

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We willingly publish the above letter in answer to the criticism of our correspondent on the pamphlet referred to. It is for Mr. McKellar, of course, to judge whether it strengthens his case by attempting to tackle only one part of the undoubtedly strong case made against him. Whether he has done so or not the reader can judge for himself by examining both arguments. Mr. McKellar says he is "willing to give proofs of the correctness of any charges he has made." All that can be said as to this is, that such proofs would be, in many cases, in contradiction of his pamphlet.

But, after all, it is of little moment, for we understand that the ventilation given to that production has rendered copies somewhat scarce; and so much the better for the credit of its author, who would probably be as well pleased as the rest of his brethren if it had never gone beyond the few members of the Legislature amongst whom it was distributed.

As to the threat of a reduction of lawyer's fees, they are so small now that it would be beneficial to the profession if they were done away with altogether, as the result would be that fees would practically be whatever the lawyer might choose to make his own client pay. Instead of a successful plaintiff making all his costs out of a defendant who had wrongfully contested a claim, he would have to pay his own lawyer. In some countries tariffs of costs are either unknown or a dead letter; and when a client wants a suit brought he has to pay a good round sum to the lawyer before the suit is brought. We doubt, however, if this would suit the mercantile men of this country.

We understand that "B" has published his letter in pamphlet form, so that the want of publicity which Mr. McKellar says he regrets will be to a certain extent overcome.—Eds. L. J.]

—

Unlicensed Conveyancers.

To the Editor of THE LAW JOURNAL.

Your correspondent "An old Subscriber," in your issue in January last, seems to think the remedy to apply to this case is

for lawyers to charge no larger fees than the unlicensed conveyancer. If he will try it I think he will find himself disappointed with the result. Those who employ the unprofessional man, do so in most cases, I believe, not on account of any saving, but because they prefer having as few questions asked about their title as possible; lawyers knowing the irresponsibility are, of course, compelled to ask the purchaser if he requires the Solicitors to be responsible for the title, and it so frequently leads to difficulties that the seller prefers going to an unprofessional man who will "do the deed" and hold his tongue, or if he searches the title be satisfied with a look at the abstract index in the Registry Office.

And I think he will find in the great majority of cases where a Solicitor is employed that it is at the instance of the purchaser, and not the seller.

If I am correct in this view of the case the Legislature should intervene and protect the public, the principle being already admitted by our law.

Yours,
Wm. B.

Walkerton, Feb. 13th, 1880.

—

To the Editor of the LAW JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR,—I am sincerely glad that your powerful Journal has consented at last to aid those members of the profession practising outside County Towns, in obtaining some protective measure against "Unlicensed Practitioners." I use the word advisedly, as there are few of the so-called conveyancers who do not also pretend to practise law; in fact there are two of these gentlemen residing in a village not over fifteen miles from here who openly give advice, charge for it, and take and defend suits in all the Courts; carrying on their Superior and County Court cases through the agency of attorneys at the different County Towns who undertake the work on even better terms than they do for a brother attorney. It has been truly remarked by one of your correspondents "that if you take away from a country practitioner Division and Surrogate Court work and conveyancing, there is but little left for him to do," for after pay-