The Legal News.

Vol. VII. OCTOBER 25, 1884. No. 43.

THE BOUNDARY QUESTION.

When an accomplished disputant and a practised writer, like Sir Francis Hincks, fills nearly a column and a half of a daily paper in the endeavour to answer an article on a subject he perfectly understands, without adding a single idea to the controversy, we may surmise two things:—first, that the article requires an answer; second, that there is none to give.

The intention of the writer of these lines is not to play into the hands of those opposed to his views by swelling the amazing mass of literature under which the simple question of the western boundary of Ontario has been obscured. Also, it may save Sir Francis a great deal of unnecessary trouble if he will at once believe that I am constitutionally not very sensitive to banter, and that the antiquated form of sarcasm he has adopted is scarcely calculated to disturb the equanimity of one much more susceptible than I am. What is said may be of some importance in argument, it can scarcely be important who says it, so it matters not whether I am a "legal luminary" or not. The question is, whether I am right. Beyond that question I do not intend to be decoyed. The due north line is a definite pretension, and it is entirely based on the Act of 1774. When Sir Francis Hincks has made up his mind as to what is the title of Ontario to anything west of that line, we shall be glad to have it stated, if possible, in a condensed form, and in technical language. If, on the other hand, the award of Sir Francis and his colleagues can only be justified on the convenience of having a natural boundary, and on its economy by saving the costs of survey, as he seems now to intimate is the case, then we are not at issue on any point in which I take an interest, and I must remain convinced, as I have always been, that the award was as unfair as it was illegal.

R.

STATUS OF COLONIAL QUEEN'S COUNSEL.

The *Law Journal* (London), referring to the opinion given by Sir Henry James (*ante*, p. 321), says:—"The Attorney-General has expressed an opinion in reference to the *Boundary Case* recently heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that there is no reason why equal rank should not be given to Her Majesty's Counsel in the Colonies with Her Majesty's Counsel in England in Privy Council cases. In the case in question, Mr. Scoble, Q.C., of the English bar, did, in fact, take a brief as junior to Mr. Mowat, Attorney-General of Ontario. The opinion of Mr. Reeve, the registrar, coincided with that of Sir Henry James, except that he added, 'of course, the English Attorney and Solicitor-General lead everybody.' Why so? If as between Colonial and English Queen's Counsel the senior leads, as between Colonial and English Attorneys-General the senior leads. The office of Attorney-General in England is no more or less an imperial office than the office of Queen's Counsel in England."

The same query suggested itself to us on reading the opinion of the registrar, but we concluded from the words "of course," that Mr. Reeve spoke from information not in our possession. It would certainly look rather singular if the Attorney-General of some very small and insignificant Province (no reference intended to Ontario) took precedence of the Attorney-General of England.

COLONIAL ATTORNEYS' RELIEF BILL.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies has transmitted to the Governor-General of Canada, a copy of the Imperial Act, 47 & 48 Vict. c. 24, entitled "An Act to amend the Colonial Attorneys' Relief Act." The following is the text of the Act:—

CHAPTER XXIV.

An Act to amend the Colonial Attorneys' Relief Act.

[3rd July, 1884.]

Whereas it is expedient to extend the provisions of the Colonial Attorneys' Relief Act as to certain colonies or dependencies:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most