matter was too serious to stop there. The jurisdiction of the Benchers was involved, and as a punishment the names of the two disputants was screened in Hall for a short time. It is to the credit of the Bar of England that scenes such as this are few and far between. It may be supposed that learned counsel devote so much attention to forensic disputes that they have little energy or inclination for actual conflict with their professional brethren. Indeed, the comradery of counsel who are constantly against each other is most striking. I remember noticing—when I was a mere tyro in the profession—how two learned members of the Inner Bar who were against each other all day *coram* North, J., invariably walked home arm in arm in the evening!

Temple, August 25, 1916.

W. VALENTINE BALL.

#### MATRIMONIAL JURISDICTION.

In the recent case of *Peppiatt v. Peppiatt*, 36 O.L.R., at p. 434, the following observation is made by the learned Chief Justice of Ontario, viz.:—"If marriages without the required consent are, as is contended they are, invalid, it was unnecessary to confer jurisdiction to declare and adjudge them to be invalid as the Supreme Court had that jurisdiction vested in it by the Judicature Act."