

guilty of wrong. Equity does not adjust the differences between rogues. The complainant is first judged, and not until he has been found free from taint does equity proceed to determine whether or not he has been wronged. The injunction should not have been granted. The judgment is reversed and a new trial granted, with costs to the appellant to abide the event."

THE CRIME OF PERJURY.

That the crime of perjury is much in evidence, and apparently on the increase, has been asserted and is probably correct. Articles many have been written on the subject in legal journals, calling attention to the evil. The Bench declaims against it, but nothing is done. Suggestions are not wanting. One is that if lawyers would discountenance false swearing on the part of their own clients and ask for judicial protection when committed by their adversaries, the crime would at once grow less. Others say that justice should be meted out to false witnesses by summary action on the part of the presiding judge, one writer saying, "the perjurer would no more dare to come forward in our Courts than in the English Courts, if he knew that our trial judges were in the habit of committing perjurers on the spot, nor would any lawyer produce an obvious perjurer if he knew that to do so would mean his disbarment." He continues by saying that "the chief responsibility for perjury in the Courts is with the trial judges themselves, because they have the power to stop it, and do not."

It is much easier to dilate upon an evil than to suggest a remedy, for the difficulties attendant upon this question are many, and need not at present be enlarged upon. Must it be left to the advancement of civilization and the supposed growing morality of the world in the future, as to which it clearly must stand till the millenium; or are the judges to take a hand in, running the risk of doing an occasional act of injustice for the benefit of the community? The law is clear enough, the application of it is the difficulty.