

IN reference to the doctrine of *ejusdem generis* recently discussed in these pages, a learned correspondent has obligingly furnished us with a note of two cases bearing upon the matter to which we think it desirable to draw the attention of our readers, because they are very liable to escape attention. The first is *Warnock v. Kloeffler*, 15 Ont. App. 324, which, owing to the fact that it does not appear in the digest under any heading indicating that it deals with the doctrine in question, might very easily be overlooked; and the other case is *Re Phoenix Bessemer Co.*, 44 L.J. Ch. 683, 685, which is not to be found in the regular reports. Our readers will kindly correct an error which occurred on p. 188, line 27, by reading "they were" instead of "it did."

THE PROFESSION AND THE PUBLIC.

IT is not necessary to remind our readers that there is a necessity that the interests of the liberal professions should, in these democratic days, be conserved, and the standards of efficiency maintained, not merely for the benefit of the members of these professions themselves, but also, and more particularly, for the benefit of the public. The recent session of the Ontario Legislature has shown that the spirit which is abroad will, if not checked, prove disastrous to the best interests of the country. The object of attack this time was the Medical Act; those who made it seeking to open unduly wide the gates of the medical profession. The determined onslaught on this body by the new political party known as "the Patrons" was defeated by a wise combination of the two great parties, for which they are much to be commended. It was expected that there would be a somewhat similar attack made upon the legal profession, but this seems to have been headed off by the Attorney-General bringing in a measure which, as it adopted some of the suggested changes, was apparently considered a sufficient "sop for Cerberus," at least for the time being.

It is necessary to look this matter in the face. The members of the legal fraternity have never united for mutual protection to the extent that their medical brethren have. If the safeguards and privileges of the latter are necessary for the protection of the public, equally so are those of the former. Nothing could be