have been passed to put an end, if possible, to such disgraceful practices. It is well then in Ontario to repress the beginnings of anything savouring of this kind of illicit procedure. To this end, I think that the circumstances of the case should be investigated and dealt with by the Law Society upon notice to the solicitor.

The plea is put forward that this client was badly injured and without means or friends to conduct litigation in the usual way. Granted that it was a case of charity and one proper to be brought into Court. The solicitor might well have undertaken the case as a matter of professional benefaction and have acted honourably and creditably. . . If he could only intervene on the terms of sharing in the verdict, then, so far, from being of charitable import, he would implicate his client in a criminal transaction.

The true method of dealing with impoverished clients is laid down by Lord Russell of Killowen in a charge to the jury in Ladd v. London, etc., R. Co. (March, 1900), 110 L. T. Jo. 80, . . . approved by the Court of Appeal in Rich v. Cork, ib. 94.

With a view of inviting professional or legislative action which might tend to meet the recognized difficulty of injuries and wrong suffered by poor and helpless people, I may refer to a suggestion long ago made by Mr. Joseph Chitty, which has not, I think, as yet fully fructified in any practical outcome. He says: "Perhaps a power, by leave of a Judge, to permit an attorney to stipulate for remuneration in difficult and doubtful cases might safely be introduced; such a stipulation would prevent the hard bargains which are secretly made in consequence of the risk incurred, and constitute a protection to needy persons who have claims which they wish to assert, and yet are not so impoverished as to be able to sue in forma pauperis. Such a power might be so qualified as to prevent any risk of maintenance or champerty:" Chitty's Practice of the Law, vol. 2, p. 28.

The second item, $200, is disposed of on the principle enunciated by the late Vice-Chancellor Mowat in Re Geddes and Wilson, 2 Ch. Ch. 477. It is not open for a solicitor during the progress of a case to call upon his client to pay a round sum or any sum (other than for costs) before he will go on. It is a sort of stand-and-deliver outrage which the Court will not sanction or allow to stand, when once attention is called to it. The solicitor must account for