

contract have not a common interest in the preservation of the property insured, one of the most efficient safeguards against fraud and crime is removed. Any such contract where the assured might expect to make a profit by the destruction of the property insured is, in law, tainted with immorality. And to require from a company, when called upon to pay a loss, over which hangs any suspicion, a stronger proof than the appellants have made in this case, to defeat a fraudulent claim, would be virtually to leave the assurer at the mercy of the assured, a result which obviously, in the public interest, even more than in the companies' interest, should by all possible means be averted. *Interest reipublicæ ne maleficia remaneant impunita.*

Appeal allowed; action dismissed; costs in the three courts against respondents.

*Dunlop, Lyman & Macpherson*, for appellants.

*Trenholme, Q.C.*, and *Laflaur*, counsel for appellants.

*Béique, Q.C.*, and *Geoffrion, Q.C.*, for respondents.

---

#### LORD RUSSELL ON LEGAL EDUCATION.

The authority of the Lord Chief Justice will probably be sufficient to convince the public that the need for a reform of the system of education under which students for the Bar or the examinations of the Incorporated Law Society are trained is both undeniable and urgent, but it is improbable that a perusal of the report of his address will persuade lawyers either that his attack on the present system is justifiable or that the promised advantages of his own scheme are likely to be realized. The staple matter of the attack is to be found in a comparison between the practice of this country and that in vogue abroad. In France, in Germany, and, above all, in the United States they have schools of law attached to the Universities. Such schools we have also, although Lord Russell overlooked the fact, attached to the universities of England and Scotland; but preparation at them is not a necessary qualification for admission to the legal profession. As a consequence it follows, if we rightly understand the address, that our text-books are not read, and the judgments of our judges are not cited abroad, and also that our legislation has assumed or preserved an unmethodical and unsystematic character. If the argument is good for anything, it must be implied that the text-books of the countries mentioned are cited, and the judgments of their judges are quoted, in foreign States, and that this, in some way, is a national advantage; and, further, that their legislation has the unquestionable merit of being more methodical and scien-