

The bill in question in *Re Solicitor* (1917), 12 O.W.N. 191, was not at all like that now under consideration.

The learned Judge said that he knew of no case binding upon this Court, at all like the present case, in which it had been held that a lump-sum charged for a series of negotiations or the like had been considered improper. If case-law and common sense had parted company, it was the function and duty of an appellate Court to reconcile them, unless absolutely prohibited by binding decisions from doing so.

Common sense indicates that the amount of remuneration a lawyer shall receive depends to some extent on the magnitude of the interests concerned, and more upon the skill which he manifests on his client's behalf than upon the number of interviews he may have or the time spent. When negotiating for a settlement in a matter of importance, it is often impossible to attach a particular value to a particular interview and less or more to another; nor should either the client or the Taxing Officer require it. It is infinitely better to state in reasonable detail what the lawyer has done and what he has accomplished, and from the whole course of the transaction determine the fee to be allowed.

No binding case having been found which precluded this Court from holding that the bill answered the statute, it should be so declared; the appeal should be allowed with costs here and below, the proper officer should be directed to tax the bill and deal with the costs of taxation, and judgment should be entered for the amount found due by the officer, with costs as above.

MULOCK, C. J. Ex., and CLUTE and SUTHERLAND, JJ., agreed with RIDDELL, J.

KELLY, J., agreed in the result, for reasons briefly stated in writing.

*Appeal allowed.*