

tific than our own. How ill-verified in fact this implication is it is hardly necessary to say; but, if it were as true as it is erroneous, it would not prove that when a legal university is set up in London there will be any change for the better. Why our legislation is as bad as it is a late Attorney-General should know as well as anyone, but assuredly legal education has little to do with the matter. Popular Legislatures cannot produce well-drawn measures, and no extension to amateur lawyers of the privilege of listening to lectures is likely to create a demand on the part of the public for anything better than the patchwork of our annual statutes. It would be as unreasonable to complain that English grammars are not studied abroad as to lament the lack of interest in our text-books or in the volumes of our law reports in any country where the rule of the common law does not prevail; but it is needless to consider whether the institution of the 'Inns of Court School of Law' would add to the circulation of our legal literature, because that is a matter which concerns only the owners of the copyrights. By all means, as Lord Nottingham said in the Duke of Norfolk's case, 'let us resolve cases here, so that they may stand with the judgment of men when debated abroad'; but that end will not be secured by the exportation of text-books. It may well be that the institution of a body of writers and lecturers who would busy themselves with the study and teaching of the more philosophical parts of the law, would tend to remove professional prejudices and to introduce greater variety and adaptability into methods of argument, and so enable us to conform more nearly to Lord Nottingham's rule. We may be confident that these advantages are to be gained from the influence of such a class of non-practising lawyers, not only by reason of Lord Russell's assurance, but also because of the actual experience gained from examples of the professors and lecturers of the existing universities.

It was a strange omission to disregard the law schools of Oxford, Cambridge, and University College, but it was surely stranger still to leave unnoticed the works of Sir Henry Maine, of Messrs. Maitland, Dicey, Muirhead, Moyle, Westlake, and Hall, and of Sir William Anson and Sir Frederick Pollock, when dealing with writers on legal subjects in English. If the works of these authors are not cited abroad, what hope can there be for the professors of the new institution?

The comparison made by Lord Russell with the education of