

CORRESPONDENCE.

which this individual carries on, in conjunction with his official and "conveyancing" business.

Yours, &c.,
Lex.

To the Editor of the LAW JOURNAL.

SIR,—I have read with some satisfaction the letter of "An Old Subscriber" in your issue of this month. My case is somewhat similar to your correspondent's. He has practised nine years in a country town; I have practised at least eighteen. There are two other professional men in our town, as in his; he has to contend with three conveyancers, and I, alas! with thirteen.

Lest my assertion of the number of conveyancers in full blast here should be incredible, I forward an issue of our local newspaper, in which you will find the advertisements of *seven* of them; the others as surely exist, although they do not advertise.

The leading professional men, occupying places in Parliament, principally hail from large centres. Blunders by conveyancers bring grist to their mill. The conveyances drawn in the country would never be drawn by, or be a source of revenue to, them; therefore it may, as "An old subscriber" states, be assumed that any application to the Local Legislature would be ineffectual if the object were to restrict *soi disant* conveyancers.

These gentlemen do not confine themselves to the filling up of blank forms, and receiving pay therefor; but strike out into other fields of legal labour, such as practising in Division Courts, and in the Surrogate Court. One at least attends every funeral within twenty miles; is said to hunt in couples with the tomb-stone man, whose business it is to attend on those melancholy occasions. "You will have some surrogate work to do," he suggests to the survivor, entitled to probate or administration. "No use going to lawyers; they are great rogues. I am an honest man, and will put *thy* business through for one-half of what it will cost thee, if thou employest a lawyer." So he gets his in-

structions, prepares the papers, leading probate, or administration; sends them to Surrogate Registrar, in name of applicant, and pockets the fees, which I must do him the justice to observe, are *not* less than would be charged by a lawyer.

Take Division Court, Surrogate, and conveyancing business from a country practitioner, and what is left? He is pretty nearly reduced to the condition of the Robin Redbreast described by somebody as "*Vox, et preterea nihil*," and I would say to country practitioners, let us raise our voices, and endeavour to obtain some recognition of rights, supposed to be secured by long and arduous study, good conduct, the expenditure of large sums of money in fees and in annual subscription to maintain the dignity and efficiency of the Law Society.

That magical name should be suggestive of hope; but when we look back and see what that Society has *not* done for us; how, in return for our annual subscriptions, it has *not* fostered our interests; how it has *not* attempted to protect us against interlopers; how it remains utterly indifferent, and allows without interference its creations to be placed at a disadvantage, then hope from that source almost ceases to exist.

I am fully aware that I render myself liable to the charge of temerity (and feel the sort of desperation that must have animated Cæsar when in the act of crossing the Rubicon), when I venture to ask: Why the Law Society does not interfere?

It is either an influential body, or it is not.

It is certainly a body fully competent to judge of the matters in question.

It is continually manufacturing new batches of lawyers.

It is continually, I submit, *not* protecting them as they should be protected.

It is receiving fees for a protection it does *not* afford.

I assume that the Law Society is an influential body, and that its representations would have far more weight with the Legislature than other representations could, or ought to, have.