

CORRESPONDENCE.

two other professional men, and three (at least) so called "conveyancers." Since coming here I have invariably charged three dollars for drawing an ordinary deed or mortgage. Not an outrageous charge you will admit. Our so called "conveyancers" charge \$1.50 for the same work. What is the consequence. The Registrar informs me that any one of these "conveyancers" draws in a year more conveyances than the three of us professional men put together. Now then, I think it is about time a stop was put to this. How? you will ask. My answer is, By doing the work for the same money. But some one replies. "By doing so, you lower the dignity of the profession." And here is where my difficulty arises. For nine years I have endeavoured to uphold the dignity of the profession at a great loss to myself, and the consequence has been that, instead of the profession being more dignified, it has suffered in reputation and dignity by its members being charged with a desire to collect more for their work than others are willing to do it for.

Of course we are well acquainted with the common charge made against these "Conveyancers" that their mistakes lead to a great deal of litigation. I very much doubt that the profession make more than they lose in this way. The special conveyancing in the country forms but a very slight proportion of the conveyancing done.

Now, sir, if you think this letter will do any good I would like you to publish it and if not I would like you to give me your views on the propriety of taking the bold step I have pointed out. By doing so you will much oblige,

Yours, &c.,

AN OLD SUBSCRIBER.

[This opens up a subject of a good deal of practical difficulty. It is one not felt to any appreciable degree in large cities. But the evil spoken of is well known in all country places. We feel some hesitation in expressing an opinion on the point. Men in other professions, physicians for example, have obtained from the Legislature a very stringent measure which practically gives a monopoly of all business in their line to re-

gistered practitioners. We see no difference in principle between their position and that of the legal fraternity. There is, however, a practical difference in this, that there is a large liberality of thought amongst the latter, and the reverse amongst the former. It would seem that Doctors, Registrars, Sheriffs and Official Assignees, can succeed in "lobbying" through the Legislature any measure which tends to their own advancement. Lawyers, however, devote their energies more to the interests of their clients than to their own and they do not seem to possess that cohesiveness which would be necessary to ensure success, were they to attempt similar legislation on their own behalf. This is a matter which in our opinion should engage the attention of the Attorney-General for Ontario, at the coming Session of the Local Legislature. There are lawyers enough in the House to carry some protective measure to the profession, even were it a less evidently just thing than in truth it is.

As to the propriety of taking the step suggested by our correspondent, we shall speak further hereafter. In the meantime, we shall be glad to hear the opinions of some of our subscribers, to whom the subject is one of considerable interest.]

ERRATUM.—An error crept into the letter from a correspondent signed "D. E. T." on the subject of composition and discharge published last month, the word "confirmation" being used instead of "consideration."

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

The following is a new way of answering an old question.

At an examination for admission to the bar, the question was asked. "What is the rule in Shelley's case?" One of the class answered: "The rule in Shelley's case is the same as in any other man's case. The law is no respecter of persons." We trust the possessor of the well-balanced mind that conceived this answer was promptly admitted.