

unless on legal evidence, and with all the forms which have been devised for the security of life and liberty. As former Chief Justice Sharswood of Pennsylvania has wisely said: "These are the panoply of innocence, when unjustly arraigned; and guilt cannot be deprived of it, without removing it from innocence." To conduct his defence in accordance with the forms of law, a prisoner, no matter how guilty, is entitled to the benefit of counsel, and moreover, if he cannot procure counsel the law will assign him counsel and force the latter to act under pain of punishment for contempt if he fails to discharge his duties properly. It can therefore not be improper or unethical for an attorney to do what the law can oblige him to do, and this principle is embodied in the codes of professional ethics adopted by many states which provide that "an attorney cannot reject [or is not bound to reject] the defence of a person accused of a criminal offence, because he knows or believes him guilty. It is his duty by all fair and honourable [or lawful] means to present such defence as the law of the land permits, to the end that no one may be deprived of life or liberty, but by due process of law."—*Law Notes*.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY.

Whatever excuses there may have been during the early stages of the war, on the grounds of ignorance or uncertainty, for committing the serious offence of trading or attempting to trade with the enemy, the sooner the truth is brought home to those who place pocket before patriotism the better. The infliction of fines alone for this breach of the law, owing to the lucrative nature of the business, is useless, and a sharp sentence of imprisonment, in addition to a heavy fine, is the only method of bringing home their position to those who are incapable of realizing their duty as citizens.