

THE LAW'S DELAY.

Our attention has been called to a *cause célèbre*—another case of *Jarndyce v. Jarndyce*—in one of the Maritime Provinces, which has given rise to a good deal of comment in the local press, and that of no very favourable nature. It is not our custom, as a general rule, to comment on any particular case that comes before the courts, unless some principle is involved, or that the case is one that calls for interference, owing to the rights of suitors being, apparently, neglected or denied. Such a case this one appears to be.

From the local newspapers, which have from time to time devoted considerable space to the facts and proceedings in the case, we gather that in January, 1883, a wine merchant in St. John, New Brunswick, died, leaving a large estate, both real and personal; his family consisting of four daughters only. By his will he appointed his brother-in-law, one James McGregor Grant (uncle of his children), his widow, and another person, executors and trustees. His widow died the year following, when, after some delay, Ronald, a son of the uncle, a young man of twenty-one years, was appointed in her place, the *cestuis que trustent* supposing that, being their cousin, he would prove desirable. His father stated, too, that, as he was a lawyer, he would be able to do certain work for which legal expenses had been previously incurred. Shortly after, this young man was, at his father's suggestion, appointed agent of the estate at a salary of \$1,500 a year, though the person previously acting as such had received but \$1,000.

It having come to the knowledge of the *cestuis que trustent* that at the passing of the executors' and trustees' accounts in May, 1890, a sum of over \$350 was charged by another son of the senior trustee, as commission on collection of rent and interest, and that the expenses of management for the previous year had amounted to nearly \$5,000, exclusive of an annuity of \$400 to their uncle as managing trustee, they began to agitate for a change in the trusteeship. Their uncle not acceding to their wishes, they, under legal advice, on the 17th of September, 1890 (this date should be borne in mind), presented a petition to the judge in equity to have both these trustees, father and son, removed, they refusing to resign the position.

At the hearing of this petition, a letter was read in open