

to be the view of the large majority of the profession, is that both the solicitor and counsel should be well paid for the services they render, but that no needless costs should be incurred so far as rules of practice can reach this evil.

Yours, etc.,

W. H. McCLIVE.

---

### Notes and Selections.

---

A WHIPPING-POST BILL.—We entirely concur with the writer of the following article taken from the *American Law Review*: "A bill to re-establish flogging as a punishment for certain offences has been introduced in the legislature of New York and defeated, though a respectable vote favoured it. The *New York Law Journal* argues against it, but its arguments do not seem to us conclusive. We have passed into the age of drivel in government, in literature, and in many other respects; and one of the instances of that decadence was the abolition of the whipping-post. There are certain criminals and certain crimes for which physical pain will afford the only adequate punishment and the only certain deterrent. The whipping-post ought to be administered to a man that maltreats his wife or his child, or that inflicts wanton and cruel pain upon man or beast, or that is guilty of any degrading or loathsome offence. The whipping-post should be applied to that class of prisoners to whom imprisonment is not a terror, but a coveted asylum. We have tried for some fifty years to get along without the whipping-post, and public opinion has been steadily turning in favour of it in view of our experience of trying to do without it. The same is true in countries where capital punishment has been abolished. Besides, the whipping-post has the advantage of public economy. It costs money to feed a criminal while he is in the county jail, and honest people have to bear the expense; but it costs very little to give such a wretch a good flogging and let him go."