

somewhat near the truth. According to Mr. Cunliffe's roseate picture, one would imagine that solicitors were a chivalrous class of human beings, like the Knights Errant of old, going through the world with the sole mission of befriending the wronged and oppressed, whereas we know it is nothing of the kind. The nobility of the profession does not consist in its being always on the side of right. There are quite as many solicitors on the wrong side of cases as there are on the right, and probably more—and it must necessarily be so, because it is no part of a solicitor's duty to act as judge. Whether his client is right or wrong, he is entitled to his professional advice and assistance, and it is the solicitor's duty, as far as in him lies, to present his client's case in the most favorable manner consistent with truth to the court, and to see that the law is applied to it correctly no matter whether his client be right or wrong. The honest and faithful discharge of that duty by the profession constitutes, we believe, its true title to nobility.

THE editor of the *Albany Law Journal* has the courage of his convictions and is perfectly able to hold his own against the small canine fraternity who snap and snarl at those whose instincts and thoughts belong to a sphere immeasurably above them. A question arose as to whether one who denied the existence of God should hold the position of judge. The *Albany Law Journal* said no; and its views will be found *ante p.* 462. The writer again refers to the subject in the following manner:—

"Another correspondent, who has *not* the courage to sign his name, but who hails from Chicago, abuses us roundly for saying that no man who 'is so destitute of reason as to deny the existence of God can be qualified to pronounce the law,' calls us a fool, saying we 'make him sick,' and wants to know if Huxley, Tyndall and Spencer are fools. By no means. They are very wise men, but in our opinion, they were in this matter 'destitute of reason,' and blind to evidence. There was once a celebrated advocate in this State who believed that the earth is flat, or at all events, thought that there is no evidence that it is round. If we had said that on this point he was destitute of reason, probably the anonymous Chicago infidel would have agreed with us, and would not have accused us of calling him a fool. And yet, as it seems to us and a good many other people, the evidence in favor of the existence of a supreme intelligence is infinitely stronger than that in favor of the rotundity of the earth. We have no apology to offer for our opinion. It is one which has been held by the great majority of the wisest and greatest and best men who have ever lived. We prefer to agree with Washington and Webster and Napoleon rather than with Huxley, Tyndall, and Spencer on this point. It ill becomes this person to accuse us of uttering 'contemptuous' opinions, when in the same sentence he calls us a 'fool,' and we intend no contempt of his trinity of unbelievers when we reiterate that no man is fit to be a judge who does not believe in God, however clever and fit he may be to gather scientific facts, and however adroit he may be in arranging them in support of an incredulous or know-nothing theory. Such a man lacks the moral sense essential to a judge. Such teachings lead small and weak and