

counsel, full of combat, and a strong man before a jury. His practice was large, and his services were sought far beyond his own county, but the more alluring and exciting arena of politics deprived the bar of his Province of an able advocate, whilst it gave to his native country a distinguished politician and leader.

Whilst Mr. Hardy's many friends will be sorry that he has felt it necessary, for a time at least, to retire from the ranks of the profession, it is hoped that the rest which he will now have, and which he has so well earned, will soon restore him to his usual vigor.

The above suggests some reflections. Mr. Hardy, feeling the infirmities resulting from the illness which has afflicted him, quietly drops into a position for which his strength is sufficient, although one of greatly less importance and responsibility than others he might naturally aspire to, but the work of which he would consider he could not satisfactorily accomplish. Such a thought on his part is much to be commended, and contrasts very favorably with the way in which we sometimes see a person in high office cling to a position for which his infirmities manifestly unfit him. Another reflection is that the offices now held by Mr. Hardy have been very properly filled by a professional man. Such, however, has not always been the case. The rule should be that offices connected with the administration of justice should be given to men in the ranks of the legal profession and not to outsiders. It surely was not in accordance with the eternal fitness of things that a baker (we believe he made very good bread) should be appointed Registrar of a Surrogate Court, or that a dry goods merchant should endeavour to master, late in life, some of the intricacies of practice in the office of the Clerk of the Crown and Pleas. There always will be those in the profession, who, from circumstances beyond their control and without any fault of their own, lose their practice; and it is only right that legal offices which they are well qualified to fill should be given to them, and not to those who are utterly incompetent to do the business entrusted to them, and are only appointed for political reasons.

There was an interesting divergence of opinion between two of the justices of the Supreme Court of North Carolina in the case of the *State v. Rhyne*, 33 S. E. Rep. 118, as to whether the lynchings