The Legal News.

VOL. XI. JUNE 2, 1888. No. 22.

In *Cary* v. *Western Union Tel. Co.*, 47 Hun, 610, the Court rejected the claim of an attorney for lobby services in importuning the attorney-general, comptroller and members of the Legislature concerning proposed legislation. The case of *Mills* v. *Mills*, 40 N.Y. 543, was cited, in which it was held that such a contract was void as against public policy, in that it furnishes a temptation to the plaintiff to resort to corrupt means or improper devices to influence legislation. *Sedgwick* v. *Stanton*, 14 N.Y. 289, was also cited, in which the Court observed:—"Persons may, no doubt, be employed to conduct an application to the Legislature as well as to conduct a suit at law; and may contract for and receive pay for their services in preparing documents, collecting evidence, making statements of facts, or preparing and making oral or written arguments, provided all these are used or designed to be used before the Legislature itself, or some committee thereof, as a body; but they cannot, with propriety, be employed to exert their personal influence with individual members, or to labor in any form privately with such members out of the legislative halls. Whatever is laid before the Legislature in writing, or spoken openly or publicly in its presence, or that of a committee, if false in fact, may be disproved, or if wrong in argument, may be refuted; but that which is whispered in the private ear of individual members is frequently beyond the reach of correction."

A new insurance company, called the British Law Fire Insurance Company, has been established in England, on the board of which only past or present members of the legal profession are eligible for seats. There is no such restriction, however, as to the holders of shares.

In noticing the appearance of a fourth edition of Holland's Elements of Jurisprudence, the *Law Journal* (London) observes:—"It is evident that a change is coming over the mental habit of English lawyers, and that a concise method of legal principles is now preferred—at least in theory—to the isolated rules of English law strung together by some slender thread of analogy. This change is doubtless due to the gradual revival of the study of Roman law in the Inns of Court since 1853, as well as to a growing familiarity with the practice and forensic literature of the Continent."

LEGAL EDUCATION.

In an address by the president of the Liverpool Law Students' Association, the history of legal instruction in England was concisely summed up:—

By 4 Henry IV. c. 18, it was enacted that attorneys shall be examined by the justices, who shall put on the roll those "that be good and virtuous and of good fame," and that if any one of the said attorneys do die, or do cease, the justice shall make another in his place, which is a "virtuous and learned man." From a statute of Henry VI., which, after a recital anything but complimentary to the attorneys of the time, enacted that there should be only six attorneys in the county of Norfolk, six in Suffolk, and two in Norwich, it is not unreasonable to infer that the justices found the performance of this duty somewhat difficult. In the reign of Elizabeth orders were made providing for the examination of such as should desire to be admitted attorneys; and by 3 Jas. I. c. 7, it was enacted that none should be admitted but such as have been found by their dealings to be skilful and of honest disposition.

By 2 Geo. II. c. 23, the judges were directed before they admitted any person to examine and enquire by such ways and means as they should think proper touching his fitness and capacity to act as an attorney. The examinations under this statute appear to have been, to put it mildly, rather perfunctory. I remember an old friend of mine, a solicitor, who was admitted in the early part of this century, describing to me the process by which it was ascertained that he was a fit and proper person to be admitted and practise as an attorney of his Majesty's Common Law Courts. He was taken to Westminster