

## CORRESPONDENCE—REVIEWS.

## CORRESPONDENCE,

*Will making in the Ontario Legislature.*

TO THE EDITORS OF THE LAW JOURNAL

GENTLEMEN:—As I hear the Parliament of Ontario are making and changing the wills of testators, I wish to enquire of you whether it would probably be of any use for me to apply to that Honourable body to supply a deficiency in my father's will. The elder brothers of the family and my sister had each their farms given them many years ago by proper deeds, but my father kept the homestead in his own hands until his death, and disposed of it by will to my younger brother and myself, who had worked the farm from our boyhood after our brothers left home, and took care of him in his declining years, but he unfortunately got a neighbor to prepare the will, which the lawyers say is all right in every respect, except, that *there is but one attesting witness*. Do you think the Parliament would pass an act to make the will valid notwithstanding? If not, why should they not as well as change the will of the late Mr. Goodhue, of London.

Yours, &amp;c.,

NEIL McKELLAR.

[The difficulty is not so much to know what the members of the Legislature of Ontario, who have just returned to their homes, *would* have done, but rather what they *would not* have done—at least, so far as private Bills is concerned.

In the case put, there would be some show of reason for passing an Act to make the will valid, for it would probably be carrying out the wishes of the testator; whilst in the Goodhue case the collective wisdom, justice and equity of Ontario not only did not carry out the testator's carefully expressed intention, but did exactly the reverse. They felt so alarmed, however, as to the lengths this kind of legislation might lead their successors, and so ashamed of their part in it, that immediately after passing the Goodhue Act they passed another, giving power to the Judges to report to the House "in respect of any estate Bills, or petitions for estate Bills, which may be submitted to the Assembly." As far as precedents are concerned, there are enough and to spare for our correspondent's comfort.]

—Eds. L. J.

*Professional advertising.*

TO THE EDITORS OF THE LAW JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—I am a subscriber to *Lovell's Dominion Directory*, and having just received a copy, I find that while I am simply mentioned as Barrister, &c., one of our legal firms appears as follows:

"M. & C., (names given in full) barristers, notaries, &c.—are highly recommended for making prompt collections in all parts of Ontario. Cor. King and James Streets."

If this emanated solely from Mr. Lovell or his agent, I must be content with complaining of his partiality to these gentlemen; but if the advertisement, as I suspect is the case, was written or prompted by that firm, I think it should get a little more publicity by appearing in your Journal—unless indeed you object to anything so *unprofessional* having a place there. I am yours, &c.,

AN AGGRIEVED SUBSCRIBER.

Hamilton, 20th February, 1871.

[We do certainly object to any thing unprofessional, and do not propose to give any further advertisement to this firm, except in a legitimate manner, and therefore put only the initials. We trust it was only a little spontaneous generosity on the part of the publishers of the Directory.]—Eds. L. J.

## REVIEWS.

THE LAW TIMES AND LAW TIMES REPORTS.

10 Wellington-street, Strand, London, W.C.

THE SOLICITOR'S JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER. 12 Cook's Court, Carey-street,

London, W. C.

THE LAW JOURNAL. 5 Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London.

Our readers have ample means of judging of our appreciation of the value of these standard legal periodicals, from the liberal use we make of their pages. The new issue of Law Reports may have affected them to a certain extent, so far as the increase of circulation of the several reports is concerned, but in no respect have the reports deteriorated: in fact the competition has only incited them to greater efforts.

The following notice appears in the *Law Times* of 25th February