

The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXVIII.

JANUARY 16, 1892.

No. 1.

WE learn that when the report of the Committee on Unlicensed Conveyancers was submitted to Convocation at its last half-yearly meeting, the chairman presented, at the same time, a number of resolutions received from various law associations, and letters received from members of the profession throughout the Province, the general tenor of which was a strong protest against the existing state of affairs; but the proposed remedies, where any were suggested, widely differed. It also appeared that many members of the profession considered that the adoption of the committee's report might give these conveyancers a status that they do not now possess, and that it was questionable whether this would be of any actual advantage to the profession or give the relief that is sought. The members of the committee present on the occasion referred to, believing that none of the suggestions received by the committee were practicable, requested that the discussion of the report might stand over until the last day of next term, when it is thought that some disposition of it will be made. The matter is one of much more difficulty than is generally supposed by the profession; and Convocation, while fully alive to its importance, especially to country practitioners, is, in the interest of the profession, compelled to move slowly, and to consider some aspects of the question that probably have not occurred to many members of the profession, before whose notice the subject in its various bearings has not been brought.

WHEN we read such cases as *Pollard v. Harragin*, 65 L.T. N.S. 4, we are apt to think that it is a very fortunate thing for the colonial subjects of Her Majesty that an appeal lies from all colonial courts to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In the calm and dispassionate atmosphere of that tribunal, litigants have often to seek for that justice which every colonial court open to them persistently denies. In the same way we sometimes feel the benefit of our own Supreme Court where judges are free from local influences and prejudices, which, unknown to themselves, often warp the better judgment of judges in Provincial Courts.

The plaintiff in this action was a member of the bar, and his action was brought against a stipendiary magistrate of Trinidad to recover damages for wrongful arrest. The cause of action arose out of a prosecution in which the plaintiff was professionally engaged before the defendant. While the plaintiff was in the middle of the cross-examination of an important witness, the defendant, without any explanation, adjourned the court. The plaintiff protested, and