

LAW SOCIETY—SELECTIONS.

The Secretary submitted the list of solicitors who have taken out their annual certificates pursuant to the standing order.

Mr. Moss, seconded by Mr. Smith, moved pursuant to notice—That the Secretary be directed to draw the attention of the Judges and Junior Judges of the County Courts to the practice under the Division Courts' Act, 43 Vict. Cap. 8, sect. 16, of allowing counsel fees to agents, not being barristers or solicitors, appearing before the Judges in Division Court causes, and to represent to them that the allowance of such fees to such agents is very injurious to members of the profession, and to request their consideration of the question whether it is desirable that they should in any case exercise the discretion vested in them in favour of agents not being barristers or solicitors.

The motion was carried.

Mr. Read, Q.C., seconded by Mr. Moss, Q.C., moved that—The Benchers of the Law Society in Convocation in affectionate remembrance of Kenneth Mackenzie, Esq., Q.C., who, before his appointment to the position of Judge of the County of York, was for several years Bencher of this Society, place on record on the minutes of Convocation this expression of their feelings of regard for him during his life-time, of regret at his demise, and of condolence and sympathy with his widow and family in their bereavement.

Ordered that the Secretary be directed to send a copy of the above resolution to Mrs. Mackenzie. Carried unanimously.

Signed, JAMES MACLENNAN,
Chairman.

Convocation adjourned.

Friday, 16th February.

Present — Messrs. Crickmore, Hudspeth, Smith, Ferguson, Foy, Britton, Leith, Maclellan, Mackelcan, Moss, Hoskin, Murray, S. H. Blake, Read. Mr. Maclellan in the chair.

Mr. Hoskin, from the Discipline Committee, reported that a *prima facie* case is shown against two solicitors upon the charges made by Mr. Grace, and recommended that the charges be enquired into.

The report was received, ordered for immediate consideration, and adopted.

The petition of Mr. Grace was referred to the Discipline Committee for enquiry.

Convocation proceeded to consider the report of the same Committee in the case of Zebulon Landon against a barrister, which stood over for consideration until to-day.

Mr. Hoskin, seconded by Mr. Leith, moved the adoption of the report.

The report was adopted.

Mr. Hoskin moved that a copy of the report be transmitted both to the complainant and to the barrister in question, by the secretary.

Mr. Hudspeth seconded the motion, which was carried.

Mr. H. C. R. Becher was unanimously elected a Bencher in the place of Mr. Glass resigned.

Mr. Murray gave notice that he would on the first day of Easter Term next, move that the examination of Mr. William Clive Atkinson be allowed to stand as passed, and that a certificate be issued to him in said Easter Term next.

On the motion of Mr. Maclellan it was ordered that Mr. Harman be paid the sum of one hundred dollars for the preparation of the index to volume six of the Appeal Reports, in pursuance of the order of Convocation made last term.

Convocation adjourned.

SELECTIONS.

Hull v. Bartlett is a recent decision of the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors, illustrating the rights and duties of an officer charged with the service of legal process in a civil proceeding. The facts were as follows: The defendant Bartlett, at the time, was deputy sheriff; a lawful writ of summons had been placed in his hands to be served on Mrs. Hull, who knowing that service was about to be made upon her, fled from town to town, and hid herself in many ways and places, resorting to extraordinary expedients and subterfuges to elude the officer. At last the defendant traced her, as he believed to the house of one Veits, where, upon inquiry, he was told that she had left in the morning. Permission to search was for a time denied, but afterwards granted; but she was not found in the house. Finally the door of a small outbuilding was discovered fastened. But no response could be obtained from any person within, after repeated calls. At last the defendant (having first obtained permission of the owner for that purpose) forced the door, and found a woman lying on the floor, with her head and face closely wrapped to prevent identification. The defendant repeatedly requested her to uncover her face in order that he might know who she was, stating his business. But after waiting long, she still kept her position and the covering over her face. He then, as gently as possible, raised her up and uncovered her face for the mere purpose of identifying her, that he might complete the service and make truthful return upon the writ.

"Under the circumstances of this case," the court proceeded to say, after stating these facts, "will the law justify an act on the part of the officer which would otherwise constitute an assault and battery? It was the