

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*Ex. gr.* At p. 224 "One of your Readers" states that "We, as a Bar, almost without exception, concur in the main point of the judgment" on the constitutional questions in the *Thrasher Case*. The fact is the reverse, as your correspondent must have known if he had really been, as his letter implies, a practitioner. Then, towards the close of his communication, he says that this constitutional judgment is now, he hears, under appeal; whereas the fact is that no such appeal has been attempted—perhaps because neither party had any interest in prosecuting it, perhaps because no appeal lies.

I observe that you now announce, (p. 314), "on what (you) consider good authority, that some of the chief and more influential Q.C.s in England, after studying with care the judgment . . . have given their opinion that the B. C. judges have satisfactorily made out that the Supreme Court of British Columbia is a Dominion and not a Provincial Court within the B. N. A. Act 1867, s. 92, par. 14." Assuming that you have not been misinformed upon this point, as you certainly have been upon several others, I respectfully submit that the announcement is worthless unless you give the names of the learned counsel and their opinions in full.

In the interests of truth and justice you will, I am confident, give the same publicity to this communication as to those to which it refers.

VERAX.

Victoria, Oct. 7th, 1882.

[WE have not the slightest hesitation in publishing the above. Our correspondent will, however, oblige by giving "particulars" under the first count of his indictment. Those that he gives are not sufficient to maintain it. As to the first point, we are glad, if the writer of the letter referred to by our correspondent was mistaken, to have the mistake corrected. As to the second, we did not speak of our own knowledge, but simply related an *ou dit*. It is quite possible that opinions have been given both ways. However, as the "announcement is worthless," there is, of course, an end of the matter. The best thing our correspondent can do is to send us a letter occasionally on British Columbia legal news. We are anxious to give all the information we can, and will find space for any well considered suggestions or temperately expressed sentiments.—EDS. L. J.]

*Unlicensed Conveyancers.*

To the Editor of the LAW JOURNAL.

SIR.—It may seem to you and to some of your readers that this question is almost exhausted? But I am of opinion that it is only by continuous and persistent agitation that country lawyers will ever obtain justice. In the village where I am trying to make a living there is one other practising barrister and four so-called conveyancers. The charge we make for drawing a deed and searching title is \$3.00 in ordinary cases—not a very extravagant rate, you will say, when compared with city offices. Our adversaries will undertake the work for \$1.00, and tell the unfortunates who patronize them that there is no need in any case to investigate the title. The result is that while regular practitioners are straining to keep body and soul together, these sharks get all the work, which makes a very nice addition to land surveying, insurance, Division Court clerkship, etc. Where is the justice in making us pay exorbitant fees, hedging us in by inexorable rules of professional etiquette, and when our hands are thus tied allowing these men to rob our children of their food.

You are probably aware, Sir, that shortly before the last election for Benchers a circular, addressed particularly to the country members of the profession, was sent out asking for opinions on this question, and stating that it was the intention of the Benchers to move in the matter. But what did they do? No sooner were they elected than it was moved in the next term that it was very inexpedient to do anything in the premises. Inexpedient for whom? Toronto men and cowards who sit in the House of Legislature. What was that circular but a bribe to catch the vote of the long-suffering country lawyer; unworthy of the authors of it when not followed by something like an attempt to carry out its proposals. The Benchers are not alone to blame, the cowardice of the Government stands as much in the way as the inaction of our representatives.

I for one will not sit quietly under the wrong. This is the last year in which I shall pay fees to a society from which I derive no benefit. After that I shall make all the money I can by every means available. If I must compete against men protected by the law and the Law Society, I want a fair field and no favour—let me cut the cords that tie me hand and foot.