

held that the transaction was void by reason of the plaintiff not having had independent advice. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Macnaghten, Collins and Shaw, and Sir A. Wilson) affirmed the judgment, but on different grounds, their Lordships dissent from *Cox v. Adams*, so far as it affirms that no transaction between husband and wife for the husband's benefit, can be upheld unless it is shewn that the wife had independent advice: but, on the facts, they came to the conclusion that notwithstanding the plaintiff admitted that she knew what she was doing and intended to benefit her husband, yet their Lordships considered she was in fact unduly influenced to enter into the transaction, which was manifestly improvident; and her husband's solicitor having acted in the transaction, and having failed to warn her against what she was doing, it was held that the bank was affected because the husband's solicitor was also acting as solicitor for the bank, and their Lordships held that it was the duty of the solicitor in the circumstances to put before the wife plainly and explicitly the effect of what she was doing, and if she had, as she probably would have done, rejected his intervention, he ought then to have gone to the husband and insisted on the wife being separately advised; and if that was impossible, owing to the implicit confidence placed by the wife in her husband, he should have retired from the business altogether.

Correspondence

UNLICENSED CONVEYANCERS.

DEAR SIR,—Knowing your solicitude for the interests of country practitioners I venture to call your attention to the following case in the hope that you may be able to suggest a remedy.

I enclose the advertising card of a leading real estate and insurance agent of this town and samples of advertisements for creditors in Surrogate matters. This man travels about the country a great deal, and, in the course of his business, solicits people to let him draw their wills. The inducement he holds out is that it costs them only a trifle and that his long experience has qualified him to do the work as well as any lawyer.

Having possession of the will, when the testator dies he undertakes to probate it and wind up the estate. Instead of handing