

“Il résulte bien clairement de ce qui précède que le secret professionnel existe en faveur du client, et non en faveur de l’avocat.

“C’est la même doctrine qui existe en Angleterre.

“*Starkie—Law of evidence, Vol 2, p. 229 Ed. 2ème* s’exprime comme suit à ce sujet :

“The rule that a counsel solicitor or attorney, shall not be permitted to divulge any matter which has been communicated to him in professional confidence, has already been adverted to as one that is founded on the most obvious principles of convenience. This is the privilege of the client, and is founded on the policy of the law which will not permit a person to betray a secret which the law has intrusted to him. To allow such an examination would be a manifest hindrance to all society, commerce and conversation.”

“Dans une cause dont j’aurai l’occasion de parler au long dans un instant, *The Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company vs Quick (L. R. 3 Q. B. D. p. 315)*, le juge Cotton s’exprimait comme suit :

“Laymen (by which I mean persons not learned in the law) cannot be expected to conduct their defence or litigation without the assistance of professional advisers; and, for the purpose of having the litigation conducted properly, the law has said that communications between the client and the solicitor shall be privileged . . . There must be the freest possible communication between solicitor and client, and it is on this ground that professional communications are entitled to privilege, which excepts them from the general rule.”

“Dans une autre cause de *Anderson vs Bank of British Columbia (L.R. 2 C. D. p. 644)*, le Master of the Rolls enseigne la même doctrine :