

*District Property Company Limited* (86 L.T. Rep. 4), "manifestly erroneous to read 'adjoining' in a legal instrument as having the same meaning as 'adjacent' unless . . . there is some special reason to the contrary in the circumstances of the case." That was the foundation of the decisions of judges of courts of first instance in several cases that are cited in our article. In each there was some special reason to the contrary. It is, indeed, the inherent objection to the word that the meaning to be ascribed to it must largely depend upon the circumstances of each particular case. On that very ground, Mr. Justice Phillimore in the present case attributed to the word its wider meaning, holding that it was sufficient to cover all the shops in a terrace, and not only those immediately adjoining the plaintiff's premises on either side. That a word which is in any degree likely to occasion doubt or difficulty should be consigned to oblivion by lawyers is a self-evident proposition. All the more when the absolute certainty of its so doing is demonstrated to the fullest extent.

—*Law Times.*

---

LAWYERS SOLICITING BUSINESS.—A correspondent of the *Law Notes* (a coloured man) takes exception to Law Associations condemning the above practice. He puts the matter in a new light. We give his argument in his own words: "All attorneys are officers of the courts. The laws are rules prescribing what to do, and what not to do. If this is true all business ought to be done in accordance with the laws. If then a lawyer is an officer of the courts, it is his duty to see to it, that this is done. If so, how can he except he tell the people, what the laws are; and how they business stand in accordance with the laws? A lawyer ought not stureup strife for money: But if telling a purson what the law is, sture up strife let it come, the lawyer has don his duty. It is as much a lawyer duty to tell he people what the laws is; as it is for a teach to tell a child what a book is made for. A preacher to tell the world what Hell is made for. When a purson is doing his duty he ought not be condemned by any one. Therefore I differ from these Associations.