University of Missouri Bulletin Law Series

Volume 39 *November 1928* Article 7

1928

# Bar Bulletin

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/ls

 Part of the Law Commons

Recommended Citation
*Bar Bulletin*, 39 Bulletin Law Series. (1928)
Available at: https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/ls/vol39/iss1/7

This Bar Bulletin is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Missouri Bulletin Law Series by an authorized editor of University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact bassettcw@missouri.edu.

# BAR BULLETIN

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE MISSOURI BAR ASSOCIATION

*Officers of Association*

*President*—R. L. WARD, CARUTHERSVILLE
*First Vice-President*—GEORGE MUNGER, BLOOMFIELD
*Second Vice-President*—WALTER C. GOODSON, MACON
*Third Vice-President*—W. E. BARTON, HOUSTON
*Treasurer*—JAMES E. KING, ST. LOUIS
*Secretary*—JAMES A. POTTER, JEFFERSON CITY

(The following is a portion of the report and summary of the proceedings of the 1928 meeting of the Missouri Bar Association, prepared by the official reporter, and furnished for publication herein by Judge Ernest A. Green, the retiring president of the association.)

## PROCEEDINGS OF 1928 ANNUAL MEETING, MISSOURI BAR ASSOCIATION, ST. LOUIS.

The 1928 Annual meeting of the Missouri Bar Association was held this year in St. Louis on September 28-29, with Honorable Ernest A. Green, its President, presiding throughout the sessions. A resume of the more important phases of its work is summarized here for the benefit of our readers.

Following the formal addresses of welcome by the City Counsellor and the President of the local Bar Association, which were responded to by Mr. Charles Liles of Dexter, President Green delivered his address. It discussed, among other matters, the provisions of the proposed amendment increasing compensation of GeneralAssembly members; the amendment authorizing the General Assembly to issue bonds, not exceeding seventy-five million dollars, for the completion of the highway system, and the widening and addition of new highways in the two large cities, all without the imposition of additional taxes. All these matters were declared meritorious. It briefly referred to the outstanding congressional enactments, and summarized the new tax bill showing the net loss in anticipated revenue for the coming year of 222 million odd. On local maters it reported that the Executive Committee at its October 1919 meeting had dedicated the $500 Shepard Barclay Bequest to create a prize for students taking the Bar examination, in commemoration of the donor; and that from the Association's funds a $10,000 Liberty Bond had been purchased for investment. Four district meetings had been held during Judge Green's encumbency; he recommended continuing such meetings because of the widespread interest and valuable association they engendered; he praised the work of Committee on Membership of which Mr. John J. Nangle was Chairman; requested support of the Statutory Revision Commission; pleaded for the establishment of the American Bar Association standards on admission to the Bar; suggested that no more important work lay before the Association than that of encouraging and cooperating with local bar associations; advised vigorous action under Sections 666-668 of the Statutes defining and limiting the practice of the law; pointed out that of the total State expenditures, the Courts were but 1.50 per cent, indicating that an increase in the Judiciary to meet the tremendous increases in litigation was not only essential but

would add little to that cost. The State referendum taken by the Association received his favorable comment as indicating the willingness of the laity to accept the Association's endorsement, and he recommended a special Committee on amendment of the referendum method; that the Constitution be amended to permit the Executive Committee to select members of the Council for circuits not represented at the annual meeting; asked for the Association's cooperation in the work of the new United States Federation of Justice, a voluntary association of Officials dedicated to promote, extend and preserve successes of justice; also prayed the Association's help in the labors of the Association for Criminal Justice, and closed a very able report with his thanks to his Committees and colaborers during the year.

Mr. James A. Potter, Secretary, was applauded when he reported that he had prepared a list of all lawyers in the State, about 6,000 correct names and addresses, for the Association's referendum vote.

Mr. James E. King, now and for many a day the Association's competent Treasurer, commented on its flourishing condition. He showed a total of 1076 paid up members and a cash balance of almost $8,000 in addition to the $10,000 United States Liberty Bond to which reference has previously been made.

The Committee on Amendments, Judiciary and Procedure, reporting by Col. Ristine of Lexington, first offered a resolution, which was promptly adopted, endorsing the Newton Bill in Congress and opposing any division of the 8th United States Circuit unless additional judges were provided; and Judge Kimbrough Stone was immediately telegraphed thereof, in order that he might be able to place before the Judicial Conference in Washington the news that Missouri had fallen in line with the other states concerned.

## SECOND SESSION

Following luncheon, the Committee on Amendments, Judiciary and Procedure resumed its report. It pointed out the pressing need for additional Circuits in the State, commented with emphasis upon the inadequate compensation paid the Missouri judiciary, recommending the lengthening of their terms of office to relieve judges of the embarrassments and influences of political campaigns, referring to the most friendly cooperation of Senator Marshall C. Ford and his Committee in the Legislature on such matters as were recommended for presentation by the Association.

Mr. Roscoe P. Conkling reported for the Committee on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar. The crux of his report, was the recommendation of a high school education or equivalent for admission to the Bar; other recommendations were that a three-year course of law be required; a declaration of intent to prepare for study and admission, with proofs of character and education, to be filed with the Clerk of the Supreme Court, to be approved by the Board of Examiners on registration; Section 676 to be amended to deny an applicant two chances at the same examination, a practice operating only in Missouri. The Committee also recommended to its successors the examination of the Pennsylvania law ere making it legislative program; and that legislation be prepared embodying these suggestions.

Mr. Guy A. Thompson inquired if the recommendation of the Committee as to a high school education was tantamount to a recession from the Association's endorsement of the American Bar Association's standards. Not satisfied with the explanation of the Chairman, who replied on the basis that half a loaf was better than no bread, he attacked that portion of the report, in such spirited and vigorous language pointing out the unwisdom of voluntarily lowering standards which had so many times been approved and which were now national, and stating that he

believed in fighting to the very end for high standards since always the Association must take what it could get, and was backed so vigorously by others, that when he moved a substitute to receive and file the report and that approval of the American Bar Association standards be reiterated and prosecuted, the substitute motion was adopted without a dissenting vote. Mr. Thompson said he believed the whole subject of such requirements should be lodged with the Supreme Court, which he thought best fitted to pass on qualifications for admission to the Bar.

Mr. Forrest C. Donnell then presented the report of the Committee on Bar Associations. Of 33 organizations functioning in the State, 12 were county, 21 city. The report recommended that the new Committee encourage local associations to report to this Association on accomplishments achieved; that it assist circuit associations to conduct local referendums, and that the Executive Committee appropriate funds for these necessities. The report was adopted.

Reporting for the Committee on Judicial Candidates, Judge Fred L. Williams said that the referendum effected at the last primary was the same as used in 1926, described in the 1927 Annual, the only change being that the voters were assured in writing their ballots were secret. He stressed the fact that with the conviction of such knowledge in mind among the Bar a larger vote would follow. Report adopted.

Mr. Herbert F. Goodrich of Ann Arbor, Michigan, advisor on Professional and Public Relations of the American Law Institute, was then introduced, and read an exposition of the labors, purposes and plans of the American Law Institute in the restatement of the law. This work is widely familiar to and highly approved by members of the Bar all over the country, and his paper need not be repeated here. He was added to the list of honorary members of the Association.

Mr. Boyle G. Clark, for the Committee on Grievances and Appeals, reported that the advent of good roads, and the lessening of personal injury suits in congested centers, due to the Workmen's Compensation Act, had infested the rural districts with personal injury runners seeking traffic injury cases. He predicted that the country and city would join hands to stop this, and recommended the appointment by the incoming President of a special committee to draft a law thereon for enactment. Report adopted. The Association then adjourned to attend a banquet given it by the Bar Association of St. Louis at which the Honorable James Hamilton Lewis of Illinois was the distinguished guest and spoke on foreign relations and the perils of alliances.

## THIRD SESSION

The report of the Committee on the Illegal Practice of Law by Laymen was presented by one of its members, Mr. Eugene Munger. It stated that no complaints were lodged with the Committee, although it recognized such practices were extant In Probate Courts and before Commissions and Boards, as well in the offices of Insurance Companies violations of Sections 666-668 were being noted.

Senator Xenophon P. Wilfley presented a scholarly paper on the Lawyer and The Public, which amply fulfilled its title.

Mr. David W. Hill presented a resolution to increase the compensation of members of the Legislature by supporting Amendment I to the Missouri Constitution, and humorously commented on the pitiful compensation now received by them.

The Association by unanimous vote approved its adoption.

Mr. E. C. Krauthoff then took up the report of the Committee on Statutory Revision, moving the adoption of a resolution that the personnel of the Committee be continued, which was seconded. Mr. David W. Hill had previously offered a substitute motion, that the report be approved but the personnel of the Committee

be not continued unless the incoming administration so decided, This substitute was carried.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| President, | R. L. Ward | Caruthersville. |
| 1st Vice President, | George Munger, | Bloomfield. |
| 2nd Vice President, | Walter C. Goodson, | Macon. |
| 3rd Vice President, | W. E. Barton, | Houston. |
| Treasurer, | James E. King, | St. Louis. |
| Secretary, | James A. Potter, | Jefferson City. |

The meeting closed with the annual banquet held at the Hotel Statler. The chief addresses at this time were made by Judge George T. McDermott, of Topeka, Kansas, and former U. S. Senator James Hamilton Lewis.

The Secretary of the Grievance Committee of the Kansas City Bar Association has kindly furnished the Bulletin with a copy of the recent report of that Committee.

The following is a portion of the Committee's report.

## REPORT OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE OF KANSAS CITY BAR ASSOCIATION

October 6, 1928.

KANSAS CITY BAR ASSOCIATION and
HON. W. C. SCARRITT, President

Gentlemen: Your Grievance Committee has the honor to submit the following report covering its work for the past year. The Committee has held fifteen sessions at which complaints have been heard.

Personnel of the committee is as follows:

Sam B. Sebree
B. M. Achtenberg
Homer H. Berger
M. W. Borders, Jr.
D. G. Warrick, Secretary
and the Chairman.

Your chairman has had the earnest cooperation of the members of the Committee and desires to acknowledge at this time their splendid and devoted service. The work of the Committee may be summarized as follows:

Number of formal complaints filed.....77
Number of complaints heard or investigated and disposed of.....74
Complaints pending in committee.....3

DISPOSITION:

1. Dismissed after hearing with reprimand and warning in Committee.....13
2. Cases heard and dismissed as without merit.....16
3. Cases dismissed after investigation but without formal hearing.....5
4. Dismissed for lack of prosecution.....7
5. Referred to prosecuting attorney.....2
6. Complaints withdrawn as result of adjustment between parties after formal notice of hearing.....10
7. Cases in which disbarment proceedings recommended.....2
8. Cases pending in committee.....3
9. Dismissed for want of jurisdiction.....10
10. Miscellaneous.....9

In addition to the seventy-seven formal complaints mentioned above, some fifteen complaints have been lodged with the committee charging oppressive and illegal practices of collection agencies, fourteen of which also involved charges of misconduct and oppression on the part of Justices of the Peace. These complaints will receive separate consideration in a subsequent part of this report.

The committee has continued the practice established by former committees of requiring all complaints to be put in the form of affidavits. This practice has been found to be eminently satisfactory and the committee recommends its continuance. The present committee has also established a permanent Minute Book in which the Secretary of the committee has faithfully recorded the proceedings had before the committee and the disposition made of all complaints that have been heard by it. Your committee believes this innovation one of importance and worthy of men tion. The members of the Bar may not be aware of the importance of the work of this committee and particularly the frequent use that is made of its records. An example of the uses made of these records should be of interest to the Bar. The increasing volume of law business transacted by various governmental departments has made it necessary for large numbers of our Bar to obtain admission to practice before these Departments. Although it may not be generally known, all applicants for admission to practice before the various departments of the Federal Government are carefully investigated by the Department of Justice before the application is passed upon. It has now become a fixed routine with the local department of Justice to inquire of the Secretary of the Grievance Committee the record of each applicant as revealed by the records of the Grievance Committee of the Kansas City Bar Association. This inquiry is made even though the general reputation and standing of the applicant may be of the highest. Another use made of these records which should be mentioned arises when members of our Bar remove to another state and apply for admission to practice there. In many states the rules of admission require a written statement from an officer of the Bar Association of the locality from which the applicant came, showing his record as a member of that Bar. These inquiries are, of course, always referred by the officers of our Association to the Grievance Committee. A search of these records is first made and from the information obtained therefrom an appropriate statement is made with reference to the applicant about whom inquiry is made.

An analysis of the nature of the complaints received by the committee during the past year may be of interest. The formal written complaints filed with the committee may be classified as follows:

Neglect of law business.....22
Retaining collections.....14
Embezzlement.....3
Illegal practice of law by laymen.....5
Unethical advertising for law business.....3
Snitching.....4
Excessive fees and refusal to make settlement with client.....14
Miscellaneous.....12

The classification of the complaints filed with the present committee reveal a striking similarity with the analyses of the reports of your Grievance Committees for the past three years. It will be recalled that your committees for the past three years have all reported that the largest number of complaints heard by them involved neglect of law business. The present committee has had the same experience As suggested by previous committees, some of these complaints are without merit. In several instances it appeared that the lawyer complained against had not, in fact, neglected the matter entrusted to him, but had merely neglected to keep his client informed. But many of these complaints heard by your committee were well founded. Substantially all of the complaints which your committee believed revealed misconduct on the part of the attorneys complained against fall into four classes:

Neglect of law business
Embezzlement or willful retention of client's funds
Unethical advertising for law business
Excessive fees.

Your committee has made a careful analysis of these complaints which it believed were well founded and has given thoughtful consideration to them to determine the probable causes of the misconduct charged.

In almost every case the lawyers involved were found to be unsuccessful practitioners inadequately trained and poorly equipped to practice a learned profession with benefit either to themselves or to society. Of the numerous complaints heard by the committee, only two were against well known members of our Bar. Both were without merit and both resulted from disagreements over the results obtained in damage suits.

Invariably the complaints of a serious nature, that is those involving charges of retention of client's funds or embezzlement, gross neglect of law business or an outrageously excessive charge for services, amounting to contemptible overreaching of the ignorant or unfortunate,—these complaints have invariably been lodged against practitioners poorly trained and inadequately equipped to practice law with benefit to themselves or their clients. We believe these observations compel the conclusion that our standards for admission to the bar are inadequate. With all charity, we believe that such men would be infinitely better off had they been apprised at the time they applied for admission to the Bar that they were inadequately trained for the law or ill suited to meet its many exactions, and their energies directed to another vocation for which they were better equipped to succeed.

The foregoing statement may strike some members of the Bar as new and startling. The conclusions of your committee and its recommendations are not original with them. Many years ago the American Bar Association appointed a committee of leaders of the Bar to study legal education and qualifications for admission to

practice. After an exhaustive study, this distinguished committee filed a report strongly recommending the adoption of higher standards for admission to the Bar, primarily predicated upon an adequate legal education. This report was adopted by the American Bar Association and by it recommended to the various State Bar Associations. These recommendations have been adopted in several states, including our sister state of Kansas. Some effort has been made in the past toward the adoption of these recommendations of the American Bar Association in Missouri by legislative enactment. That effort has not yet borne fruit.

It is the sense of your Grievance Committee that this Association should by appropriate resolution, endorse the recommendations of the American Bar Association with reference to standards of admission to the Bar and should instruct its legislative committee to lend its efforts toward a consummation of this proposal.

The recommendations made with reference to raising our standards for admission to the Bar are fortified in the opinion of your Committee by another circumstanc that is worthy of mention. It may be stated in a sentence. Disciplinary action on the part of Bar Associations is wholly inadequate to cope with the infractions of the Code of Ethics that should be followed by lawyers. The reason for this is obvious. The only disciplinary action that your committee can take against a member of the Bar that has been guilty of misconduct is: Institute disbarment proceedings against him, reprimand him in committee, or if he happens to be a member of the association, recommend his suspension or expulsion from the Association. Your Committee finds that complaints are rarely lodged against members of the Association. The overwhelming majority of those against whom complaint is made are not members of the Association. This latter remedy, then in not available in most cases. A reprimand by the committee, though effective upon occasion, cannot be deemed to be a sufficient corrective force to preserve and maintain that high standard of ethical conduct which should obtain in our profession. Nor is the power to institute disbarment proceedings sufficient or appropriate to meet the situation in question. Your committee believes that this remedy can be properly employed only where it is shown beyond a reasonable doubt that a lawyer has been guilty of such gross misconduct as to render him wholly unfit to continue the practice of law. These cases are rare. Furthermore, disciplinary action is not curative, it can be merely corrective at best. It does not remove the cause, it merely stays the progress of the disease. The cause should be removed. We believe the chief cause, by no means the only one, but the chief cause of most infractions of professional good conduct by members of the Bar may be traced to inadequate training or want of suitable qualifications for the practice of law, which condition, could in a large measure, be relieved by an adequate standard of admission to practice.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) Arthur Miller
Chairman

## ADDRESS BY DEAN ROGERS

(The following excerpts are taken from an address by Dean James Grafton Rogers, of the School of Law of the University of Colorado, delivered March 1, 1928.–Ed.)

In England, the prevailing lawyer type is a product of three stages of training. He has spent three years or more in studying what we would call liberal arts at a university. Oxford, Cambridge, or sometimes such schools as London, Manchester, or

Edinburgh appear in all the biographies. In one of these universities, upon a spool of classics and literature, he has wound many threads of history, philosophy, and all the familiar adjuncts of European culture. Much energy has been devoted to debating unions, current affairs, and to an extraordinary amount of purely social life and continental travel. He comes out of this process a highly developed social animal, with much insight into the history and the accumulated thought of mankind. He has developed no skill to earn a living but has been made ready. He is next required to devote three years to law study, the actual rule being merely that he must enroll in one of the four London Inns of Court and eat six dinners at the Inn dining room in each of twelve terms which go to make up the three years. He passes a preliminary examination at the end of two years and a final one at the end of three. These are real examinations, given by a joint committee of the four societies. Lectures are conducted in the Inns, but their value has varied in cycles down the years, and recently the tendency for most university men is to pursue law during these years at the university law schools, preserving a nominal membership at the Inns. Much Roman law, historical law, and other abstract courses are in vogue, but parts of the studies are applied law. At the end of this period our young Englishman is admitted to the bar, not by the courts but by the Inns. He has even then no prospect of practicing. Custom, quite as effective as any statute, requires that he serve an apprenticeship to some lawyer as a "devil" for at least three years more, usually paying an annual fee for the privilege of attending his master, sitting for days in court to watch the treacherous docket and then summon his superior when the case is called for trial. He gradually gets into subordinate work and finally by favor or fortune is permitted to "open a case." At the end of this period of "deviling", which often extends to five years or more, he can hire chambers and launch out for himself. Any form of partnership is forbidden the English barrister.

Under this scheme, the normal English lawyer has spent at least nine years since he left the equivalent of high school, three in academic education, three in legal education, and three in apprenticeship. Reverting again to our list of primary qualifications, he has built a broad foundation in the humanities, has spent three years learning legal theory, three years more learning applied practice in a workaday office and court room. He has spent about six years in actual contact with the practicing profession, absorbing and watching its character and conduct.

The French system of training the advocate and the French product are strikingly similar. To begin the study of law, the French youth must present a "Baccalauréat," which certifies the completion of his secondary education. This certificate, usually acquired at the age of seventeen to nineteen, represents an attainment about equivalent to our first two years of American college attendance. The student then pursues three years of law study, much of it in the field of public law, political and legal science. As in England, most of the law curriculum is given to such general themes rather than to practice courses. After passing a series of examinations, he receives the government "license en droit." As in England, a period of apprenticeship begins. He becomes a "stagiaire," or probationer, in the Order of Advocates. Here for at least three and not more than five years, he attends weekly meetings presided over by the Batonnier or President of the Bar, and three times a year meets with a group to study legal ethics. One of his duties as probationer is the defense of pauper cases. In both France and England the typical lawyer graduates at about twenty-two, but does not become a full-fledged lawyer until he is about twenty-five. Perhaps England is a year or two slower in allowing full recognition. Many students in both systems do not become lawyers in fact until nearly thirty, even with the advantage of sound and early education.

The common factors of the French and Anglican preparatory courses for the bar as near as can be gathered by considerable observation and reading, are already fairly evident. They have been described, of course, with my own conclusions already in mind. Both systems contemplate for the lawyer a general cultural education. Both follow this by three years of law study. In both this law curriculum is very broad in its content, with only a lesser emphasis on practical courses. The student, in the jargon of the American college catalogue, takes a major in governmental and legal history and a minor in applied law. In both of these national plans, the student is subjected to a long period of exposure to the influence of the mature lawyer before he is released to guide or misguide the public. In connection with both systems, writers emphasize their effect in building standards of professional conduct and special attitudes of mind. In either of them, the student learns the details of practice after he has left the schools and in the actual arenas of performance. But he brings to this study at the workbench a mature mind, enriched with study of much human experience, mapped with the general outline of legal doctrines and theory,—a mind which ought readily to gain command of the mass of custom and rubrics which, after all, absorb the lawyer's working hours.

In America, the apparatus for educating lawyers is an undigested heterogeneous muddle. We are admitting men to practice with every degree of preparation from a high school education plus a smattering of legal phraseology to the other extreme, namely a comprehensive academic education followed by considerable training in legal theory. The great mass of men when they take the oath today are about a third of the way up this scale. The typical man—though it is impossible to arrive at an average or even a norm in the present helterskelter—seems to have about one year of slim college work and two years of reasonably good law-school experience. He enters the bar with little information in literature, history, or the social and political experience of our race. He enters the practice, moreover, possessing no closer contact with the actual daily work of a lawyer than an apprentice carpenter would have if he had never had a saw or square in his hand but had read and been told about them for some years.

Democracy has sometimes been described as the government of lawyers. Yet here we find one of the oldest and most elaborate of democracies which is committed to a program of general education, is requiring long and costly training for many professions and crafts, which has provided widespread schools for law study and yet, on the whole, is turning out the average lawyer with less collegiate education than the average Bachelor of Arts. Furthermore, it is striking that what legal education we have been requiring is wholly different in emphasis from that of the older countries. Our law schools have been concerned almost entirely with the teaching of practice courses, devoting their time almost entirely to equipping our legal craftsmen with the tools of their trade, in contrast with the English and French traditions which are aimed primarily at building background and developing the special professional standards of conduct. In short, legal education in America is one of the curiosities of our national museum.

If our conclusion that character and broad human understanding, as well as technical equipment, are the outstanding elements in this peculiar profession, even approximates the truth—then the American emphasis has not so far been properly placed. Unless our conditions are wholly different from those in the older countries, we have been thinking too much about the private side of the law practice and too little about its public side. We have been teaching a vocation before we trained the mind. It is undoubtedly true that the very practice of this peculiar craft to some extent does train and broaden the practitioner. The lawyer enters many

doors. Like the doctor he sees into the secrets of many lives. It may be true that he acquires breadth of view from his daily tasks or else falls by the wayside, but it is not true that he develops along with this insight and as a necessary part of it any considerable public and detached view of community problems. I am not convinced that the American lawyer is as keen a public critic and as far-seeing a public adviser as his brother across the sea. I am not sure the individual is getting all the rewards that his profession affords.

The conclusions spring naturally from what has been said. The teaching of legal technique has been more highly developed in America than ever before. There are limits, however, to the power of any school in any field to teach a craft. This is as true of journalism or engineering as it is of public justice. The American law school in both curriculum and method is distinctly ahead of the European institutions in developing professional knowledge and skill. This has been our specialty, our preoccupation, our main concern for a hundred years. If this equipment makes a lawyer, we can rest content. Surely it does not. If character and breadth of human understanding are necessary, and are equal factors in a successful and efficient career, they should occupy a larger place in the regimen than has been imagined. I conceive that we must emphasize in the education of the future American lawyer at least two new points of view.

First, we must devise some means of inculcating in him the peculiar responsibility of his position, the capability to resist the manifold temptations of his brotherhood and the sense of the public obligation of his place in society. This training must be brought about either by contact with books and teachers who understand the subject or by contact with the profession itself under some apprentice system.

Second, we must give our American lawyer a broader outlook on the public side of his career. He must be exposed to more government, more history, more general literature than we have thought necessary. He must be able to think nationally, instead of provincially, in terms of generations and not of days or weeks. He must realize that law is no mere collection of doctrines and rubrics treasured by a priesthood and unrelated to the realities of society. He must see law as a mere reflection in technical terms of the shifting panorama of human life itself. This is a problem of education, a problem for both the colleeg and the law school. We must somehow crowd this training into a period that permits our turning out the lawyer fully equipped in his middle twenties. My own instinct is to advise for him, first, three or four years of general cultivation without any reference whatsoever to any vocational work. Then, to require not less than three years in a law school which devotes at least part of its energy to broader phases of the profession, namely, its traditions, its literature, its history and theory. My thought is not so much on introducing new specific courses as on carrying forward our legal studies in the light of older and larger lamps of learning. Perhaps the law school should emphasize the broader courses early in the student's career and encourage specialization in technical fields in the senior year. If this plan crowds out some teaching of professional technique, then the apprentice system facesus. It was the original means of law education in America, now driven into the background by the growth of the schools. It is, as we have already seen, an established supplement to skilled training in the older countries. Again I hazard a guess. The typical young man who receives his first client in 1950 will have behind him three years of academic education, three years of law school much broader and richer in content than any we now possess, and at least a year or two of workaday life with older lawyers before he dares to accept a fee. If so, the youngster of 1950 will work more efficiently, live more understandingly, reap more of life's rewards. If so, perhaps American justice, American social order, and America itself may be substantially better off.