

to-day the interest of the legal profession is for a relentless and aggressive crushing out of those who bring disgrace and distrust for their calling. There cannot be such a thing as giving another trial. The good reputation of the whole Bar being at stake, consideration for the individual would be a wrong to the whole body. The Bar cannot continue to have as one of its members a detected culprit. In our country we have but little ungowning, and that has been generally for using clients' money. What are often of equal importance, however, are the dishonourable and ungentlemanly acts, which unfortunately obtain to some extent everywhere; but which are not generally regarded as serious enough to provoke investigation by the governing authorities. Now and again, however, an example is made of some of the more grievous offenders, and no doubt such prosecutions have a good effect on many with unprofessional tendencies. From the distant colony of Australia comes the account of a peculiar case, where the question of unprofessional conduct in its purest form has arisen. The junior member of a law firm defended a gentleman accused of attempting to kill his wife by slow poison. A conviction resulted, and as there were some grave doubts generally prevailing as to the prisoner's guilt, the senior

member of the firm, who was a member of the Local Legislature, proposed to bring the case before that body. His partner gave him to understand that there had been a miscarriage of justice, and that the prisoner protested his innocence. Not satisfied with this, however, the junior was prevailed upon to go to the jail and get an unequivocal account as to the fact. When he went to the jail, however, the prisoner confessed his entire guilt. Instead of making his senior aware of this, we find that the junior member gave an wholly false account of the interview, and urged that the matter be brought before the Legislature. This was done accordingly, and a Royal Commission issued to investigate the whole case. In the course of this investigation the fact of the confession was revealed. Proceedings were then instituted to have the junior partner struck off the roll of solicitors for New South Wales. In a careful and elaborate judgment, the Court, composed of Chief Justice Darley, and Judges Stephen and Owen, on the first June decided that, though it was a painful duty, yet they owed it to the public, that the solicitor's name should no longer remain on the Roll as an accredited practitioner. There will be a general agreement of feeling, that the decision is sound. Gentlemen of an honoured profession must