

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.—REVIEWS.

Now I again repeat that the judge admitted that he was bound by the written retainer; and although "J. T." wished to confound my first employment with the last, the judge told him the *evidence proved the contrary*, and he did not give his judgment upon any such views put forward by "J. T."

"J. T." is pleased to say that the judge in question is a young man and beloved in his county. That is not the question however; I am not dealing with character, age or position in this matter. The profession has rights as well as the judge, and it would be well for all judges to remember, that like me and many others, they and their families once depended on the fair earnings of their profession for a livelihood.

I believe in judges protecting lawyers in those rights. It is all very well for people to talk of the great fees and earnings of lawyers, but every man knows, who has looked thoroughly into it, that taking education, study, talents, and time into account, no profession upon the whole is worse paid than that of the law. There may be a few law firms that make money, but how many are there who deserve better things, who only make a "bare annual living?"

My letter of December was not written alone for myself, but for the rights of a learned body of men, who ought to be fairly and equitably paid by those who employ them, and who have a right to expect better treatment from judges than I have received from the one who "dealt out lame equity" to me.

AN ATTORNEY.

February 9, 1869.

[We speak of the subject matter of this in another place. Our correspondent also alludes to another suit in which he was allowed only \$1, but we have given more space to these matters than we can well afford, and it is only because they are of some interest, as to the question of what fees attorneys should be allowed for Division Court services that we insert them at all.—Eds. L. J.]

TO THE EDITORS OF THE LAW JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—In August, 1864, I was articulated, and in Hilary Term, 1865, was admitted into the Law Society.

It will, therefore, not be necessary for me to pass either of the two extra examinations

as articulated clerk, and only the last of the two as Student-at-Law.

At the foot of the list of books prescribed by the Law Society for the second examination is a memorandum, to the effect, that the students will be re-examined in subjects and books of the first examination.

The question arises, will I, who will not be required to pass the first examination be examined in the books and subjects of it.

By kindly giving your opinion on this point in the next issue of the *Law Journal* you will very much oblige the writer as well as many others similarly situated.

Yours very truly,

London, Nov. 19, 1868.

A STUDENT.

REVIEWS.

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE LAW. By Joel Prentiss Bishop. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1868.

This book is by the author of some excellent works, well known to our readers, which treat of "Criminal Law," "Criminal Procedure," and "The Law of Marriage and Divorce." It is intended as an explanation of the nature, sources, books and practical applications of legal science, and methods of study and practice.

It is all that the title page promises, and much more, and contains a great deal that will be useful to those who perhaps think themselves above any assistance or information that can be derived from such an avowedly elementary work.

The object of the work is, as is set forth in the preface:—

"First, to enable all young persons to decide for themselves the question, whether the law offers to them the pursuit for life which is best adapted to their natural capacities and tastes; secondly, to teach all, who may choose to read it, something concerning the nature of the law, how it has come to us, what is legal authority, and so on, in order to qualify them the better to discharge the duties of citizens in a free republic; thirdly, and chiefly, to teach the student of the law how to study it, and to furnish him with various incidental helps in the study. It is not written upon the plan of teaching a little law upon every legal topic, therefore of necessity conveying to the mind of the young reader no really correct and perfected image of any thing; but its object is to prepare the way for a thorough and profound study of the law,