

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>





The records of the Society of Gentlemen Practisers in the Courts of Law and ...

Society of Gentlemen Practisers in the Courts of Law and Equity (Great Britain), Incorporated Law Society (Great Britain)



Stanford Law Library

HERBERT L. PACKER
MEMORIAL FUND

2/-

AF
ALG
PK₂

THE RECORDS
OF THE
SOCIETY OF GENTLEMEN PRACTISERS

81-

AF
ALG
PK₂

THE RECORDS
OF THE
SOCIETY OF GENTLEMEN PRACTISERS



SOCIETY OF

COMPILED BY
OF THE INSTITUTE

PUBLISHED BY THE
CHA



Law Society (United Kingdom)

THE RECORDS
OF THE
SOCIETY OF GENTLEMEN PRACTISERS
IN THE COURTS OF LAW AND EQUITY
CALLED THE LAW SOCIETY.

COMPILED FROM MANUSCRIPTS IN THE POSSESSION
OF THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

PUBLISHED BY THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY,
CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

1897.

Printed by Rixon and Arnold, 29 Poultry, E.C.

ERRATA.

- Page 22, third paragraph from the top, *for* "Cruddenden" *read* "Cruttenden."
- „ 22, last paragraph but one, *for* "balance of his last amount" *read* "balance of his last account."
- „ 28. The note should *read* "See Appendix, p. 312."
- „ 58, fourth line, *for* "habeus" *read* "habeas."
- „ 113. For "leasts" in the second paragraph *read* "feasts."
- „ 152. The list mentioned at the foot of page 151 is out of place. It should come in at the top instead of the bottom of the page.
- „ 158, fourth paragraph from the top, *for* "1787" *read* "1781."
- „ 163, last line but one, *for* "valve" *read* "value."
- „ 166, end of first paragraph, *for* "Secrety" *read* "Secretary."
- „ 293, last paragraph but two, *for* "Langdon Jones" *read* "Landon Jones."

ILLUSTRATIONS.

1. PIECE OF PLATE PRESENTED IN 1816 TO THE PROLOCUTOR OF THE SOCIETY, JOSEPH KAYE, ESQ. *Frontispiece.*
2. FAC-SIMILE OF LETTERS FROM MR. JOHN ALEXANDER ON BEHALF OF THE SOCIETY TO MR. F. BENTHAM, ATTORNEY FOR THE SCRIVENERS' COMPANY. *To face page xxviii.*
3. FAC-SIMILE OF DINNER TICKET. *To face page xcix.*

INTRODUCTION BY

EDWIN FRESHFIELD,

DOCTOR OF LAWS; KNIGHT OF THE ORDER OF ST. JOHN OF JERUSALEM IN ENGLAND;
TREASURER OF THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES OF LONDON;
ONE, ETC.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE RECORDS OF

THE SOCIETY OF GENTLEMEN PRACTISERS.

THE Records which form the subject of the present volume were lately found by Mr. Williamson, the Secretary, in the basement of the premises of the Incorporated Law Society. A perusal of them at once showed him the value and interest to be attached to them, not merely as a record of the events which led ultimately to the foundation of the Incorporated Law Society, but for the light thrown by them upon the position and proceedings of our brethren, at a period when their history is little known.

The Records begin with a short description of the circumstances in which our brethren associated themselves together, for the purpose of improving their own condition and that of the other members of the profession. It is clear from the context that the Association took its origin in friendly and convivial meetings of members, which meetings seem to have been habitual before the commencement of these Records. Out of these meetings a powerful society gradually developed. The manner in which this occurred cannot but remind the student of history of the way in which the Merchant and Trade Guilds of the City of London originated and developed, and the history of the Incorporated Law Society is but a complement to that of these Companies.

Without losing its quality of conviviality, the Association gradually added to it the objects of mutual improvement, self-government, and protection, until at last the Society became that which it is now—the most powerful of the London Guilds.

The opening paragraph in these Records may not inappropriately be compared with the opening paragraph in the Records of the Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London, the only difference being that four hundred years ago a further element, viz. that

of Religion, was introduced into the consideration of the associated brethren—an element which is naturally wanting in the Association of later date. I have selected the Grocers' Company as an example; but, indeed, the history of almost all of the City Companies is the same. Originating in a voluntary association of members of the same trade or profession, for the purposes of mutual protection, benefit, and improvement, each Company, after having continued with this imperfect constitution for a longer or shorter period, eventually were compelled to accept a more regular constitution, at first from the City of London, and afterwards by Royal Charter from the Crown.

The same law seems to have guided the course of the Associated Attornies and Solicitors. The voluntary association of 1739 becomes the Incorporated Law Society of 1831.

The Records commence in the year 1739, and continue without any great break until the year 1810, when they end abruptly. From the abrupt manner in which they stop, I conclude that our collection is not complete. There is no evidence that the Society was in 1810 in a moribund condition. It was not only in a state of full activity, and, as appears from the Minutes, in a prosperous financial position, but some of the members whose names appear as having recently joined the Society were not, I am convinced, men who would have joined it had it not been in active healthy work, and in a condition to do further good service. I refer to such gentlemen as Mr. Joseph Kaye, Mr. Gatty, and Mr. Winter, who joined in 1809, and my own grandfather, Mr. Thomas Dawes, of Angel Court. Therefore I think we may conclude that the proceedings of the fifteen years which intervened between the years 1810 and 1825, when the Minutes of the Society are again in existence, have only been mislaid—possibly to be found in the same manner as the documents about which I am now writing.¹

Among the minor matters to be remembered in these Minutes, is one touching the dates. Up to the year 1750, the dates are recorded according to the old computation of England—the year ending March 24—so that the meetings in February and March fall to the preceding year. In 1751 the new computation begins, and the subsequent years commence with January 1.

To one who is interested in such matters, some information is afforded by these Minutes, particularly in the earlier stages, by the recapitulation of the different places at which the meetings of the

¹ Since this Introduction was first put into type, this conclusion has been confirmed by the accidental discovery in this office of a pamphlet printed in the year 1822, which will be found in an Appendix, p. ci.

Society were held. The Society appears to have tried one after another the various taverns and coffee-houses in the neighbourhood of the Temple. Among those named are the Crown and Anchor in St. Clement's, the historical Old Devil Tavern, the Anchor and Baptist's Head, and the King's Head in Symon's Inn. The Old Devil Tavern seems to have been the most favoured. Afterwards, the Society met occasionally in George's Coffee House, Chancery Lane, and the Anchor and Baptist, which I take to be the same as the Anchor and Baptist's Head. At length, the Society seems to have got a definite footing, by the permission of the Governing Body of Clifford's Inn (who are called the Principal and Rules), in Clifford's Inn Hall, and afterwards held their meetings there.

Turning to the Records themselves, these commence with one which may be said to be the keynote to the whole of the proceedings. It is dated February 13, 1739, and it declares, as will be observed, that the object of the Society was to detect and discountenance "all male¹ and unfair practice."

"At a meeting of the Society of Gentlemen Practisers in the Courts of Law and Equity, held on the 13th February, 1739, the Meeting unanimously declared its utmost abhorrence of all male and unfair practice, and that it would do its utmost to detect and discountenance the same; and to that end it was agreed that a General Meeting be had twice a year, viz. on the next day after every Hillary and Trinity Term, unless such day happened to be on a Sunday, and then on the day following, and that the Steward for the time being should appoint the place of such meeting, and that twenty-one members should be appointed to meet once a month, or oftener, if thought proper, to consider of such methods as might best answer the purposes aforesaid, who were to report the same and their opinion thereon at the next General Meeting, and that any five of them should be a sufficient Committee. That four stewards should be appointed for each half-yearly Meeting."

I think it is clear from this Minute that the Society had then an existence, a name, and sufficient of organization to have a Steward. This Minute makes no mention of the social element, namely the dinner; but this soon appears, and almost immediately afterwards the

¹ The word "male" is not, as I first thought, a mistake in spelling, but represents, I believe, the manner in which the word we call "mal-practice" was then pronounced.

third object, namely, that of self-protection, is also evidenced. In all these matters, making allowance for the difference of manners and customs obtaining a century and a half ago, the Society seems to have carried on pretty much the same description of business as is now transacted by the Incorporated Law Society. This may be deduced from the following facts.

In 1740 the Society took into its consideration a Bill for regulating the trials at Nisi Prius, and the more effective summoning of Juries. The matters to be considered were referred to the Committee, and the Committee made its Report to a General Meeting.

In the following year, 1741, it was determined that the Committee should meet as often as they thought proper, and take into consideration any matters relating to the benefit and the honour of the profession.

In the following year, 1742, the Land Tax Act, which was considered to deal unfairly with Attornies and Solicitors, inasmuch as by a clause in it, it was proposed that they should be incapacitated from being Commissioners for executing the Act, was taken into consideration. The Society strenuously opposed this provision. In the same year, a clause was read touching the admission of persons to act as Attornies, which had been added to a Bill to review the Acts for explaining the laws to punish persons who should destroy turnpikes. The Committee seems to have opposed this Clause also.

At the same time we also find the Committee being consulted by a member of the House of Commons, in an endeavour to prepare the heads of a Bill for the more speedy recovery of small debts.

It is satisfactory to note that the Society appears as actively assisting in a reform which through no fault of theirs did not take effect till one hundred years later, and yet I have heard my brethren charged with being impeters rather than promoters of reform.

In the same year, at a General Meeting of the Society, held on February 23, it was ordered that all proper and necessary inquiries be made by the Committee, to discover any Attornies or Solicitors who had been or should be surreptitiously admitted, and that every member of the Society should use his utmost endeavours to discover and obtain the discontinuance of any such practice, and that the Committee should use such ways and means as they found most necessary to prevent such practice in the future. At this meeting there is the first—and that a very slight—reference to the Dinner.

Towards the latter end of the period covered by these records, the Dinner, and the proceedings for the Dinner, seem to have occupied a more prominent place.

From these references, it will be seen that from the commencement of these Records the Society appears as a working body, and is, as I said before, voluntarily discharging the same duties as are now imposed upon and discharged by the Incorporated Law Society.

In the next year, 1743, a question was much debated in the Society respecting the application of the Clerks in Court, in the Court of Chancery, to be admitted Solicitors. This was a proceeding much disliked by the profession, and was strongly opposed by the Society, who appeared by Counsel before the Master of the Rolls. The subject is constantly recurring in the earlier part of the Records, and the opposition of the Society seems to have been ultimately successful.

In the same year, in addition to internal matters, the Society took in hand the consideration of an Act for the better regulation of Attornies and Solicitors, and the Rules of the Court of Common Pleas, for the more easy proving of acknowledgment of Fines and the like.

The President of the Society was termed the Prolocutor, but it is not clear whether he was more than chairman elected at each meeting; he was a sort of constitutional monarch.

Among the subjects relating to internal discipline was one in 1745, which is interesting as showing the peremptory, not to say touchy, manner in which the Society acted with its members.

“1745 (10 *July*). The Society having been informed that the clerk or servant of a member of the Society had attended Mr. Steward Wakelyn with a ticket, and desired the said Steward to return the sum of 5*s.* for the same in regard to his master being out of town, or unable to attend. It was thereupon desired that Mr. Steward Wakelyn should forthwith offer the sum of 5*s.* to the said member, and in case the same member should accept the money, or by the admission of the said member it should appear to the satisfaction of Mr. Wakelyn that the said clerk or servant had acted in the manner aforesaid by the directions or with the privity of the said member, then or in either of the said cases it was ordered that Mr. Steward Wakelyn should inform the Secretary of the name of such member, to the intent that such name may be struck off the list of Members of the Society.

“It was ordered that no member of the Society should presume to give or deliver over his ticket to any other member of the Society, or to any other person whatsoever, and it was declared

to be the sense of the Society that no person be admitted on a ticket but the member or person to whom the same was delivered, 'and whose name shall appear to be wrote at the foot of the Ticket.'"

Mr. Wakelyn was not Steward, but being one of the Acting Stewards for the year was called by this title. At the next General Meeting, which was held February 14, 1745, Mr. Wakelyn reported that, pursuant to the Order made at the last General Meeting, he had attended the Member therein mentioned, who refused to receive back the 5s. therein referred to, and disavowed the behaviour of the Clerk or servant.

In the same year, 1745, the Society appears to have taken seriously in hand the question of unworthy members of the Profession. The first active step in removing a Solicitor from the Rolls was taken in that year. One Landen Jones had been convicted for an offence for which he had suffered the sentence of the Pillory. He had been struck off the Roll of the King's Bench, but still continued to practise as a Solicitor in Chancery. It was resolved that an application should be made to the High Court of Chancery, and any other Court in which the said Landen Jones should practise, to have his name struck off the Roll in such Court or Courts, and that it should be referred to the Standing Committee to carry such resolution into execution. The Minutes detail the proceedings taken with this end, and the Secretary was instructed to serve Mr. Jones with a Notice of Motion, and attend Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Clerke, with Briefs. In the end, Mr. Landen Jones was struck off the Rolls.

The case of Mr. James Hodgson, who was accused of being admitted an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench without serving a clerkship, was also considered. It seems that Mr. Hodgson had acted as a writer for hire, in several places in and about London, during the time of his pretended clerkship. In his case, Mr. Richardson, the Master who had certified his fitness, was dead, and Mr. Hodgson had been in practice for four years, and so it was determined not to apply to strike him off the Rolls.

Almost immediately afterwards, the Society was informed that one William Sparry was employed as an Attorney by William Kelly, for the recovery of a debt of £30 from one Joseph Hoyle, and that Sparry received of his client £8 for the costs of his action, and afterwards received £30 from the Defendants, and had not

paid it over; that Kelly employed Mr. Beech, a member of the Society, who had sued Sparry for the money, and that Mr. Beech obtained judgment against Sparry, by confession, with a stay of execution. At the expiration of the stay, execution was issued, but, on application to the Sheriff, it appeared Sparry was entered in the Sheriff's list as a servant of the Minister of the King of Prussia. The Committee to whom the matter was referred further believed that there was reason to apprehend that Sparry had been surreptitiously admitted an Attorney. If this should turn out to be the case, an application should be made to the proper Courts for his being struck off the Rolls. The Committee was to take steps for discouraging a practice so derogatory to the honour of the profession. This case failed also, because it did not appear that Sparry had been surreptitiously admitted, but it did appear that the Minister by whom Sparry was protected had several months previously left the kingdom, whereby the protection ceased. In the meantime, other executions had been issued against Sparry

But in the year 1753—and I wish to finish this branch of the Society's business now, so that I may not break into an important and interesting proceeding in the middle of which this notice occurs—Sparry, being a prisoner in the Fleet, acted as an Attorney in commencing proceedings, contrary to the Statute of 12 George II. This induced the Society to instruct Counsel to support a rule for his being struck off the Rolls, and to take the opportunity of informing the Court that the Society would at all times be ready, at their own expense, to prosecute Attornies for any unfair practices, and to use their utmost endeavours to detect all illegal practices and to prosecute Attornies or Solicitors who should be surreptitiously admitted. At a General Meeting held at the same time, the whole subject of Attornies and Solicitors confined in prison taking upon themselves to defend suits at law or equity, was considered by the Society, with the view of amending the law upon the subject.

There are one or two other cases in 1756 and 1757, illustrating this branch of the Society's business. The first is the case of Mr. John Greenwood and Mr. John Sliper, which was taken into consideration with a view to their being struck off the Rolls, on the ground of Sliper's surreptitiously procuring himself to be admitted an attorney under articles to Mr. Greenwood, at the time that he, Sliper, was footman or common servant to Mr. Greenwood.

The other case is somewhat historical, and I hope I may be excused for quoting the whole Minute on the subject.

“The Secretary was ordered to get a copy of the record of conviction of the said Wm. Wreathocke for a robbery on the highway, and that he search for and read the pardon alleged to have been granted to the said Wreathocke by His Majesty, and take a copy thereof if he thought it necessary; that he get copies of the Order made in the Court of Exchequer for taking off the File a Bill exhibited in the said Court by one highwayman against another, in case he finds the said Wreathocke named in such orders as Solicitor concerned in filing that Bill; that he prepare a notice and brief for counsel to move to strike the name of the said Wreathocke out of the Roll of Attorneys of the Common Pleas, and that he pursue the like directions given for the motion against Landon Jones, for discharging the said Landon Jones from being a Solicitor of the Court of Chancery.”

This is the celebrated highwayman's case, which is referred to in Lord Justice Lindley's book on the Law of Partnership. The nature of the offending Bill is there mentioned, and an extract from the note gives some interesting information upon the subject :—

“Everet v. Williams (2 Pothier on Obligations, by Evans, p. 3, note, citing *Europ. Mag.* 1787, vol. 2, p. 360). Is said to have been a suit instituted by one highwayman against another for an account of their plunder. The bill stated that the Plaintiff was skilled in dealing in several commodities, such as plate, rings, watches, &c.; that the defendant applied to him to become a partner; and that they entered into partnership, and it was agreed that they should equally provide all sorts of necessaries, such as horses, saddles, bridles, and equally bear all expenses on the roads and at inns, taverns, alehouses, markets and fairs; that the plaintiff and the defendant proceeded jointly in the said business with good success on Hounslow Heath, where they dealt with a Gentleman for a gold watch; and afterwards the defendant told the Plaintiff that Finchley, in the County of Middlesex, was a good and convenient place to deal in, and that commodities were very plenty at Finchley, and it would be almost all clear gain to them; that they went accordingly, and dealt with several gentlemen for divers watches, rings, swords, canes, hats, cloaks, horses, bridles, saddles, and other things; that about a month afterwards the defendant informed the plaintiff that there was a Gentleman at Blackheath, who

had a good horse, saddle, bridle, watch, sword, cane, and other things to dispose of, which he believed might be had for little or no money; that they accordingly went and met with the said Gentleman, and after some small discourse they dealt for the said horse, &c., that the Plaintiff and the Defendant continued their joint dealings together until Michaelmas, and dealt together at several places, viz. at Bagshot, Salisbury, Hampstead, and elsewhere, to the amount of £2000 and upwards. The rest of the Bill was in the ordinary form for a partnership account. The Bill is said to have been dismissed, with costs, to be paid by the Counsel who signed it; and the Solicitors for the Plaintiff were attached and fined £50 a piece. The Plaintiff and the Defendant were, it is said, both hanged, and one of the Solicitors for the Plaintiff was afterwards transported."

From further notices in our records, it seems clear that Wreathocke had himself been convicted, in 1735, of robbery on the highway, and sentenced to death; but our records show that he had been transported and returned, though the circumstances were not well understood. He had been left out of the Roll of Attornies, and subsequently admitted again.

At last the Society succeeded in getting his name permanently removed.

I hope I may not be considered as suggesting a precedent, but I would observe that upon this and upon similar occasions there is a note that the counsel obligingly gave their assistance as counsel for the Society without taking any fees.

I would like now to return to the history.

In the year 1748, the Society undertook to protect the interest of their brethren in another class of matters. Mr. Nuthall, a member, considered that he had been improperly treated by Mr. Hume Campbell, a Counsel (who afterwards became a warm friend of the Society), in the matter of a retainer. The Committee, therefore, waited upon Mr. Hume Campbell with a memorial that Mr. Nuthall had prepared of his grievance against that gentleman. The Memorial is set out at full at p. 312. The complaint was that Mr. Hume Campbell had given directions to his clerk to take no retainer or fee for the future in any cause in which Mr. Nuthall was concerned, and an entry to that effect had been made in Mr. Hume Campbell's Retainer Book, which Mr. Nuthall considered injurious and a reflection on his character. The Report of the Committee to the general

body of Solicitors is sufficiently interesting and amusing to be set out at length.

“To the Society of Practisers in the Several Courts of Law and Equity.

“Gentlemen,

“Pursuant to your Order at the last General Meeting, your Committee have several times met and considered Mr. Nuthall's Memorial relating to Mr. Hume Campbell, and have been attended by Mr. Nuthall, and also by Mr. Brown, Mr. fford, and Mr. fell therein named, and have examined into the allegations of the said Memorial; and the Committee being of opinion that it would be proper to attend Mr. Campbell thereon, a Select Committee was appointed for that purpose, who have accordingly attended him, and your Committee do represent that the said Committee were received by him in the most genteel manner; and one of the Committee proceeded to open to him the occasion of their then attending him, and stated to him the whole substance and effect of the said Memorial, which Mr. Campbell heard with attention.

“Mr. Campbell was pleased to declare his regard for this Society, and that he did not know or apprehend that he had done anything in his profession that should give them the least displeasure.

“That he had accidentally seen the said Memorial, and that he had not then been apprised that any memorandum was entered in his Retainer Book as stated in the Memorial, and that the instant he knew it he directed his clerk to strike it out of the Book, and was extremely concerned that any such should have been made.

“That the entry of such memorandum was occasioned by the officiousness of his clerk, whom he directed upon, or soon after receiving Mr. Nuthall's letter (stated in the Memorial), not to take any fees or retainer from Mr. Nuthall without previously acquainting him therewith, and that he had never directed his clerk to make any such entry or memorandum.

“That he looked upon himself as retained by the clients of Mr. Brown solely, who originally employed him, but that he esteemed Mr. Nuthall's being concerned jointly with Mr. Brown, being occasioned by other insurers or underwriters coming in to defend subsequent to the retainer given by Mr. Brown, and to avail themselves of Mr. Brown's retainers, which

they ought not as he apprehended, and returned Mr. Brown's retainer that he, Mr. Nuthall, or the partys may retain in such manner as they should think fit, as a dispute had arisen as to the retainer as is stated in the Memorial.

“That if Mr. Nuthall had applied to him in case there was any impropriety in returning the Retainer, he would have heard all sides and done what was right, or would have left the determination of any question arising thereupon to any Gentleman of the Bar, and been Determined by his opinion; but he owned that he did think the letter he received from Mr. Nuthall, previous to any application made to him, a little unkind, but had no resentment to Mr. Nuthall, though he might reasonably expect a personal application from him.

“And concluded with hearty wishes for the prosperity of the Society, declaring whether in or out of Parliament he should in all places and in all times be ready to serve the Society in the best manner he was able, not only as bound in point of gratitude, but that he considered the worthy part of the profession, whether attornies, Solicitors, or Counsel, as one Body.

“And in order further to satisfy your Committee, Mr. Campbell directed his clerk to produce the Retainer Book, and it appeared thereby, very much to the satisfaction of your Committee, that the memorandum complained of was totally erased.

“All which is submitted by order of the Committee.”

In the same year in an Act for regulating Attornies and Solicitors, which was being discussed, the Committee preferred a clause for the more effectual obliging the Clerks of Attornies and Solicitors to an actual and menial service of their masters, and also another clause for preventing broken tradesmen and other loose and disorderly persons from soliciting, carrying on, or defending causes, or other matters relating to proceedings in the Courts of Law or Equity, by means of some Attornies or Agents who encouraged such practices, under pretence of authorities, under the hands of the parties being sent and delivered to such Attornies and Agents. This Act was much debated, and the clauses were settled and resettled.

That such a provision was not unnecessary seems likely, from an example which presents itself, owing to a report of Mr. Brown that

Mr. Samuel Jordan, who was not admitted an Attorney, had with the consent of Mr. Butler, of St. Mary Axe, and in his name, commenced and prosecuted several actions. The Committee reported that the consideration of proper methods to prevent such a practice, and the remedy, should be taken at the expense of the Society.

We are now in the year 1749, by which time, as you will have observed, the Society was actively and effectually engaged in its self-imposed duties. If I do not refer to them in greater detail, it is only because I hope and trust the Minutes themselves will be read. I have neither extracted, nor attempted to extract, what may be called the plums.

The year 1749 brought the Society face to face with another curious and serious contention, which occupied it, and occupies these Minutes, more or less exclusively, for the succeeding eleven years. I have thought it convenient to extract the most interesting Minutes as to this matter, and to illustrate it as far as I can with the relative documents.

This contention is the now historical litigation with the Scriveners' Company, which will necessitate a few remarks as to the origin and cause of this conflict.

The Scriveners' Company of London is a Company incorporated by Royal Charter in the reign of King James I. But for many years, and indeed centuries before that date, it had existed as a guild. The origin of the guild is, of course, uncertain; but there is little doubt that, as early as the reign of King Henry II. there was an Association of Writers of the Court Letter or Court-hand; whose business it was to draw charters, leases, and such-like documents, and with them also were associated persons who practised the art of illumination, which was then really an art. It seems probable that the guild was in existence in the reign of King Henry III. It received a constitution at the hands of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council, according to the custom of the City of London in the early part of the reign of Richard II. By this time the Company of Writers of the Court Letter, or Scriveners, had in fact become also the College of Notaries of the City of London. The ancient Records of the Company, which date from that time, contain a complete list of all the notaries practising in the City of London, with their notarial marks, and until the reign of King Henry VIII. specifying which of them were Papal and Imperial Notaries. There is no doubt that the Worshipful Company of Scriveners had gradually come, not only to

be a Company of persons writing the Court-hand, and illuminating, but also the Company to which all those occupying themselves with the business of Scriveners and Notaries usually belonged.

Among the duties of Scriveners and Notaries was that of preparing Deeds and Wills, as to which, if the deed or will was of an important nature, the Scrivener was advised by Counsel. Any antiquary acquainted with the parochial records of the City of London will recognize, among their Records, deeds which were prepared by the Notary or Scrivener, who generally in the Deed itself, or occasionally in the ornamental Initial letter, introduced his name, and sometimes the price he was paid for his work. That these persons were not mere copyists, may be gathered from various circumstances. I have met with one who invariably wrote his name in Greek characters.

The word conveyance, or conveyancing, is of comparatively speaking modern use. I have a copy of a popular book of precedents compiled in the reign of King Henry VIII. My copy was printed in 1594, the latter part of Queen Elizabeth's reign. The book is termed "*Symbolæography*, which may be termed the Art, Description, or Image of Instruments, or the Paterne of Præsidents, or The Notarie or Scrivener. The first part of Instruments Extrajudicial, the third time corrected by William West of the Inner Temple Esq^r first author thereof."

These extrajudicial instruments consist of Covenants, Bills and Obligations, Conditions, Feoffments, Uses, Trusts, Grants, Mortgages, Fee-farms, Gifts, Leases, Releases, Partitions, Exchanges, Warrants of Attorney, Licences, Grants of Advowsons, and Wills and Testaments; and of all these documents many and various forms are given.

From which it is, I think, pretty clear that as early as the reign of King Henry VIII.—certainly until the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and up to the very close of it—all these Deeds were drawn by the Scrivener or Notary, and the Book which we should now call a book of Conveyancing Precedents, or perhaps the "Complete Conveyancer," was then called the "Notarie or Scrivener."

I have a later edition of the *Symbolæographie*, as it is then spelt, printed in 1647. In this edition the words "or The Notarie or Scrivener" are omitted.

Hobert,¹ Lord Chief Justice of the Common Bench in King James the First's reign, is reported to have said "That it did no more belong to an Attorney to make writings than it did to an apothecary to prescribe physic." In this case an Attorney sued a man for slander for accusing

¹ His name is thus spelt in the edition of Winch's *Reports* (London, 1657).

him of making false writings, and was non-suited on the ground that it was no part of an Attorney's business to make writings. In the cases reported by Winch there are two of this nature, from which I conclude that although it may not have been their proper business, Attornies were in the habit of making writings. They did not oppose King James granting a Charter to the Scriveners' Company.

At what time it became the general practice for Attornies, and Solicitors, also to transact the description of business called Conveyancing is not quite so certain. Conveyancing was considered in 1749 to be a new term. But there is no doubt that at that time the Attornies did in fact do all that business which we now call Conveyancing. There is also no doubt that the particular privileges of the City of London were not so well maintained in the reign of King George II. as they had been up to the end of the seventeenth century.

In 1748 the position of the Notaries and other members of the Scriveners' Company carrying on business in the City of London, was in their opinion very much impaired by what they considered the infringement of their rights by the Attornies and Solicitors who were not free of the Scriveners' Company, or of any Company of the City of London, but who drew deeds, mortgages, and conveyances in the City, without being under the same rules and restrictions as themselves.

The Clerk to the Company, under the direction of the Committee to which the important affairs of the Scriveners' Company are submitted, called the Committee of Priviledges, prepared an exhaustive statement of the origin of the Company, and the duties and privileges of its members.¹ This document was submitted to Counsel and carefully settled. It contained copious extracts from the old constitution and Bye-laws, and upon it the Company approached the City with a view to the passing of an Act compelling all persons doing the same business as Scriveners in the City of London to take up their freedom in the Scriveners' Company. The City hesitated to do this until the right of the Scriveners was established at law, and the Company, after consultation with the Chamberlain of London, took proceedings against an Attorney of the name of Alexander, under a Bye-law of

¹ This statement was subsequently printed, and there is a copy in the Society's library. "The case of the Free Scriveners of London, set forth in *A Report from a Committee of the Court of Assistants of the Company of Scriveners*, London, To The Master, Wardens, and Assistants of the Company At their Court holden the 23rd day of *June*, 1748."

the City, passed in the year 1712, in the reign of Queen Anne. A copy of this Bye-law is as follows—

“Byelaw of the City of London dated 1712 Queen Anne which enacts ordains and declares that no person whatsoever not being free of the City should after Michaelmas then next directly or indirectly use exercise or occupy any Art Trade Mistery manual occupation or handicraft within the City upon pain of forfeiting £5 for every offence. That all Penalties or forfeitures by the Act imposed on any offender or any part thereof should and might be sued for and recovered by Action of debt Bill or Plaint to be prosecuted in the name of the Chamberlain in any of Her Majesty's Courts of Record within the City. One moiety thereof to go to the use of Bridewell Hospital the other moiety to the use of the person who should prosecute the same in the name of the Chamberlain.”

The general outline of the case is as follows :—The Chamberlain, Sir John Bosworth, who occupied that office from 1734 to 1751, commenced the proceedings against Mr. Alexander, in the Mayor's Court, for infringing the Bye-law. It would seem that Mr. Alexander, in consultation with the Law Society, conducted his own case. He did not attempt to dispute the question of fact, as to whether or not he had infringed the bye-law, but raised the question of the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court to entertain an action against an Attorney of the High Court by writ of Privilege. The Scriveners' Company moved for a rule to set aside this writ, and the case came for argument before the Court of King's Bench in the years 1750-51. It is mentioned in the Minutes, but no judgment was given. There is no doubt that the Lord Chief Justice was not in favour of the writ. In the same year, Sir J. Bosworth retired from the office of Chamberlain, and shortly after died. With the death of Sir J. Bosworth, the action against Mr. Alexander abated. On Sir J. Bosworth's retirement and death, Mr. Harrison, who was shortly afterwards knighted, became Chamberlain.

The Scriveners' Company, encouraged by an expression of the Lord Chief Justice in their favour, urged upon the Corporation to pass the Bill they had asked for. The Corporation acquiesced, and the Law Society ineffectually opposed it. In Nov. 1752, the Scriveners' Company, by the Chamberlain, Sir T. Harrison, commenced further actions against Mr. Alexander and other attornies, to take the place of the action which had abated.

The second action against Mr. Alexander was founded, like the first, on the City Bye-law of Queen Anne, not on the recent Act of Common Council. In this action the Law Society directly intervened. They appointed their own lawyer to conduct the case, and they adopted precisely the same tactics as in the former action. They sued out a writ of Privilege in the Court of King's Bench. The Scriveners moved to quash it, and after some long consideration the case was, in 1754, remitted to the Mayor's Court for Mr. Alexander to plead his privilege by way of demurrer. The Recorder decided against the Demurrer, and Mr. Alexander appealed to a Commission of Error, where the case was argued at length.

This argument is reported in a volume which is in the library of the Incorporated Law Society, called "A Report of the Proceedings particularly on the Commission of Error in the case of Thomas Harrison Esq^{re} Chamberlain of the City of London Plff against John Alexander Gent an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench touching the right of the City of London to oblige Attornies at law who practise Conveyancing within the said City to be free of the Scriveners' Company."

The judgment was against the Attornies, and they paid the costs.

Upon the judgment being given, the Scriveners' Company called upon the Attornies in the City to take up their freedom in the Company, thereupon the Law Society advertised that the decision was only on demurrer, and did not touch the merits, and offered to defend any further actions brought by the Scriveners' Company against Attornies. The Society also took the advice of Counsel as to the future course of the litigation. I propose to set out the case and opinion in its proper place in the narrative.

The Chamberlain, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, upon this commenced a series of actions against the Attornies, and amongst others against a Mr. Smith. In this case, after an ineffectual attempt on the part of the Attornies to obtain discovery by a Bill in Equity, the action was tried on its merits before the Recorder, and was decided in favour of the Attornies and Solicitors.

This litigation lasted for twelve years, eleven of which were spent, after the fashion of the day, in discussing a legal question which ultimately turned out to be immaterial to the issue though very important to the City.

Writing at this distance of time, it seems extraordinary that the Society should have adopted such a long and circuitous route, when a speedy remedy lay before them. Their persistency in trying to

raise the question of privilege delayed, as I have said, the judgment in their favour for nearly eleven years; but they seem to have had a high sense of the honour of their profession, and that, as I have said, it was not proper that an Attorney or Solicitor of the High Court should be called upon to answer in an inferior court, as they considered that of the Lord Mayor. There is also some indication that the Society were afraid of not getting a fair trial in the City, an unwarranted apprehension due probably to ignorance.

According to the rigour of the game, the losers had to pay the costs, but I think the City, who had in the proceedings established the right of the Mayor's Court, contributed to them. They are not mentioned either in the minute or account books of the Scriveners' Company.

This is a short statement of the facts, and I now proceed to tell in detail the story thus sketched out, by extracts from the Minutes, and from the Records of the Scriveners' Company, and the City. This will make the story long, but I hope not uninteresting.

The Scriveners' Company presented a Petition in the spring of 1749 to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the City, praying for an Act "to oblige all persons exercising the Art or Mystery of Scriveners within the City of London who are or shall be compellable to be free of the City to take up their freedom of the Scriveners Company for its encouragement, to enforce the custom of London against foreigners exercising the said Art."

This Petition was referred to and considered by a special Committee of the Court of Common Council, who decided that "the Scriveners' Company should first try their right to the benefit of the custom and Bye-laws of the City in respect of persons exercising within the same the Art or Mystery of Scriveners, before the Committee made a report for granting the Act applied for on behalf of the Scriveners' Company."

This decision was reported to the Court of the Scriveners' Company on June 1, 1749.

At a Court of that Company held the next day several Resolutions were passed upon the subject.

The first was "that it is the opinion of this Court that the questioning of the Company's right (as one of the Free Arts belonging to the City) to the benefit of the Custoum of London and the Bye-laws founded thereon (against non-freemen using any art, trade, occupation, mistery, or handicraft whatsoever within the City), in respect of the art, trade, occupation, or mystery of Scriveners, the proper and peculiar art of

this Company, is striking at the very constitution and being of the Company itself, as one of the free Companies of London."

The second Resolution was "that it was the opinion of the Court that the primary and principal, if not the only use and intention of this Company, as well as of every other free Company of the City of London, was, and is, to regulate persons exercising their respective arts within the City, and to protect and support their respective freemen against encroachment from foreigners whenever and as often as instances thereof should become so frequent as to render it difficult for the individual members to do themselves justice in their private capacities against such violations of their rights and privileges."

The Company then resolved "that the art, mystery and occupation, business, or profession, exercised by members of the Company, and all others who gain their livelihood in the use and exercise of the same Art, which they do by making or writing for gain or reward within the City of London of any kind of deeds or writings polled or unpolled, sealed or to be sealed, whether Bonds, Bills of Sale, Charter Parties, Leases, Releases, Indentures of Bargain and Sale, and other Deeds concerning estates real or personal, is the proper art or mystery of Scriveners, and the peculiar Art or Mystery of or belonging to the Scriveners' Company, as it is one of the free Companies of the City of London."

The Court then resolved that the Company was bound in justice to its free members to protect their privileges, and ordered "that a Suit be forthwith commenced and prosecuted in the Lord Mayor's Court on behalf of the Company in the name of the Chamberlain of London against one of the Attornies of the Courts at Westminster for exercising within the City the proper Art or Mystery of the free Scriveners belonging to the Company by making and writing any deed or deeds, writing or writings, polled or indented, sealed or to be sealed, not being a freeman of London." The Court then referred it to the Committee of Privileges to carry on the Suit.

The Committee of Privileges of the Company met on June 8 and "took into consideration the fixing upon some Attorney-at-Law against whom to bring an action in the Lord Mayor's Court for exercising the proper Art, Mystery, or occupation of the Scriveners' Company, not being free of the City of London, and it was resolved that for the avoiding of partiality in pointing out such Attorney for being made a Defendant for trying this right that twelve of the most eminent Attornies-at-Law living within the City who are non-freemen, and exercising therein the proper art of the Company, should be

named by Ballot." The names proposed by the Committee were "Mr. Ambrose Newton, Mr. John Heaton, Mr. John Michel, Mr. John Alexander, Mr. Edward Lewis, Mr. Samuel Troughton, Mr. Morgan Morse, Mr. Thomas Banks, Mr. George North, Mr. Thomas Hardwicke, Mr. John Scot, and Mr. Harding Tompkyns."

The Committee then resolved "to the intent such nomination might be made in the main equal, that the said twelve names be written on so many different pieces of paper folded up and to be mixed together and then drawn by the Master by way of Ballot, and that an action or actions be brought against the said twelve Attornies respectively for the purpose aforesaid in the order in which their names shall so happen to be drawn by the Master. Whereupon the said Master proceeded with such ballot, and upon examination thereof the said names appear to be drawn in the order following:"—Mr. John Alexander, Mr. John Scott, and the others follow.

It was then resolved "that Mr. Bentham, the Company's Clerk, do forthwith cause an action to be entered in the Lord Mayor's Court at the instance of the Company upon the City's Custom and Bye-laws, against Mr. Alexander, whose name happened to be drawn first in manner aforesaid, for using within the City of London the art, trade, occupation, mistery, or handicraft of a Scrivener (the proper art of this Company) not being a freeman of the City of London."

The Counsel were then retained by the Company "in the Court of King's Bench by way of caution least the Defendant in such action shall by Writ of Privilege or otherwise try to supersede the said Action or control the Mayor's Court from proceeding therein."

The first indication of all this which the Law Society had was conveyed to the Committee, and is duly recorded in the following minute—

"1749 (16 *June*). The Committee considered several letters sent to the Secretary by Mr. John Alexander, a member of the Society, informing him that a complaint had been lodged against him in the Lord Mayor's Court, at the suit of Sir John Bosworth, Chamberlain of the City of London, in a plea of debt or demand for £5, which Mr. Alexander apprehends is grounded on a bye-law of the said City, which directs that 'no person shall follow any art, trade, occupation, mistery or handicraft, without being free of the said City'; and that it being a matter of general concern, and of great consequence to the gentlemen of the Society, Mr. Alexander hoped that

they would agree to defend it. The Committee apprehended that the prosecution was commenced at the instigation of the Scriveners' Company against Mr. Alexander for acting as a Scrivener in the said City not being free thereof nor of that Company, and resolved that Mr. Alexander be acquainted, that in their opinion the defence of the said prosecution should be carried on at the general expense of the Society, and that Mr. Alexander immediately retain Sir John Strange, Sir Richd Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, Mr. fford, Serjeant Skinner, and Mr. Serjeant Prime, if not already retained on the other side, and such of the City Counsel as he should think proper, and take their opinion on the case and the proper method of defence."

The Bye-law to which Mr. Alexander referred in this Minute is that which I have already given.

In due time the Committee reported to the General Body, and in the next Minute will be found a record of the Society's action upon the matter:—

"1749 (21 *June*). The Minutes of the Committee in relation to the prosecution of Mr. Alexander being read, the Society ratified the Order made by the Committee on that occasion, and it was resolved that the defence of Mr. Alexander be defrayed by the Society, and a Select Committee was appointed to conduct such defence, and to assist Mr. Alexander, who was to have the management of such defence, and who was, from time to time, as there should be occasion, to take the Committee's directions. It was resolved that at a meeting of the said Committee, any three may constitute a Committee and proceed to business. It was also ordered that if any other action were brought before the next General Meeting against any other Member at the instigation of the Scriveners' Company, the same Committee should have power to direct the defence (if desired) at the expense of the Society."

Neither in this Minute, nor among the records of the Society, is there any record of the next proceeding of Mr. Alexander to resist the claim of the Chamberlain, but as a fact on June 23, or two days after the Minute, Mr. Alexander served the Scriveners' Company with a Writ of Privilege, issued out of the Court of King's Bench, to restrain the proceedings in the Mayor's Court.

Among the muniments of the Scriveners' Company I found some—though not all—of the original papers in the action, and I propose to illustrate this part of the story with some few of them.

Among the number is the Writ of Privilege served upon the Company by Mr. Alexander, and as I never saw this Writ before, and I think it very likely that my brethren have not either, I give a copy of it for their and my edification:—

“George the Second by the Grace of God of Great Britain France and Ireland King Defender of ye Faith &c. To the Mayor Aldermen and Sheriffs of the City of London and to every of them Greeting. Whereas as well on account of our Royal Dignity as by ancient custom agreable thereto used and approved in times past hitherto the usage hath been that all and singular the Attorneys of our Court before us ought not neither have they during all ye time af^d. been nor have used or been accustomed to be drawn or compelled to ans^c. (elsewhere than in our s^d. Court before us) before any secular Judges in any Plea or Plaint (Pleas of Freehold and Appeal only excepted) and now on ye behalf of John Alexander Gentⁿ. one of ye Attys of our s^d. Court before us Wee are informed that Sir John Bosworth Knt Chamberlain of ye s^d. City of London notwithstanding ye premisses and not regarding our Royal Dignity nor the custom af^d. hath drawn ye s^d. Jno Alexander into plea in our Court before you some or one of you under pretence of a certain Plaint Levied agst ye s^d. Jno Alexander before you some or one of you in a certain plea of Debt upon demand of Five pounds of lawfull money of Great Britain at the Suit of him ye s^d. Sir Jn^o. Bosworth Chamberlain as af^d. to the manifest prejudice and lessening of our Dignity and Infringement of the custom afores^d. & to ye Great Expence and hindrance of the said John Alexander which practice if it should be permitted wo^d. hereafter afford an ill Example to others. Wee therefore Comand and strictly enjoyn you and every of you that you and every of you wholly desist from any further proceeding in the plaint af^d. before you or any of you declaring to the said Sir John Bosworth so prosecuting ye s^d. plaint before you or some or one of you that he repair to our Court before us there to seek for Justice in that behalf if he shall think fitt so to do. Witness Sir William

Lee Knight at Westm^r. ye 14th day of June in ye 23rd year of our Reign.

“ Lee and Antonie.

“ John Alexander proper.

“ E. Sand.”

“ 23 June 1749.

Naturally the Scriveners took proceedings to quash the Writ, and Mr. Alexander reported the fact to the Committee :—

“ 1749 (3 *Nov.*). At a meeting of the Committee appointed to consider the prosecution of Mr. Alexander at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, held at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavern in Chancery Lane, on the 3rd Nov., 1749, Mr. Alexander attended and produced the notice given to quash his writ of privilege, and for a *Procedendo* to proceed in the action against him brought in the Mayor's Court, and also some instructions he proposed giving to Counsel in opposition to the Motion; and after consideration the Committee ordered that Mr. Alexander give instructions to Sir Richard Lloyd and Mr. Hume Campbell to take notes on the said intended Motion.”

The next meeting of the Committee records the progress of the suit, and the steps taken by Mr. Alexander to defend his writ :—

“ 1749 (13 *Nov.*). Mr. Alexander again attended, and the several cases cited on the motion, and proposed to be cited, were considered and observations made thereon, and several matters were proposed to be added to the instructions to Counsel on showing cause against the Rule obtained by the Scriveners' Company. Mr. Alexander was desired to settle the briefs to be delivered to counsel in accordance with the directions given to him, and it was resolved to give briefs to all the Councill retained, and with proper fees.”

The next Minute is that of the General Meeting of the Society, at which the proceedings since the last meeting are duly recorded :—

“ 1749 (16 *Febry.*). At the General Meeting of the Society held on the 16th Febry, 1749, at the Devil Tavern, after the usual business had been gone through, the Report of the Committee was read, and was to the following effect :—That since the last

General Meeting Mr. Alexander, against whom the Plaint was lodged in the Mayor's Court, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, brought his Writ of Privilege as an Attorney of the King's Bench, and that a Motion was made and a Rule granted, unless cause shown in the said Court for quashing the said Writ of Privilege, and for a Procedendo in the Mayor's Court. That the Select Committee appointed at the last General Meeting had since then twice met, and in consequence of their resolutions briefs had been given to Counsel to show cause against the said Rule, and that in the preceding November cause was shown, and the Court adjourned the consideration of the matter until Hilary Term, when the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company were to reply in respect of the Rule, which was enlarged for that purpose; but they, instead of replying, had only enlarged the Rule to the following Easter term.

"It was ordered that the thanks of the Society be given to Sir Richd Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Williams for their assistance and obliging behaviour in Mr. Alexander's affair, and that the Deputy Secretary send letters to the Select Committee to meet and wait on these gentlemen for that purpose."

The argument did not take place until the 10th of the following November.

The report of the proceedings taken from the Scriveners' Records is as follows:—

"The Committee of Privileges of the Company met at the Exchequer office, near Westminster Hall, the 10th Nov^r 1750, this day having been appointed by the Judges of the Court of King's Bench, namely the R^t Hon. Lord Chief Justice Lee, Mr. Justice Wright, Mr. Justice Dennison, and Mr. Justice Foster, for the further arguing of the matter upon the Writ of Privilege brought by Mr. John Alexander.

"The said matter was solemnly argued on the part of the Plaintiff agst. Mr. Alexander, by Mr. Henley, Mr. Ford, and Mr. Cox, of Counsel for the Scriveners' Co., and upon the conclusion thereof the said Court of King's Bench declared their opinion in favour of the Plaintiff, and the Lord Chief Justice Lee expressly recommended it to Mr. Alexander to submit and take up his freedom to qualify himself for exercising the said Art within the City."

It is interesting to read Mr. Alexander's report to the Committee on the same subject :—

- “ At a Meeting of the Committee appointed to consider the prosecution, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, of Mr. Alexander held on the 14th Novr 1750.
- “ Mr. Alexander attended, and informed the Committee, that on the previous Saturday the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company had replied to the Arguments of the Counsel acting on his behalf, and that the Court had adjourned the giving a determinate opinion on the Motion, but that the Chief Justice had declared his private opinion in favour of a Procedendo, and to quash Mr. Alexander's Writ of Privilege, and the Committee's opinion as to Mr. Alexander's future conduct was desired. It was resolved that Counsel on behalf of Mr. Alexander be desired to have a Consultation, and to advise (1) whether it was not proper to apply to the Court of Kings Bench for leave to reply to the new cases cited by the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company ; (2) whether it would not be proper to make a proposal and to have a trial in Middlesex on a feigned or any other issue so as to bring the merits of the case in question ; and (3) if by the determination of the Court a Procedendo were directed, whether it would be advisable for Mr. Alexander to plead his privilege in the Action brought against him in the Mayor's Court. Mr. Benton, Mr. New, Mr. Wade, Mr. Atwood and the Deputy Secretary were requested to wait on Counsel for Mr. Alexander, and inform them of the above resolution, and to fix a time for a consultation, and they were to be at liberty to propose to Counsel any other questions they should think necessary. In consequence of the above-mentioned resolution, the Members of the Committee referred to waited on each of the Counsel concerned, and the Consultation was fixed for Monday the 19th Novr at 5 o'clock in the afternoon.
- “ Three Members of the Committee, viz. Mr. Wade, Mr. Pardoe, Mr. Attwood, and the Deputy Secretary and Mr. Alexander, accordingly attended at Sir Richd. Lloyd's chambers, and Sir R. Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, and Counsellor Williams, on consultation, were of opinion on the first question that when the Scriveners' Company moved for the judgment of the Court on their rule, time should be asked for to reply to the

new cases cited by the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company ; and on the second question it was adjudged needless to propose a trial on a feigned issue in regard to Mr. Bentham, Attorney, for the Scriveners' Company had absolutely declared he would not consent thereto, and on the third question Counsel were of opinion, in case the Court determined against Mr. Alexander's privilege, that they would advise pleading that privilege in the Court below, and endeavour to get a special case made to be argued before all the Judges."

The proceedings, as far as they went, were obviously not in favour of the Attornies.

The Scriveners' Company at all events looked upon them as a success, and instructed Mr. Bentham to renew the petition for the Act before the Court of Common Council. The Company also gave a general retainer to their Counsel, giving £5 5s. each to the Counsel and 10s. 6d. to each of their Clerks, and thanked the Counsel for their services.

In the Company's Minutes is a copy of the fresh Petition, and it is stated in it that the Court had not delivered its judgment in the case of Mr. Alexander, but did advise and recommend Mr. Alexander then present to submit and take up his freedom in the City.

On February 8, 1750, the Common Council came to the determination that the Scriveners' Company were entitled in the circumstances to the Act prayed for, and gave directions for the Bill to be prepared.

This in due time became known to the Law Society, and was reported to the General Meeting.

The Minute at which this is referred to is as follows :—

"1750 (18 *February*). At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, on the 18th February, 1750, the Select Committee was ordered to enquire into the proceedings of the Scriveners' Company, to obtain a Bye-law, which was then under consideration by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City, and if they should find the same to be prejudicial to the interests of the Society, the said Committee were enabled to take such methods as they should be advised to prevent the same passing."

Before the next meeting of the Committee Mr. Alexander had discovered that it was not a new Bye-law that the Scriveners' Company was about to apply for, but an Act of the Common

Council, which would be founded, as in the House of Commons, on a Petition. This forms the subject of the next meeting :—

“1750 (*25 Feby.*). At a Meeting of the Committee appointed to consider the prosecution at the instance of the Scriveners’ Company, held on the 25 February, 1750, Mr. Alexander also attended. The Deputy Secretary having obtained a copy of the Petition of the Scriveners’ Company, the same was read, and the Deputy Secretary informed the Committee that he had applied for a copy of the Bill for the intended Bye-law, but had not been able to procure same. The Secretary was ordered to get a copy of this Bill as soon as he could, and summon the Committee to meet thereon.”

It is interesting to remark that the proceedings for the obtaining a private Act in the Court of Common Council, were exactly similar to those now in force in the High Court of Parliament—that Court having framed its procedure upon the model of the proceedings of the Court of Common Council, though it is very doubtful if they would like to be reminded of this.

The next Minute records the fact that the Secretary had obtained a copy of the Bill :—

“1751 (*25 March*). The Deputy Secretary having obtained a copy of the Bill, it was resolved that such Bill be laid before Mr. Williams for his opinion as to how far it may affect the members of the Society, and whether it was proper for the Society to oppose the said Bill, and in what manner.”

The next Minute shows the result of this :—

“1751 (*April 17*). The Deputy Secretary informed the Committee that he had, in accordance with their instructions, laid the Bill before Mr. Williams, and had received from that gentleman a letter to the following effect—that he had read over the Bye-law, and believed it was in the common form, except as to the penalty, which was larger than usual; that it seemed to him advisable to oppose the passing of this Bye-law into an Act of Common Council; for supposing that the merits of the question between the Scriveners and Attornies should be determined in favour of the Scriveners, and the Attornies be obliged to become Freemen of the City, it may

be more eligible for them, for many reasons, to take up their freedom in other Companies than the Scriveners'; that the most proper method to oppose the Bill may be by the Gentlemen of the Society applying to their particular friends on the Common Council to postpone the consideration of it until such time as the merits of the case then depending had been determined; if this method should not be thought proper, or should not prove effectual, it would be very material to have a clause added to the Bye-law, enabling every Attorney who should act as a Scrivener to employ in his office any articulated clerk, notwithstanding that such clerk should not be articulated for seven years, or bound according to the custom of the City, and also to employ any writer, although such writer should not be free of the City. Unless some clause of this sort were added, he doubted all the Attorneys in the City should article their clerks for seven years, and should employ such writers only as were freemen."

"After considering the foregoing letter from Mr. Williams, it was resolved that the members of the Society, in their private capacity, should apply to their particular friends of the Common Council to postpone the passing of the Bye-law into an Act of Common Council, until the judgment of the Court of King's Bench had been given in the cause depending between the Chamberlain of the City of London and Mr. Alexander."

From this interesting Minute it will be seen that the Attornies and Solicitors rightly apprehended the intended effect of the Act of the Common Council, and determined to oppose it in the only manner in which they could.

In the same month of April the Scriveners' Company asked the Judges to deliver Judgment, and the Clerk to the Company attended the Lord Chief Justice, and gave him a copy of the Writ of Privilege and also a Book of the Company's Charter and Constitutions at his request, and Mr. Owen, the Chief Justice's Clerk, also put before his Lordship the printed documents containing the ancient Bye-laws of the Company—in fact, the volume which I have referred to before as being the Scriveners' Company's case.

Nothing, however, was done at this time, and in June 1751 the Scriveners' Company were very anxious to get the case disposed of before the Long Vacation, and among their records is a

Sir

Dejworth Kent
Alexander -

J^r. Rich. Hoys Clerk told -
me he should not be ready to argue the -
Point till abt. the middle of the Term - I was
agreeable to my Promise I thought proper to
acquaint you with

Sir

Yo^r. mt. hble Serv^t

J. Bentham
June 11. 1751

J.

Mr. Bentham Attorney at Law

near

Abbots Church.

J. W.

I'm very glad of your fixed night
Monday - last Night I left Instr.^{no}
at J. Chambers of all my Counsel, 'twas
my Misfortune not to meet with 'em
I do not mean any delay but am

for

yo. m. till I see

J. W.

June 11.
1751

J.

M^r. Bentham

J.

Bjworth 3 dead - J. R. says sent word to me
last night that he could not be ready till
Wednesday - I suppose two days will -
make no difference -

I am fr.

yo. mt. hble Jew

J. B. BENTHAM

Sunday
afternoon

J.

M^r. Bentham Attorney at Law

near

Abgato Church

J.

Byworth 3 Dec^r - J. R. Kay sent word to me
last Night that he could not be ready till
Wednesday - I suppose two days will -
make no difference -

I am fr.

yo. mt. hble Jew

J. R. Kay

Sunday
afternoon

J.

M^r. Bentham Attorney at Law

near

Abgato Church

To this letter Mr. Alexander replied later in the day :—

“ SIR,

“ I’m very glad you’ve fix^d next Monday. Last Night I left Instr^{ms} at y^e Chambers of all my Councel, ’twas my misfortune not to meet with ’em.

“ I do not mean any delay, but am,

“ Sir,

“ Yo’ m^t hble Serv^t,

“ JNO. ALEXANDER.

“ June 11, 1751.

“ To MR. BENTHAM.”

A letter from Mr. Alexander on Sunday afternoon—mark the day—alters the arrangement :—

“ SIR,

“ Bosworth v. Alex^t. Sir R^d. Lloyd sent word to me last Night that he c’oud not be ready till Wednesday. I suppose two days will make no difference.

“ I am, S^t,

“ Yo’ m^t hble Serv^t,

“ JNO. ALEXANDER.

“ Sunday Afternoon.

“ To MR. BENTHAM, Attorney at Law,

“ near

“ Aldgate Church.”

Even in this litigation there is some touch of nature, for at the bottom of one of Mr. Bentham’s letters is the following memorandum—“Crayfish or prawns a dish, if not dear, and one Salmon Trout.”

One may be forgiven for expressing a hope that Mr. Alexander shared this delicious but rather spare meal with Mr. Bentham.

As a fact—as has happened to many practitioners since the days of Mr. Bentham—the sons of Zeruah, as the Protector Oliver called Counsel, were too many for either him or Mr. Alexander, and the case duly and properly went over the vacation.

The way in which this happened is thus recorded in the Scriveners’ Records :—

“ On the 17th of June, 1751, the Committee of Priviledges met at

the Exchequer Coffee House, near Westminster Hall, this day having been appointed by Sir Rich^d Lloyd of Counsel for Mr. John Alexander to speak again to the matter of privilege, and Messrs. Henley, Ford, and Cox, Counsel for Sir John Bosworth Knight on behalf of the Scriveners' Co., having had instructions to attend, and the Judges, also having had notice in writing by Mr. Bentham agreeable to their directions to him the last term. The Committee attended the Court of King's Bench at Westminster, in expectation that the Defendant Alexander's Counsel would speak again to the matter of privilege as to the new cases cited by the Plaintiff's Counsel upon the last argument, but Sir Richard Lloyd not attending in Court, notwithstanding his own appointment of to-day for that purpose, Mr. Henley moved for the judgment of the Court on behalf of the Company, in answer to which Mr. Hume Campbell, also a Counsel for Mr. Alexander, acquainted the Court that they were not prepared to speak to the matter, and prayed that as it was a matter that concerned the whole profession of Attornies in London, they might have further time given 'em to speak to the same again. Whereupon the Court, at the request of the Defendant's said Counsel, thought fit to suspend giving their judgment until the next term."

This was also reported to the Society on July 10th following.

"At a General Meeting of the Society, on Wednesday the 10th July 1751.

"After the usual business had been disposed of, the Prolocutor reported, that since the last General Meeting the Scriveners' Company in Trinity Term moved for judgment in Mr. Alexander's affair, but that Mr. Alexander's counsel desiring leave to answer some new cases cited in the reply, the Court adjourned the further hearing of the Motion and giving judgment till the following Michaelmas Term."

The Prolocutor also reported that the Byc-law had not been passed by the Committee of the Common Council.

The next Meeting of the Society was held in February 1752. At that time the Bill had passed the Committee, and was being, or was about to be, discussed in the Court of Common Council.

"1752 (21 February). After the usual Report had been made, the Prolocutor stated that since the last General Meeting

nothing material had been done relating to the prosecution of Mr. Alexander at the instance of the Scriveners' Company.

“The Deputy Secretary having laid before the Society a printed copy of the Bill then depending before the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of London, for regulating the Company of Scriveners, and the same being read and several members declaring their sentiments and opinions thereon, it was resolved that every member in his private capacity should apply to his particular friends of the Common Council to postpone the passing of that Bill until the Judgment of the Court of King's Bench had been given in the case depending between the Chamberlain of the City of London and Mr. Alexander, touching his Writ of Privilege; and it was that the special Committee be summoned forthwith to consider the said Bill, and to consider whether it was proper to oppose the passing of the said Bill, and if so, to oppose the same in such manner as they should think fit. The thanks of the Society were given to Mr. Alexander for his prudent conduct and steady behaviour in opposition to the prosecution against him at the instance of the Scriveners' Company.”

The Bill came on for discussion on May 6, and was much debated in the Court of Common Council.

The debate on the third reading lasted four hours, but the Bill was passed without alteration.

The discussion appears to have excited some little public interest at the time, and the fact of the discussion is duly recorded in the *Gentleman's Magazine*. The following is the extract:—

“1752 (Wednesday 6th May, 26 George 2nd). At a Court of Common Council of London the Bill for regulating the Company of Scriveners was read a second time, and after a debate of four hours read a third time, and passed into an Act.”

As this Act of the Common Council is very scarce, in fact I believe only two prints of it are in existence, I give a copy of it:—

“AN ACT FOR REGULATING THE COMPANY OF SCRIVENERS,
LONDON.

“Whereas the Company of Scriveners is and hath been an

antient Company and Fraternity of this City, and long since incorporated, and the said Company have from Time to Time framed diverse Laws and Ordinances for the Regulation and ordering of the Art or Mystery of Scriveners and for the better Government and Demeanor of their several Members using or exercising the same Art which said By-Laws and Ordinances have been duly ratified according to law.

“And whereas of late Years many persons using and exercising the said Art or Mystery have obtained their Freedom in other Companies whereby the said Company of Scriveners is much lessened and may in time fall into utter Decay. To the Intent therefore that all Freemen of this City Using Occupying or Exercising the Trade Occupation Art Mystery or Science of Scriveners within this City and Liberties thereof may in Time to come be brought into the Freedom of the said Company of Scriveners.

“Be it Enacted Ordained and Established by the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor Aldermen and Commons in this present Common Council assembled and by the Authority of the same, that from and after the 24th Day of June next every Person not being already free of this City occupying using or exercising or who shall occupy use or exercise the Trade Occupation Art Mystery or Science of Scriveners within the City of London or Liberties thereof shall take upon himself the Freedom and be made a Freeman of the said Company of Scriveners. And that no Person or Persons now using or exercising or who shall hereafter use occupy or exercise the said Trade Occupation Art Mystery or Science of Scriveners within the said City or Liberties thereof shall from and after the said 24th Day of June next be admitted by the Chamberlain of this City for the Time being into the Freedom or Liberties of this City of or in any other Company than the said Company of Scriveners any Law Usage or custom of this City to the contrary notwithstanding.

“Provided always that all and every Person and Persons not being already Free of this City and who now are or hereafter shall be entitled to the Freedom of any other Company within this City by Patrimony or Service and ought in Pursuance of this Act to be made Free of the said Company of Scriveners shall be admitted into the Freedom of the said Company of Scriveners upon Payment of such and the like Fine and Fees

- and no more as are usually paid and payable upon Admission by the Child or Apprentice of a Freeman of the same Company.
- “And be it further enacted and ordained by the Authority aforesaid that if any person (other than and except such persons as are already Free of this City) do or shall at any Time or Times from and after the said 24th Day of June next occupy use or exercise the Trade Occupation Art Mystery or Science of Scriveners within this City or Liberties thereof, not being Free of the said Company of Scriveners, then every such person (other than and except as aforesaid) shall forfeit and pay the sum of Five pounds for every such Offence.
- “Provided always and it is hereby enacted and declared that nothing herein or in any other Law Custom or Usage of the said City of London shall extend or be deemed taken or construed to extend to charge any Freeman of this City who shall occupy use or exercise the said Trade Occupation Art Mystery or Science of Scriveners within the said City or the Liberties thereof for Employing or setting on Work at any Time or Times from and after the said 24th day of June any Writer or Writers or to charge any such Writer or Writers for Writing for or under any such Freeman who shall so occupy use or exercise the said Trade Occupation Art Mystery or Science of Scriveners within the said City of London or the Liberties thereof.
- “And be it further Enacted and Ordained by the Authority aforesaid that the Forfeitures and Penalties made payable by this Act shall and may be recovered by Action of Debt Bill or Plaint to be commenced and prosecuted in the name of the Chamberlain of the said City of London for the time being in His Majesty's Court of Lord Mayor and Aldermen to be holden in the Outer Chamber of the Guildhall of the City of London Security being first given by the Master and Wardens of the said Company to indemnify him against all Costs Damages and Expences that may happen or arise on Account of commencing and prosecuting the said Action. And that the said Chamberlain of the said City for the Time being in all suits to be prosecuted by Virtue of this present Act against any offender shall recover his ordinary Costs of any Suit to be expended in and about the prosecution of the same; And that in Case the said Chamberlain for the Time being shall be Non-suited or discontinue the said Action or a Verdict or Judgment shall be given against the said Chamberlain in any such

d

Action to be brought by Virtue of this Act then the Costs of such Nonsuit Discontinuance Verdict or Judgment shall be paid and born by the Master Wardens and Assistants of the Company of Scriveners for the Time being and the said Chamberlain to be fully indemnified and saved harmless by the said Master Wardens and Assistants of and from the same: any Law Usage or Custom of the said City to the contrary notwithstanding.

“And be it further enacted and ordained by the Authority aforesaid that all Penalties and Forfeitures to be had and recovered by Virtue of this Act (the Charges of the Suit for the Recovery thereof being first deducted) shall be divided into two equal parts the one Moiety thereof shall be paid to the Treasurer of the London Workhouse for the Time being to be applied towards the Maintenance of the Poor there and the other Moiety to him or them that shall prosecute for the same.”

The Act was duly read at the next meeting of the Select Committee, and it was determined to submit a report upon it to the General Meeting :—

1752 (13th *May*). Mr. Alexander also was present. Upon reading the Act of Common Council for regulating the Scriveners' Company, it was unanimously resolved that the said Act, so far as it may be intended to affect sworn Solicitors or Attornies of the Courts of Law or Equity in the conveyancing branch of their business, was contrary to law, and that no Attorney or Solicitor should submit thereto until the validity thereof had been properly determined; and that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the above-mentioned Act of Common Council, the Society should defend such action at the general expense; and it was resolved to lay such resolution before a Special General Meeting of the Society, to be summoned by the Deputy Secretary, and to be held on the 29th of the same month, at the Devil Tavern, at six o'clock in the evening.”

The Committee, however, met again in the interval to consider what, I suppose, they thought a case they had not provided for, viz. to defend any action that might be brought against a member of the Society, not under the new Act of Common Council, but under the old Bye-law of the City—a proceeding which was actually taken.

A copy of this Minute is as follows :—

“ 1752 (27 *May*). It was resolved unanimously, that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the general Bye-law of the City of London, whereon the action pending against Mr. Alexander was founded, that such action should be defended at the expense of the Society; and it was resolved to lay this resolution before the Members at the Special General Meeting on the following Friday.”

The General Meeting was held two days later. At it Resolutions were passed in conformity with the recommendations of the Committee, and it was further ordered that they should be advertised. A copy of the Minute is as follows :—

“ 1752 (29 *May*). After reading the resolution of the last General Meeting, the Scriveners' Company's Bill, and the Resolutions of the Select Committee relating to the Act of Common Council, as also the said Act and the Bye-Law of the City of London, whereon the action against Mr. Alexander was pending, it was unanimously resolved that, in the opinion of the Society, the said Act, so far as it was intended to affect the Sworn Attornies and Solicitors of the respective Courts of Law and Equity, in the conveyancing branch of their business, was contrary to law, and that no Attorney or Solicitor should submit thereto, and that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the said Act, the Society would defend such action at the general expense. It was also unanimously resolved, that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the General Bye-law of the City of London, on which the action against Mr. Alexander was founded, such action should also be defended at the general expense of the Society. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to have the foregoing resolutions inserted in the following public papers—*The Daily Advertiser*, *The General Advertiser*, *The Gasetter*, and *The London Advertiser*. At the same meeting the Select Committee were fully empowered to give directions from time to time for defending all actions which should be brought on the said Act of Common Council or Bye-law against any Attorney or Solicitor, and to employ such persons as they thought proper in the defence of such actions,

reporting, their proceedings from time to time to the Society at the General Meetings as occasion should require.

On June 4th, 1752, Mr. Bentham was ordered to enter in the Minute Book of the Scriveners' Company the Act of the Common Council. Mr. Bentham also reported "that since the passing of the Act several attornies-at-law, in order to qualify themselves to exercise the Art or Mistery of Scriveners within the City, had procured themselves to be made free of other Companies in order to be admitted into the freedom of the City, contrary to the tenour and true meaning of the Act. It was ordered that public notices be given in some or one of the daily papers, that all persons who are not actually free of the City at or before the passing of the Act, and who exercised the Art or Mistery of Scriveners' after the 24th inst. would be liable to be sued by virtue of the Act in case they be not admitted into the freedom of the Scriveners' Co., notwithstanding such their admission into the freedom of any other Company." It was ordered that this notice should be published in the *Daily Gazette*.

This was done, and it appears from the Scriveners' Records that on June 10th, Mr. Adams Barber, an Attorney of the Court of Common Pleas, and Mr. Joseph Smith, one of the Attornies of the Court of King's Bench, were admitted into the freedom of the Company, and it was ordered "that an account of all persons exercising the Art or Mistery of the Scriveners within the Walls or Liberties of the City of London, whether Notaries, Attornies-at-law, Solicitors in Equity, or others, should be made for the use of the Committee of Privileges, that the Master and Wardens might better know and consider what persons the better to summon before them after the 24th inst."

It seems very probable that the proceedings of the Scriveners' Company were very well known to the Attornies, and it was no doubt this knowledge that made the Society appoint an Attorney to represent it, as up to this time Mr. Alexander had, as it appears from the Writ, appeared in person and conducted his own case, though employing Counsel. A Mr. Mason was elected, and a resolution of the Committee was come to to that effect. A copy of it is as follows :—

"1752 (15 June). At a meeting of the Select Committee, It was resolved that Mr. W^m. Mason, one of the members of the Com-

mittee, be desired to undertake the defence of all actions which should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor under the Act of the Common Council for regulating the Scriveners' Company, or upon the General Bye-law of the City of London, the said Mr. Wm. Mason taking the direction of the Committee, touching such defence from time to time as he should judge necessary."

The next step was to appoint Counsel, and this was done at the next meeting of the Committee :—

"1752 (22 *June*). At a meeting of the Committee, the Committee proposed to retain the following Serjeants and Counsel to defend any action that should be brought against any member of the Society by the Chamberlain of the City of London, on the Bye-law of the said City, or on the Act of Common Council lately passed.

Mr. Serjeant Prime	Mr. Bathurst	Mr. Pratt
" " Willes	" Gould	" Huett
" " Poole"		

At the General Meeting of the Society, four days later, the Prolocutor reported that the position was still unchanged, and "that since the last General Meeting there had not been anything material done relating to the prosecution against Mr. Alexander, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company."

On June 24th, the List of Attornies and Solicitors ordered by the Court of the Scriveners' Company was presented, and the Court ordered that Mr. Bentham "cause the following twelve persons to be summoned by the Beadle to attend the Master and Wardens on July 8th, between eleven and twelve o'clock, at the Rainbow Coffee House, on Cornhill, to take upon themselves the freedom of the Company in pursuance of the Act of Common Council lately passed :—

Mr. Langley Hill, at Grocers' Hall.

Mr. John Dowding, Attorney-at-Law, at Mr. Metcalfs, in Bucklersbury.

Mr. Thomas Moye, Attorney-at-Law, in ditto.

Mr. Philip Worlidge, Ditto in Freeman's Court, Cornhill.

Mr. Ralph Carre, at Mrs. Humphrys, in Norman's Court, Cornhill.

Mr. Thomas Constable, in Great Elbow Lane.

Mr. John Smith, in Talbot Court, Gracechurch Street, next door to the Ship, in Broad Street.

Mr. John Hawkins, Attorney-at-Law, in Clements Lane.

In addition to these names are those of others not Attornies.

At the same meeting it was ordered that Wm. Moreton, Esq., be retained on behalf of the Company.

Of the Attornies selected to be summoned, Mr. Worlidge was a member of the Society, and Mr. Langley Hill was clerk to the Grocers' Company. I shall point out at a later period, that several of the Clerks to the City Companies were Attornies, in fact Mr. Alexander, who at this time was carrying on his business in Threadneedle Street, on Mr. Hill's death in 1757, succeeded him at Grocers' Hall as Clerk.

This summons the Attornies and Solicitors determined to resist, and this is stated in the following Minute:—

"1752 (7 July). At a meeting of the Select Committee Several Summonses served by the Scriveners' Company on Mr. Thos. Constable, Mr. John Dowding, Mr. Thos. Moye, and Mr. Nathaniell Andrews, requiring them personally to appear before the Ma. and Wardens of that Company on the 8th of July, then and there to take upon themselves the freedom, and to be made ffreemen of the said Company, as they should answer the contrary at their peril, were read, and it was unanimously resolved to totally disregard the aforesaid summonses. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to give notice of this Resolution to Mr. Dowding, Mr. Moye, & Mr. Andrews.

"It was ordered at the same Meeting that the general resolutions of the Society of the 29th of May last be reprinted three times in the *Daily Advertiser* and *Gazetter* with the following addition thereto:—

"'The Attornies or Sollrs who have been or shall be summoned to take upon them the freedom of the Scriveners' Company are desired to apply to Mr. Edward Bowman at his house in Chancery lane.'"

It appears from the Scriveners' Records that on July 8th, Mr. Langley Hill, the Clerk to the Grocers' Company, attended the Company, "and desired that he might have time to consider of

the affair till the beginning of October next, and he would then acquaint the Master and Wardens with his Resolution in respect to the taking up the freedom of this Company."

Only one other Attorney attended, and he denied that he had done any business of the nature complained of.

It would seem, however, that some Attornies tried to take up their freedom in other Companies, because there is a Minute in the Scriveners' Book of September 19th, to the effect that the Master and Wardens had attended the Lord Mayor on the application of two Solicitors, named Wheatley, and Daniel Highmore, one to be admitted to the Waxchandlers' Company, and the other to be admitted to the Grocers' Company, and it is mentioned that Mr. Harrison, the Chamberlain, declared that he would not admit any Attornies into the freedom of the City by any other Company than the Scriveners' Company.

I do not, however, find that either of them were admitted to that Company.

A short time after this, viz. on September 20th, Mr. Bentham reported to the Company "that the Action brought at the instance of the Company, in the name of Sir John Bosworth, late Chamberlain of London, against Mr. John Alexander, was abated by his death. It was ordered that Mr. Bentham do cause an Action to be entered in the Lord Mayor's Court against the said Mr. John Alexander at the suit of Thomas Harrison, the present Chamberlain, and that he prosecute the same with effect as well in the said Mayor's Court as in the Court of King's Bench, in case any Writ of Privilege be sued out to stop or supersede the said action."

The Action was accordingly commenced in the Mayor's Court, and exactly the same proceeding was adopted by the Society, who was now conducting the defence, as had been taken in the proceeding which had abated.

A Writ of Privilege was sued out which the Scriveners' Company moved in the Court of King's Bench to supersede.

In the Autumn several Attornies took up their Freedom in the Scriveners' Company, but it does not appear that Mr. Langley Hill was one of them.

In the following November, the position of the proceedings was duly reported to the Committee of the Law Society.

The Minute of the Committee is as follows :—

"1752 (20 Nov.). At a Meeting of the Select Committee Mr. Mason reported that since the preceding meeting anōr

action had been brought agt Mr. Alexander, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, at the suit of the Chamberlain of the City of London, on the same Bye-law the former action agst him was brought, and that a Writ of Priviledge had been sued out for him; and further informed the Committee that Motions had been made in the Kings Bench to quash the Writs of Privilege brought by Mr. Alexander, and Mr. ffotherby Baker, and that rules had been obtained to show cause, and that he had prepared and delivered briefs and instructions to the Councill retained by the Society to show cause on that occasion. The Committee passed a resolution entirely approving of Mr. Mason's conduct. It was resolved that in the opinion of the Committee, the sume of one Guinea should be paid by each member of the Society into the hands of the Deputy Secretary towards defraying the expense of defending the several suits already brought or to be brought against Attornies or Sollicitors upon the Bye-laws of the City of London. Each of the members present at the Committee paid the same accordingly."

The records of the Scriveners' Company are rather more precise as to what took place, as will appear from the next Minute:—

"On the 22nd of November 1752, the Committee of Privileges again met at Westminster for the purpose of hearing the arguments. Mr. ffotherby Baker moved the Court to make the former Rule absolute for superseding the Defts Writ of Privilege, upon which Sir Richard Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, Mr. Bathurst, and Mr. Williams, Counsel for the Defendant, alleged that it was too late in the day for them now to go through their further arguments, as the term was so far spent. Desired the matter might go over till next term, but proposed that the parties concerned on both sides might enter into a Rule by consent to try upon an issue to be joined in the Court of King's Bench for the sitting to be held at Westminster, whether the Attornies-at-Law were entitled to exercise the art or mystery of Scriveners within the City of London without being free. And Mr. Bentham was asked by the Defendant's Counsel in Court whether he would consent to such proposal; he there-upon declared he would never consent to any such proposition, for that it would be giving up not only the privileges of the Scriveners' Co., but also of all other the citizens of London, who

he insisted had a right to have all actions founded upon the customs and bye-laws of the City tried and determined in the City Courts and not elsewhere, and while the matter was stirred in the Court, Mr. Justice Foster intimated he sho^d be glad to be informed what was the proper business of a Scrivener, and at the close of what passed upon the said Motion the Court ordered the said Rules to be enlarged to the first day of next term, and that the Judges should be then informed by the agent for the Plaintiff what day in particular they proposed to move again to make the original Rules absolute. After which Mr. Moreton, the Companie's Counsel, thought it would be proper to cause the printed report of the Companie's Committee, setting forth the case of the free Scriveners of London, to be delivered to the Judges of the Court of King's Bench as a means of given 'em the information Mr. Justice Foster expressed a desire to be furnished with."

On December 7th, 1752, the Court of the Company ordered Mr. Bentham to give each of the Judges a copy of the report with the appendix, which he did upon December 15th.

On January 17th, 1753, Mr. Moreton, the Counsel, had a conference with the Company for the better to prepare himself against the argument on the matter of privileges. He and Mr. Cox, another Counsel, dined with the Company, and no doubt left their hosts fully equipped for the argument. "Mr. Moreton and Mr. Cox both expressing their "particular approbation of the method the Company had taken hitherto "in their proceedings, gave them assurances of the greatest probability "of success in the matter of privilege in question in the Court of King's "Bench, for that it was their opinion that Attornies were no ways entitled "to privilege in any action grounded upon the customs of London." When, however, on Jan. 26th, the parties were arranging with the Lord Chief Justice for the case to be heard, Mr. Mason found out that the Scriveners' Company had sent their book to the Judges, and was very angry. This is duly recorded in the next Minute of the Company:—

"On the 26th of January an arrangement was made for the case being heard, and Mr. Mason, the Solicitor (who is termed the agent for the Defendants and the Society of Attornies), went to the Lord Chief Justice Lee, who signified his approbation, and while Mr. Mason was in the said Judges' Chambers, finding that the Lord Chief Justice and the other Judges had received

the Companie's printed Report from Mr. Bentham, Mr. Mason objected thereto, and very peremptorily insisted that the said Books ought not to have been delivered to the Judges, notwithstanding which the Lord Chief Justice thought proper to retain his book, which had been delivered to Mr. Owen, his head Clerk, before the holidays, but which he had forgotten to deliver to his Lordship until that day."

Mr. Mason then addressed a letter to Mr. Bentham :—

" SIR,

" As you thought it proper to leave with each of the Judges a printed state of the Scriveners' Company's case, I desire you will be pleased to send me by the bearer, or as soon as possible, five of those printed cases, that I may deliver one of them to each of the Defendants' Counsel, that so they may know what it is you have thought fit to leave with the judges, and be prepared to give a direct answer thereto if necessary.

" I am your humble servant,

" W. MASON,

" Agent for the Defendants."

" It appeared, however, that Mr. Bentham had some time ago, soon after the publication of the Companie's printed Report, gave one to Mr. Wishart Jr., an Attorney-at-Law and Secretary of the Society of Attornies, for the use of the said Society, and the Company therefore determined to give no more to Mr. Mason, but he be at liberty to give one of the said printed Reports to any of the Defts Counsel if he desired it, if he should think fit."

It was arranged that the case should be heard on January 29th, and the Committee of Privileges of the Company duly attended at Westminster Hall, but the Lord Chief Justice Lee, being ill of the gout, was prevented from going to Westminster Hall, and the case was put off, and so it went off till Easter term.

The next Minute of the Society marks the concluding stage of the first action brought by Sir John Bosworth against Mr. Alexander which had abated. I suppose each party had to pay their own costs.

" 1753 (19 *Feb.*). At a meeting of the Committee, Mr. John Alexander having been desired to send in his Bill of costs in the suit agt him by the Scriveners' Company, in the

name of the late Sir John Bosworth, the late Chamberlain of the City of London, By a letter acquainted the Committee that he had no demand on that account, except a sune of £6 3s. 10d., which he disbursed out of pocket, and that he felt himself greatly obliged to the Gentlemen of the society in general, and to the Comitte for their assistance in his defence, and should be always glad to contribute what lay in his power for the benefitt of the profession. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to pay out of the balance in his hands the aforesaid sum of £6 3s. 10d. to Mr. Alexander, and out of the same balance to pay Mr. Mason £40 on account of fees and disbursements in the Society's affairs."

The General Meeting of the Society was held upon February 23rd, and a Report was made to it. A Minute of this Meeting, as far as it concerns the Scriveners' Action, is as follows:—

"1753 (23^d February). At the General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, After the usual business the Prolocutor (Mr. ffotherby Baker) reported on behalf of the Committee that since the last General Meetings several actions having been entered in the Mayor's Court at ye suit of the Chamberlain of the City of London, agt several members of the Society and others at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, Writs of Priviledge had been sued out and allowed.

"That in Michaelmas Term motions were made in the Court of King's Bench to quash the Writs of Priviledge brought by Mr. Alexander and Mr. ffotherby Baker, and rules obtaind to show cause. That the Councell retained by the Society had had briefs and had been fully instructed.

"That no cause had as yet been shown, the Court of King's Bench not having been at leisure to hear the argumt, so that the Rules to show cause had been from time to time enlarged and then stood enlarged till next Easter Term."

When the case came on for hearing in the Easter term, the Committee of Privileges of the Scriveners' Company attended duly at Westminster, viz. on May 9th, 1753, but the same fate attended them. The reason for the case being then put off was that the Court was unexpectedly taken up in the trial of Dr. Archibald Cameron for High Treason, in the last Rebellion, when, not surrendering himself, he was excepted from the Act of Indemnity.

The case was, however, adjourned to May 14th, on which day, as appears from the Scriveners' Minutes, the Law Society's Counsel insisted by way of objection to entering the Motion, that the cause was abated by the Plaintiff, the Chamberlain of London having been knighted since the commencement of the suit in his name. The objection being overruled, the arguments were made and the case was adjourned until Trinity term.

In Trinity term, 1753, the case was postponed because the Court declared "that they could not have the matter argued this term, because it was an issuable term," and so it went off to Michaelmas.

When Michaelmas term came, the Lord Chief Justice fell ill and could not attend, and in his absence, which lasted until Easter term, when he died, the other three judges declared the point to be of too much consequence for them to determine without the Chief Justice.

Towards the end of Easter term, 1754, Sir Dudley Ryder was appointed Lord Chief Justice, and Mr. Bentham waited upon him and handed him a copy of the Scriveners' Company's book, explaining the circumstances in which a copy had been handed to the late Lord Chief Justice.

On July 3rd, 1754, Mr. Bentham reported "that he had that morning attended the Court of King's Bench at Westminster, when the matter of the Writ of Privilege of the Chamberlain of London agst Alexander was moved for further argument, and the judges of the Court were pleased to give judgment that a rule of Court should be made for a procedendo to issue in the action against Mr. Alexander in the Lord Mayor's Court, London, notwithstanding his Writ of Privilege."

On July 18th, Mr. Bentham reported that Mr. Mason would not agree to the form of rule drawn up by the Court, and that Mr. Cooper, the Clerk of the Rules, had referred the matter to the Lord Chief Justice. Mr. Mason had prepared an alternative form.

In the Scriveners' Company's Minutes, the forms of the rival Rules are duly entered, and after discussing them the Company proceeded to order the Dinner. The Dinner was to consist of:—

" Five dishes of fish, consisting of salmon and trout, 'souls,' &c.,

" Three dishes of Lobster, and shrimp sauce,

" Three hams,

" Four dishes of Chicken, three in a dish,

" Two venison pasties,

" Four dishes of Colleyflowers, Cabbages, Carrots, &c."

For the second course :—

“ Four haunches of venison,
 “ Four dishes of French beans,
 “ Four ducks in two dishes,
 “ Two currant tarts,
 “ Two raspberry and currant tarts,
 “ 5 stands of fruit.”

A very meagre report was made to the General Meeting of the Society of their proceedings, and no notice of the fact that the Rule was not settled :—

“ 1754 (19 July). At the General Meeting of the Society, The Prolocutor, on behalf of the General Committee, reported that since the last General Meeting the Court of King's Bench, pressed by the Councill for the Scriveners' Compy to appoint a day for the further hearing of the Motion depending before them concerning Mr. Alexander's Writ of Priviledge, were pleased to declare that they thought it a question of too great weight and importance to be determined on a Motion in a summary way, & that it ought to receive a judicial determination; they therefore determined that so much of the Rule as required Mr. Alexander to show cause why his Writ of Priviledge should not be superceeded should be discharged, but that the Chamberlain of London should, notwithstanding the Writ of Priviledge, be at liberty to declare in the Mayor's Court, so that Mr. Alexander may there plead the privilege by him claimed, and the merits of the question respecting the privilege may receive a judicial determination.”

Mr. Mason and Mr. Bentham could not agree the Rule, and in the following November the question of settlement of the Rule came before the full Court, and on November 7th, 1754, “ Counsel for Mr. Alexander laboured to induce the Court not to perfect the Rule they had made the last term, to the intent that the matter of privilege might be argued *de novo*, but the same was disallowed by the Court, and the Judges themselves settled the Rule in Court, which Mr. Cooper, the Clerk of the Rules, had not been able to do.”

After all this trouble, it seems worth while to set out the Rule as it is given in the Scriveners' Records :—

“Thursday next after the Morrow of All Souls, in the 28th year of King George the Second.

<p>Harrison Esq^{re}, Chamberlain of London. Alexander, one &c.</p>	}	<p>Upon reading the Rule made in this Cause on Tuesday next, after the Morrow of All Souls, in the 26th year of his present Majesty, and the several subsequent rules made for enlarging the same, and upon hearing of Council for both Parties. It is ordered that the Writ of Privilege issued out of this Court be superseded, but without prejudice to the Defendant's pleading his privilege in the Court below. And that the Defendant be at Liberty to sue out another writ of privilege to verify his plea if he thinks fit upon the Motion of Mr. Pratt, for the Plf, and the Soll^r General for the Deft.</p>
---	---	--

“ By the Court.”

The course of the proceedings is accurately reported to the next Meeting of the General Body, in February 1755.

The Minute is as follows :—

“ 1755 (21 *Feb.*). At the General Meeting of the Society. The Prolocutor reported that since the preceding General Meeting the Lord Chief Justice Ryder during the Trinity Vacation, on the application of Mr. Mason, and on hearing him and Mr. Bentham (the Attorney concerned on behalf of the Scriveners' Compy), being dissatisfied with the rule as pronounced on the last day of Trinity Term, was pleased to order the drawing up of the said rule to be stayed till the Court should be again moved in the matter in Michaelmas term. That on the 2nd day of Michaelmas Term the Court was moved again, and on hearing Councill on both sides, it was ordered that the Writ of Privilege issued out of that Court by Mr. Alexander should be superseded, but without prejudice to his pleading his privilege in the Court below, and that he should be at liberty to sue out anōr Writ of Privilege to verify his plea if he should think fit. That the first Writ of Privilege being thus superseded, Mr. Alexander appeared in the Court below, and a declaration being delivered against him, he pleaded his privilege in the Court below in abatement of the action, which plea was drawn by Mr. Altham, and perused and approved of by Mr. Williams

and Mr. Sergeant Poole, and also by Mr. Sergt. Martyn, who signed the same (being one of the City Councill), and there was annexed to the plea in support thereof a new Writ of Privilege under Seal, as also an affidavit that the substance of the Plea was true. That the Plaintiffs had demurred generally to the said plea, and a joynder in demurrer was prepared, which had been approved by Mr. Serjeant Poole, and afterwards perused and signed by Mr. Sergt. Martyn, and was then ready to be delivered."

The effect of this proceeding was that the case came on for hearing on the demurrer, before the Recorder of London. At the General Meeting just a year later it was reported that the demurrer had been argued before the Recorder, and that he had taken time to consider his Judgment, but he had not then delivered it.

The Minute of this Meeting is as follows :—

" 1756 (20 *February*). At the General Meeting of the Society The Prolocutor reported on behalf of the General Committee that, since the preceding Genl. Meeting, the demurrer on Mr. Alexander's plea of privilege in the Mayor's Court was on the 4th Nov^r, argued by Mr. ffield on the part of the Plaintiff and by Mr. Sergt. Poole on behalf of the Defendant, and that the Recorder declared there was no occasion for any further argument, but that he would consider the arguments used, and the several authorities cited on both sides, and form his judgment upon the whole as soon as he conveniently could, and when he had done so would give sufficient notice to the parties to attend to receive his judgment. Up to that time, however, no such notice had been received. The thanks of the Society were ordered to be returned to Mr. Sergt. Poole, and Mr. Mason was requested to wait on that gentleman with such other members as he should think proper for that purpose."

On November 16th, 1756, the Recorder delivered Judgment against Mr. Alexander.

It is notified in the Scriveners' Company's Records that upon this the Company determined to petition the City, either to undertake the further proceedings, in the event of Mr. Alexander appealing to a Court of Error, or to aid the Company with a grant of funds. This question came before the Court of Common Council, on the petition

for a grant of funds, on February 10th, 1757. The motion was opposed by Messrs. Skynner, Cooper, and Baskerville, all of them Attornies, as well as members of the Common Council, and was debated for two hours, but was carried in the affirmative, *nemine contradicente* (Mr. George Baskerville only excepted). In the course of the discussion, it was stated that a Writ of Error had been brought by, and at the instance and joint expense of the Society of Attornies-at-Law, to reverse the Judgment of the Recorder.

This is also mentioned in the Society's Records :—

“ 1757 (25 Feby.). At a general Meeting of the Society Mr. Mason reported that on the 16th of the preceding Novr. the Court gave judgment of Respondeas Ouster on the Demurrer joined in the cause depending in the Mayor's Court between Harrison, Chamberlain of London, and Mr. John Alexander, and Mr. Mason also gave a very clear, distinct, and satisfactory account of the steps since then had and taken in that cause, and in obtaining and issuing forth a Commission of errors on the Judgment given in the said cause, and of the proceedings had in the said Commission of Errors. The thanks of the Society were returned to Mr. Mason for his great care and service in the business of the Society, and the Secretary was ordered to pay Mr. Mason £30 on account of his fees and disbursements in connection with the Society's affairs.”

On June 20th, 1757, Mr. Justice Forster and Mr. Baron Legg, two of the Judges Commissioners in Error, attended at the Guildhall, when Mr. Alexander assigned errors, and a Joinder was put in on the part of the Chamberlain, and the Judges appointed Wednesday, Nov. 16th, for the argument of the Matters of Error.

This was reported to the Committee of the Law Society as follows :—

“ 1757 (15 July). After Mr. Mason informed the Society that since the last Genl. Meeting the Recorder had certified the Record of the Judgment in the cause of Harrison v. Alexander, *ore tenus*, before the Judges' Delegate, that errors had been assigned by Mr. Alexander, and *in nullo est erratum* pleaded thereto, and that the cause stood for argument before the Judges' Delegate at the Guildhall on Wednesday the 16th Novr.”

The case came on for argument on Nov. 16th, and was argued for

several days. On the conclusion of the arguments the Judges took time to consider their judgment. I do not think it worth while to go into this argument in detail. It is fully reported in the Scriveners' Records, and more fully in the printed report, which is in the Society's Library.

The fact of the argument was duly reported to the General Meeting in February 1758, Judgment not having been then given.

The proceedings at this meeting were as follows :—

“1758 (24 *Feb.*). At the General Meeting of the Society Mr. Mason informed the Society that on the 16th Nov^r. the cause on the Writ of Error in the matter of Harrison, Chamberlain of the City of London, against Alexander was argued by Councillor Williams before the Judges' Delegate, and was further argued on the Wednesday following by Mr. Field, Councillor for the Chamberlain of London, and that Mr. Williams replied to this argument on the 19th Jany. The matter was again argued before the said Judges' Delegate by Councillor Norton at Serjeants' Inn Hall on behalf of Mr. Alexander, and by Councillor Cox on behalf of the Chamberlain, that Mr. Norton replied, and Mr. Sergt. Poole attended these arguments, and took notes ready for another argument, but the Delegates required no further arguments, and had agreed to give judgment on the Wednesday before the following Easter Term. That Mr. Norton and Mr. Williams had greatly exerted themselves in their several arguments and replies for the service of the Society.”

“The thanks of the Society were ordered to be given by Mr. Mason to Mr. Norton, Sergeant Poole; and Mr. Williams for their kind assistance in the said cause. The Prolocutor returned the Society's thanks to Mr. Mason for his great care and diligence in the cause.

“Mr. Mason informed the Society, that on the occasion of the arguments before the Judges' Delegates on the Writ of Error he had employed Mr. Thomas Cooke to take down in shorthand the several arguments on both sides, which arguments Mr. Cooke had transcribed at length, and that he was likewise to attend at the time of the Judges' Delegates giving judgment, and that Mr. Cooke had greatly served the Society in this way; and Mr. Mason submitted to the Society that a satisfaction should be made to Mr. Cooke for his trouble and

attendance. The Secretary was ordered to pay to Mr. Cooke such sum as the General Committee should direct to be paid to him as a satisfaction for his trouble and attendance."

This Minute is interesting, for several reasons. In the first place it gives a short account of what took place, and in the second place it accounts for the existence of the printed report in the Society's Library.

The Judges met on November 3rd, nearly a year after the argument. They were the Lord Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Dennison, Mr. Justice Clive, and Mr. Baron Legg.

They delivered their Judgment, affirming the Judgment of the Recorder.

The Scriveners' Company's record on the subject is as follows :—

" 3 Nov., 1758. This morning the Committee attended the Court of Error, at Guildhall, when four of the five Judges appointed by the King's Writ, Lord Chief Baron Parker, Mr. Justice Dennison, Mr. Justice Clive, and Mr. Baron Legg, sat in the Lord Mayor's Court, and severally delivered their opinions from said arguments, which each of 'em had composed in writing, beginning with Baron Legg, the Junior Judge in the Commission, and upon the whole they were all unanimous in giving Judgment for the Defendant in Error, the Chamberlain of London, in favour of the Company for affirming the judgment in the Mayor's Court, against Mr. John Alexander, who they declared was noways entitled to privilege as an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench, as the Action against him was a customary action founded upon the Bye-law of the City of London, and that the City Courts had in such cases an exclusive jurisdiction."

This was duly reported to the Court of the Company on the same day, who resolved "that the Master and Wardens should meet at the Rainbow Coffee House in Cornhill on the 8th and 15th instants, to admit into the freedom of the Company all such Attornies-at-Law who should apply for the purpose."

They also ordered Mr. Bentham to cause an advertisement to be inserted in the daily newspapers, purporting the resolution.

As I remarked at a previous part of this story, the case had attracted some public attention, and a short statement of the fact of the Judgment appears in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of the date :—

“ 1758 (*Friday 3 Nov.*).

Lord Chief Justice Parker, Mr. Justice Dennison, Mr. Justice Clive, and Mr. Baron Legg, four of the Judges who were appointed to give Judgment upon a writ of error in a cause depending between the Chamberlain of London, on behalf of the Scriveners' Company, and Mr. John Alexander, one of the Attorneys of the Court of King's Bench, for exercising the art or mystery of a Scrivener within the said City, not being free thereof, came to Guildhall to give Judgment, when they were unanimous in their opinion that the Judgment formerly given in the Mayor's Court, and which was in favour of the said Company of Scriveners, should be affirmed.”

The Judgment was duly reported to the Committee of the Law Society on Nov. 10th. A Minute of the proceedings is as follows :—

“ 1758 (10 *Nov.*). At a Meeting of the Committee. Mr. Mason having reported to the Committee the substance of several conferences which he had had with Mr. Sergt. Poole, Mr. Norton, and Mr. Williams since the affirmances of the judgment by the Judges' Delegate, and the advice given by those gentlemen, it was resolved that Mr. Mason from time to time pursue the advice already given, and thereafter to be given by the said gentlemen, and return them the thanks of the Society for all their obliging services.”

“ The Committee, thinking it necessary that an advertisement be put in the public papers, drew up and settled the following advertisement :—

‘ The resolution of the Judges' Delegate between the Scriveners' Company and an Attorney residing within the City of London being confined to a point of privilege only, and not on the merits of the case, we are assured That the Attorneys are Determined to Dispute the Merits of the Question in the Court to which the Action is confined.’

“ Resolved that the above advertisement be Incerted in the *Gazetter* on Monday next and the two following days.”

The effect of these tactics may be seen in the Scriveners' Records :—

“ 15 Nov. 1758. The Master reported to this Committee that he and the Wardens had attended on Wednesday last and also

INTRODUCTION.

this day, pursuant to an advertisement inserted in the public papers agreeable to the Order of the last Court of Assistants, for the admission of Attornies-at-Law exercising the Art or Mistery of Scriveners in the City into the freedom of this Company who should apply for that purpose, in consequence of the Judgment in Error lately given in favour of this Company in the Cause of the Chamberlain of London and Alexander, but that no one Attorney-at-Law had attended the said meetings of the said Master and Wardens for admission, and the Master further informed the Committee he apprehended the same was owing to a Resolution the Attornies had come to to dispute the merits by questioning what was the Art and Mistery of a Scrivener, and whether Attornies as such had not the right to exercise the same as incident to the profession of an Attorney, independently to its being the peculiar and proper business or occupation of the Art and Mistery of the free Scriveners of London, and that the Attornies had thought fit to signify such their intention by publishing an advertisement in the *Daily Gazette* in the following words":—

The Records here give the advertisement.

The Committee then took into consideration the bringing of one or more actions against Attornies, as the proper means of enforcing the Bye-law of the 12 Q. Anne, which had been determined by the Judges in Error to be a good Bye-law.

The names of the following Attornies-at-Law, resident in the City, were proposed for the consideration of the Committee, against whom of them actions should be entered and prosecuted in the Lord Mayor's Court. Namely:—

Thomas Banks, of Goldsmiths' Hall.
Robert Winbolt, of Tokenhouse Yard.
James Bernard, of Sun Court, Cornhill.
John Heaton, of Threadneedle Street.
Thomas Kingsley, of Bishopsgate Street.
Philip Worlidge, of Freeman's Court, Cornhill.
Anthony Benn, of Pudding Lane.
Thomas Athawes, of Cordwayners' Hall.
Peter Fenniac, of Wainford Court.
Charles Dubue, of Bartholomew Lane.
John Tilly, of the Poultry.
William Southhouse, of Milk Street.

Moses Sierra, of Staining Lane.
 — Briggs, of Weavers' Hall, Basinghall Street.
 Thomas Benn of Pudding Lane.
 Thomas Lough, of Monument Yard.
 — Charlton, of do.
 Thomas Nuthall, of Crosby Square.
 Samuel Commeline, of Cordwayners' Lane.
 John Mitchell, of Fryday Street.
 Archibald Wynne, of Lawrence Pountney Lane.
 William Hipperley, of Fishmonger Hall.
 Benjamin Cook, of Princes Street.
 Thomas Harrison, of Angel Court, Throgmorton Street.
 Benjamin Rosewell, of do.
 John Alexander, of Grocers' Hall.
 Philip Roberts, of Copthall Court.
 Francis Duroure, of Throgmorton Street.
 — Smith, of Austin Fryars.
 Polydore Plumtree, of do.
 James Green, of Token House Yard.
 Morgan Morse, of Queen Street.
 Charlton Palmer, of Philpot Lane.
 John Langmore, of Bow Lane.
 George Daniel, of Wood Street.
 George Unwyn, of Waxchangers' Hall.
 Thomas Stagg, of Red Cross Street.
 Ambrose Newton, of Aldermanbury.
 Richard Newton, of do.
 Thomas Constable, of Abchurch Lane.
 John Beardmore, of Nicholas Lane.
 Edward Grubb, of Abchurch Yard.
 Joseph Cruttenden, of Surgeons' Hall.
 John Hawkins, of Austin Fryars.
 Nathaniel Neal, of Naggs' Head Court.
 Nathaniel Sheffield, of Ironmonger Lane.
 Thomas Wall, of Carpenters' Hall.
 Branstone Seawell, of Gutter Lane.
 Samuella Dodd, of Threadneedle Street.
 Thomas Hardwick, of Drapers' Hall.

And it was resolved that the actions be entered and prosecuted against the first twelve Attornies above named."

I have set this list out in full, because of some interesting facts to be gathered from it. I have no doubt it represented the whole of the City Attornies. They are fifty in number, and about one-half of them at least appear to have been members of the Law Society, some of them active members. But it is a singular fact that they number among them Clerks to some of the most important Companies. The Grocers', the Goldsmiths', the Drapers', and the Fishmongers' Companies are four of the great Companies, and among the most important. The Weavers', the Cordwainers', the Waxchandlers', the Surgeons', and the Carpenters' Companies, though not reckoned in the first rank, are all of them ancient and important Companies. So that the Attornies were strongly represented even among the City Guilds, and this was certainly not an element favourable to the Scriveners' contention.

I have already mentioned that Mr. Hill was in 1752 Clerk to the Grocers' Company, and that Mr. Alexander succeeded him in 1757, in the middle of the proceedings. From inquiry at the offices of the other Companies, I find that the majority of the Clerks above mentioned had been appointed between the years 1750 and 1758 and therefore while these proceedings were pending. I think probably that the Company of Scriveners were the only citizens interested in the question of forcing the attornies to be Scriveners or even freemen.

On Nov. 17th there was an important meeting of the Law Society's Committee, at which the future course to be taken, and also a Case stated for the Opinion of Counsel, and the Opinion, was considered :—

“ 1758 (17 Nov.). At a Meeting of the Comittee Mr. Mason said that since the last Comittee night he had mett Mr. Sergt Poole, Mr. Norton and Mr. Williams, the Society's councell, in consultation, and that he had by their directions stated a short case relating to the cause between the Chamberlain of London & Mr. Alexander, upon which case they had given and signed a written opinion as to what was proper further to be done in the matter and in any future action to be brōt agt any other Attorneys at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, and Mr. Mason laid before the Come the said case & opinion, which was read. It was resolved that Mr. Mason pursue the advice given by the Society's Councell.”

I think it will be interesting, both as aiding in understanding the

case and also as showing how a Case was prepared and an Opinion given in those days, to set out the Case and Opinion.

They are as follows :—

“ STATE OF THE CASE, WITH THE OPINION OF COUNSEL THEREON.

“ The Chamberlain of *London* having, at the Instance of the Scriveners' Company, brought an Action of Debt in the Mayor's Court *London*, grounded on the general Bye-law of the City for excluding Foreigners, to recover a Penalty for five Pounds supposed to be incurred by Mr. *John Alexander*, for exercising the Art or Mystery of a Scrivener within the City, not being free thereof, and having declared in the said Action Mr. *Alexander* pleaded his Privilege as an Attorney of the Court of *King's Bench* in Abatement of the Jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court to the said Action.

“ To which Plea the Chamberlain demurred and Mr. *Alexander* joined in Demurrer, and the said Demurrer being argued in the Mayor's Court, the Plea was over-ruled, and Judgment of *respondeas ouster* was thereupon given against him, after which Mr. *Alexander*, by advice of Counsel, refusing to answer over, Judgment by *nil dicit* was entered against him for the said Debt of Five pounds and costs.

“ Upon which Judgment Mr. *Alexander* sued forth a special Commission of Errors directed to certain Judges Delegate therein named; and the Record being brought before them, by Writ of Error issued for that Purpose, the Defendant assigned the General Errors; and the Cause being argued before those Judges, they have been pleased to affirm the Judgment given in the Mayor's Court, but the Merits of the Question have not yet been tried.

‘ As this is the Case of the Body of Attornies, who though jealous of their Privileges, would at the same Time cautiously avoid doing any Thing unbecoming their Profession and Character,

“ The Favour of your Opinion is desired whether Mr. *Alexander* ought to submit to the Judgment of Affirmance or not? and if he should do so, and in case any future Action of the like Kind should be brought against him, or any other Attorney, what Defence will be most adviseable to be made therein, as well with respect to the Matter of Privilege, as with regard to

the Merits of the Cause? And as the Handicraft or Business of a Scrivener is by no Means fully understood, and as it is a novel Attempt to compel Attornies into the Freedom, will it be prudent or not for Mr. *Alexander*, in such future Action, to bring a Bill in Equity for a Discovery relating to these Matters? and who will be the proper and necessary Parties to be made Defendants to such Bill?

“OPINION.

“We think that in the present Action it is advisable for Mr. *Alexander* to submit to the Judgment of Affirmance. In case of any other Action brought upon the Bye-law, against Mr. *Alexander* or any other Gentleman of the Profession, we recommend it and it is our advice to plead the like Plea of Privilege in Abatement in the Mayor’s Court, but not to oppose the Courts giving Judgment of *respondeas ouster*, and after the Chamberlain has obtained such Judgment, then to plead the General Issue in order to try the Merits. The Reason for recommending this Method is, that if a special Verdict be found upon the Trial of the Issue, this Plea of Privilege and the Judgment of *respondeas ouster* may appear upon the Record, so that the Gentlemen of the Profession may not be precluded from entering into the Question of Privilege, if it shall be thought advisable. We think it may be of service for Mr. *Alexander*, in a future Action, to bring a Bill in Equity for a Discovery of the Bye-laws of the Scriveners’ Company, and of such other Matters as may tend to show what was formerly understood to be the proper Business or Profession of a Scrivener. The Chamberlain, the Company of Scriveners, and Mr. Bentham their Clerk, should be Defendants to the Bill.

“D. Poole.

“Fl. Norton.

“E. Williams.”

There are several matters interesting bearing upon this case. First the manner of drawing it.

It seems from the Minute of the Committee Meeting of Nov. 17th, 1758, where the history of the case is given, that Mr. Mason had met Mr. Serjeant Poole, Mr. Norton, and Mr. Williams, in

consultation, and that he had by their directions stated a short case, upon which they had given a written opinion.

According to the accepted idea this was putting the cart before the horse. We should now, I think, prepare the Case, submit it to Counsel, and then have a consultation.

Next, as to the matter of it. Short and unsatisfactory as the case is upon the facts, I think one can gather from it that the course taken by the Attornies up to that time had been mistaken. It seems to me that their jealousy for their privilege had made them adopt a wrong line of tactics. They had staked everything upon the defence of privilege, of which they were so jealous, and the nett result of ten years' jealousy and litigation was two severe defeats.

The advice of the Counsel was excellent, though, as will be seen presently, one part of it was not capable of being carried out. They advised the Attornies to defend another case, and both to plead the general issue and also specially their claim of privilege. They recommended trying the case upon the merits.

As a matter of criticism, and as showing how the use of a word may be lost, and the word misunderstood, I see that in the case "the art or mystery of a Scrivener" is spoken of. I do not know that the Attornies would have liked it any better if they had known that mystery there was none, but "mistry" is the mediæval English for *ministerium*, or, as I suppose we shall call it, service.

Unlike a modern opinion, it is undated; but it must have been given between November 10th and 17th, 1758.

The Scriveners lost no time in commencing proceedings against the Attornies, and at a meeting on January 10th, 1759, Mr. Mason reported the issuing of several plaints; amongst others, one against Mr. John Smith. It was in his plaint that the question was eventually tried on its merits, and finally settled.

A copy of the Minute of this Meeting is as follows:—

"1759 (10 *Jany.*). At a meeting of the Comittee, Mr. Mason informed the Comittee that since their last meeting several summons's in the like Plaints levyed mentioned in their last Minitts, had been served on Mr. Philip Worlidge, Mr. Joseph Cruttenden, Mr. John Smith, and Mr. Thos. Kingsley, and that he had taken the proper steps for their defence. Mr. Mason also informed the Comittee that, in pursuance of their last order, a draft of a Bill to be fyled in the Court of

Chancery agreeable to the advice of the Society's councell had been prepared, and had been perused, settled, and signed by Mr. Wilbraham and Mr. Altham, the Society's councell and he produced a draft of the same which was read to the Committee. The Committee unanimously approved of the draft as settled, and desired that the Bill might be forthwith fyled, and that Mr. Mason act as Sollicitor for the Society in the said suit. The Secretary was ordered out of the first moneys he should collect from the members, in pursuance of the Committee's resolution of the 10th Nov^r to pay to Mr. Mason fifty pounds on account of his Bill of ffees and disbursements in the Society's affairs."

The Scriveners' Company were also preparing, for in the following month the pleadings were submitted to the Court of the Company, and the Brief, which was approved, with the statements as to the evidence which was submitted to Counsel for advice.

The whole proceeding fell to be considered at the General Meeting of the Society in the month of February following, and a report of the Meeting is as follows:—

"1759 (23 *Feby.*). At a Genl. Meeting of the Society at the Devil Tavern, at Temple Bar.

"Mr. Mason informed the Society that since the last General Meeting the Judges' Delegate in the affair betn. Harrison, Chamberlain of the City of London, & Alexander had given judgment of affirmance, and that he had taken care to appear to & defend the sevl. new actions mentioned in the Minutes of the Committee, & had filed in the Court of Chancery the Bill mentioned in the preceding minits, to be brought agt the several persons therein named agreeable to the advice of the Society's councell, and that he had filed the bill in the Court of Chancery mentioned in the minits of the 10th Jany & served all the Defendants with process, & that they had appeared & prayed time to answer, upon which the common injunction for stay of execution until answer & further order had been obtained and served. The Society unanimously approved of what Mr. Mason had done, & the Prolocutor by their desire returned him thanks for his great care and diligence in the Society's affairs. It was ordered that the

Comittee retain such person as they shd think proper to be of councill for the Society in the place of the late Mr. Williams, & that the Comittee from time to time have power at any meeting of theirs to add such other persons to their number as they think proper in the place of those who die or decline attending the service."

It appears both from the Scriveners' and the Society's Records, that the Society paid the costs in the Court of Error, amounting to £64 7s. 6d.

At the next General Meeting, in July, Mr. Mason made his report, showing that he was following in the lines of the opinion given by the three counsel in conducting the defence of the proceedings.

Those interested in old legal terms will enjoy with me in reading of a Judgment of *Respondeas Ouster*:—

"1759 (20 July). At a General Meeting of the Society Mr. Mason informed the Society, that since the last General Meeting the Defts to ye Bill fyled in Chancery, mentioned in the former minitts, had obtained further time to answer ye same, and that no answers were as yet come in. Mr. Mason also said that he had by the advice of the Society's Council again pleaded priviledge to the several actions brought agt the several persons named in the former minitts, to which pleas the plt in those actions had demurred, and that the Demurrers had been argued and judgment of *Respondeas Ouster* given thereon. That at the time of argueing those Demurrers, he had informed the Court that the aforesd Bill had been fyled, and then prayed the Court for three months' time to plead in chief to those actions, which the Recorder thought reasonable, but being opposed by plts Councill, Rules were made unless cause at the next Sitting of the Court, and that at ye next Sitting the plts council being absent, the Rules were further enlarged. The Society unanimously approved of what Mr. Mason had done, and the Prolocutor by their desire returned him their thanks for his great care and diligence in the Society's affairs."

In the month of January following, Mr. Mason reported the condition of the proceedings. Those of us who are old enough to remember the time when it was not unusual to file a Bill of Discovery in Chancery, in aid of an Action at Law, will appreciate why an

Action commenced in January 1759 had got such a little way in January 1760.

“1760 (19 *Jany.*). At a Meeting of the Committee on Saturday Mr. Mason laid before the committee a brief of the Bill fyled at the Society's instance in Chancery as mentioned in former minitts, and of the several answers which had been put in thereto, and also a notice of motion in that cause for inspection of records, books, papers, writings &c. which he had served, and copies of the Brief intended to be delivered to council, and the Committee perused the Brief and considered the notice and unanimously approved the same, and agreed that the motion should be made accordingly.”

You will see that it was here that the advice of the Counsel was at fault. The next Minute of a Committee Meeting held on Feb. 15th shows that the Motion for discovery failed, and the Solicitors had to plead in the Mayor's Court.

A copy of this Minute is as follows :—

“1760 (15 *Feby.*). At a Meeting of the Committee, Mr. Mason informed the Committee that the Motion mentioned in the last minitts was made on the 12th instant, and that the Lord Keeper did not think fit to grant, but was pleased to deny the same, and that Mr. Mason proposed on Tuesday next to apply to the Mayor's Court for time to plead in chief to the actions brot there, in order to have an opportunity of consulting with council as to what pleas were proper to be pleaded.”

The same fact was also reported to the Scriveners' Company. The Committee of Priviledges attended at Westminster Hall, on February 12th, “when Sir Robert Henley, the Lord Keeper, (His Honour Sir James Clark, the Master of the Rolls, being in Court), declared his opinion that the Plaintiffs had no reason or Equity for bringing their Bill for the purpose of their motion, and that therefore they ought to take nothing by their motion.”

The matter had not much further progressed at the meeting of the General Body of the Society on the 22nd; but I have thought it well to set out the Minutes of the meeting as part of the history :—

“1760 (22 *Feby.*). At a Genl Meeting of the Society Mr. Mason informed the Society that the Judge of the Mayor's Court not

sitting on Tuesday last, he had no opportunity of applying for time to plead in chief to the action brought in that Court, but that he proposed to do so on the next Tuesday, and that in the meantime the case had been prepared and digested to be laid before the Society's Council for their advice in consultation intended to be had as to what pleas were proper to be pleaded in the said action."

I regret to say that this case is not forthcoming. I suppose it was with Mr. Mason's papers, and he died shortly after the termination of the action. At all events, the case is not with the Society's papers.

The next Minute is very interesting. It shows that the case was now approaching trial upon the plea of the General Issue, and in anticipation of some of the members of the Society being called as witnesses they were discharged from their membership of the Society.

I presume it was considered that a point might be made that the Society being the real defendants, members of the Society were incapable of being called as Witnesses.

"1760 (2 June). It being represented to the Society by Mr. Mason that several members of the Society would probably be called upon as necessary witnesses for the Defendants on the trial of the cause depending in the Mayor's Court, at the suit of the Chamberlain of the City of London, and that matter being taken into consideration, it was resolved ordered and declared by the Society, with the consent of the persons after named, That in order to avoid and remove all objections to the competency of the testimony of the following members of the Society, in case they should be called upon to give evidence, that they should be and were thereby discharged from the Society, and declared to be no longer members thereof, nor in any way bound to contribute to the charge or expenses of those suits or any other charges or expenses of the Society, nor should they nor any of them from that time forth have any right to or interest in any stocks, moneys, or effects of or belonging to the Society."

The next meeting at which any important matter was reported is one on Nov. 3rd. At this Meeting it was announced that the case stood

for trial on the next day, and that it was to be tried by a Special Jury of Merchants not freemen of the City of London.

A copy of this Minute is as follows :—

1760 (3 Nov.). At a Meeting of the Committee Mr. Mason informed the Committee what steps had been taken since the last General Meeting with regard to the action against Mr. John Smith, at the suit of the Chamberlain of London, and the Committee approved of Mr. Mason's conduct in the affair. Mr. Mason also stated that the cause was to come on for trial on the following day at the Guildhall before the Recorder of London and a special Jury of Merchants not freemen of London."

The Attornies had here scored a success. They had applied to the Recorder to direct that the case should be tried before a Jury of what were termed foreigners, *i.e.* persons not free of the City, and he had so ordered. The Scriveners' Company was very indignant at this, but could not help it.

As a fact, the case did not come on for trial for another month. In the report of the trial of the case which is appended to this volume, and which is printed from a shorthand-writer's manuscript, which I was fortunate to obtain from the Scriveners' Company, the date is given as December 11th.

It ended in a verdict for the Attornies.

The case was tried before Sir William Moreton, Recorder, and a Special Jury at the Guildhall of London.

The Pleadings were stated by Mr. Round.

Mr. Serjeant Hewitt then opened the case on behalf of the Chamberlain of London, stating shortly that the intention of the action was to try whether Mr. Smith was allowed to follow the Mystery of a Scrivener within the City of London, he not being free thereof.

The learned Serjeant then read the Bye-law, and said the case would depend

" 1st On the Bye-law;

" 2nd Whether there is such an Art and Mystery as that of the Scriveners in the City of London and what it was;

" 3rd Whether Mr. Smith had done that act which is the property of a Scrivener to do in the City of London. If so he had forfeited the penalty."

He then described the circumstances in which the Bye-law was made, and described the Art and Mystery of a Scrivener. In order to illustrate what this Art and Mystery was, he quoted the Petition of the Scriveners' Company to the City of 1375, and the ordinances of the City of 1390, and described the oath of that date, and showed that the Art and Mystery of a Scrivener was to prepare writings and Deeds to be sealed.

The Serjeant then quoted the Charter to the Scriveners' Company of the 14 James I., and the oath then taken by the Scriveners. He then quoted Lord Cooke, as saying that it was no question but that the business of a Scrivener was an Art, Mystery, or manual occupation.

It appeared from one of the oaths that Scriveners were bound not to make any deed of great charge without the advice first obtained of Counsel.

Mr. Serjeant Hewitt then put in as evidence—1st the City Bye-law; then the proceedings of 1375, the Ordinances of 1390, the 3rd and 6th Articles, and extracts from other oaths, and ordinances, and the Charter of King James, and the relative Bye-laws.

The Common Serjeant, who also appeared for the Plaintiff, then called Mr. Ellis, a Scrivener. He described that the business of Scriveners was to make all manner of writings and instruments; they drew them and engrossed them, and if there were any doubtful points they submitted them to Counsel.

He was cross-examined by Mr. Norton, on behalf of the Solicitors, as to Scriveners putting their names over their doors and procuring money. He said he had not put his name over his door, but he did procure money; but that that was the duty of a Broker.

Upon being further cross-examined, Mr. Ellis said that a Counsel lived with a firm of Scriveners, Messrs. Gibson and Jacomb, who was not free of the City, and "who drew his nice drafts." He was asked if they kept shops, and he replied, "Not any more than an Attorney kept a shop." Mr. Norton then asked him about the ordinances of 1390, in which a shop is mentioned, and he replied, "Why, tempora mutantur." Mr. Norton said, "So because the times are changed the Councillors and Attornies were all to be Scriveners." The witness added that the Scriveners' Company "had long had it in their consideration to take in Attornies, when they broke in upon us, when they practised as Scriveners in the City of London, and undertook to draw deeds." The witness also admitted that he had been witness to deeds drawn by Attornies as far as twenty or thirty years back.

The next witness was another Scrivener, named Beedle, and his evidence was to the same effect.

The next witness was named Coverly, and was examined on behalf of the Plaintiff by Mr. Field. Mr. Coverly was a Scrivener carrying on business out of the City. He described the business of a Scrivener to consist in buying and selling estates, and procuring money for clients.

Mr. Norton then opened the case for the Defence, and said in effect that the case of the Counsel and Attornies was one. That from time immemorial the Attornies had drawn deeds. It was not because an Attorney draws a deed in the course of his profession that he was therefore to be a Scrivener.

Mr. Norton proceeded to say, "That the business of a Scrivener was receiving other men's moneys and other men's property in trust." "The witnesses," said Mr. Norton, "all of them said this, that it was the business of a broker to procure money, but that a Scrivener did procure money, that it follows out of their business, the making of Deeds." "I must submit it to you," said Mr. Norton, "whether it does not amount to this: that the Scrivener is a gentleman who keeps a shop, or should keep one, who makes writing—or if the gentlemen please, drawing Deeds—the principal means of his livelihood. Now if I can show you that the Attorney does not come within that description, then an Attorney may still go on to follow his profession without submitting himself to the City Bye-laws.

"If the Attorney procures money I give him up being an Attorney, let him be a Scrivener and nothing else. But if an Attorney follows his profession as a Gentleman and an honest man, why must he be called upon to be free of the City of London? Why should he be called upon now? If I were on a Jury this would weigh with me much."

Mr. Norton then called the following witnesses :—

Mr. Filmer. An Attorney who had confined himself for twenty years to Chamber practice and had made Deeds.

Mr. Wilbrowe. An Attorney for forty years also doing Chamber business and conveyancing. He had never heard of a Scrivener till within three years.

Mr. Booth. A Counsel who had known scarce anybody else than Attornies to attend him in conveyancing of Lands, Marriage Settlements, and Deeds of Partnership. He knew but few Scriveners, the deeds that were brought by them were

not well drawn. "I was forced to have them drawn over again."

Mr. Capper. A Counsel who had been a conveyancing Counsel since 1717. He had had business with attornies. He also had had business with Mr. Gibson, a Scrivener.

Mr. Harper. A conveyancing Council for forty years, and had many drafts brought him by attornies. He had known a Scrivener named Smith.

Mr. Webb (lately a member of the Society), who had been an Attorney and was afterwards a barrister and Solicitor to the Treasury, and as he stated, an antiquary. He had searched in all sorts of places, and found a great many antient deeds not signed by a Scrivener.

(But I, as also an antiquary, here take leave to say that this gentleman is either not correctly reported or is talking very wide of the mark, and it is much to be regretted that the deeds were not produced as he suggested.)

Mr. North. An Attorney (lately a member of the Society) who said he had frequently drawn deeds which it would not be convenient for him to let a Scrivener inspect.

Mr. Hardin, of Drapers' Hall, an Attorney who had himself been concerned in the business of conveyancing and known many eminent Attornies not free of the City, who had done the same and had not been interfered with by the Scriveners' Company.

Mr. Woodcock. A Solicitor not an Attorney (lately a member of the Society) who had done conveyancing in the City of London.

Mr. Henshaw. An Attorney and Solicitor (lately a member of the Society), also a member of the Common Council.

He considered it as a branch of the Attorney's business to do conveyancing.

He never heard that it was an improper business for an attorney to be concerned in the City of London till it came into the City cognizance. This witness evidently spoke with something of bitterness, for he added :—

'Really the reason given was a moving reason, but it did not move me. It was said that the Company was thrown into very great straits, and therefore must make use of this means to recover itself.'

f

Where I have noted the witnesses as lately members of the Society, I have identified them as having been members by the fact that they were discharged from membership to enable them to give evidence at the trial.

Mr. Henshaw was the last witness. Mr. Serjeant Hewitt then replied upon the whole case, pointing out that a good deal of the evidence did not apply; that the question was one turning on the Bye-law of the City, and the question was whether the Bye-law had been broken or not.

The Recorder summed up the evidence, and left it to the Jury in the following words:—

“If you are satisfied that it is the proper business of a Scrivener to draw these Deeds, then you are to give a verdict for the Plaintiff.

“If you are of opinion that it is the proper business of an Attorney, then you are to give your verdict for the Defendants.”

The Jury found for the Defendants.

I have given a very short sketch of the trial, but the report is one which it is well worth while to read through.

It is, I think, possible to see that underlying it all there was an intense objection on the part of the Attornies, who, as Mr. Norton described it, wished to carry on their profession as gentlemen, to be placed on a level with a person whom they obviously looked upon as an inferior being—one who was no better than a Broker; who ought, as they said, to keep a shop and write his name over it, if he acted up to his duties under the City Ordinances; and who procured money, and wrote deeds because he had procured money. All the same, it seems to have been admitted on all hands that the Scriveners did not keep shops, and perhaps Mr. Ellis was right when he said that the Attornies had broken in upon them.

I hope I may be excused for moralizing.

Tempora mutantur, as Mr. Ellis says. We do write our names over our doors, or on them, or by the side of them; we do procure money and draw the deeds of security for the money we have procured; we do charge a commission, or brokerage, not only for procuring the money, but for drawing the Deeds. Now let us listen to what Mr. Norton says—“If the Attorney procures money, I give him up from being an attorney, let him be a Scrivener and nothing else.”

I am sure that many of my brethren felt as I did, when the Act which permitted this came into force.

We went to bed Attornies, following our profession as gentlemen, as Mr. Norton puts it; we woke up, "Scriveners, and nothing else." But I suppose there was balm in Gilead.

The shorthand-writer's notes of the trial are interesting reading, for many reasons. They are obviously faithful, and phrases and expressions peculiar to the individuals may be clearly traced.

The Recorder in his summing up is described, and no doubt truly, as frequently commencing his sentences with the word "Why." For example—"Why then is he cross-examined?" "Why then, Mr. Wilbrowe, is called," etc. "Why then, Mr. Capper, is called," etc.

In the speech of Mr. Norton, the reporter gives a curious example of this gentleman's method of argument.

Mr. Norton is criticizing the speech of Serjeant Hewitt, and says :—

"This is all that Mr. Serjt. meant to state to you of the antiquity of this Company—that they kept open shops; that they were subject to inspection and regulation; and that these writings, whether it was drawing of deeds or any other thing, were their means of livelihood. Mr. Serjeant subjoins to this, and proves that now every Attorney that draws a Deed is a Scrivener.

"Now he could just as well prove that a man is a pin. A man has a head : a pin has a head : therefore a man's a pin."

There are other interesting points in the case besides those to which I have alluded, and not the least interesting is the insight we get into the manner in which business was then transacted.

The result of the trial is duly recorded in the Scriveners' Records of December 11th. The first part of the Minute is purely formal, and then it proceeds :—

"After examination of the Plaintiff's witnesses, the Defendant's Counsel produced several Deeds purporting to be made by clerks before and since the time of Edward 3rd, and also examined Mr. Filmore, and other witnesses, including Mr. Robert Henshaw, Clerk to the Cooks' Company, that witness proved that the making of deeds was always considered and deemed, and was in fact the business of Attornies-at-Law and Solicitors in Chancery. Sir William Moreton, the Recorder, having summed up the evidence, referred it to the Jury whether the making of Deeds was the proper business of the free Scriveners of London, or of the Attornies and Solicitors of the Courts at Westminster. The Jury drew out of Court to consider of their Verdict, and after a short stay, the trial

lasting from 11 in the morning to 7 in the evening, the jury then returned into Court and brought in their verdict for the Defendants. It resolved that the proceedings at the said trial, and the Verdict of the Jury thereon, be reported to the next Court of Assistants, and that it is the opinion of this Committee that the question intended by the Company to be tried, was whether upon its being proved, (as in fact it was proved at the said trial,) that the making of Deeds was the business, art, and mystery of and exercised by the free Scriveners of the City of London, the Attornies and Solicitors of the Court at Westminster had a right as such to make deeds to be sealed within the City of London, without being free thereof, and not whether it was the proper business of Attornies or Scriveners to make Deeds. Resolved, that it is the opinion of this Committee that the said cause ought to have been tried by a Jury of freemen of the City of London, and not of Foreigners, and that in this opinion they are warranted by the reasons given by the Judges in error, in their arguments upon their judgments in the cause in error of the Chamberlain of London and Alexander, who then declared that actions on the City Bye-laws upon the customs ought to be tried in the City Courts, in regard the citizens of London were the best and most proper judges of their own customs and privileges, notwithstanding which the Recorder thought proper to deny the Plaintiff in the said cause against Smith a special Jury of freemen, upon this Company having applied to him by way of Motion on the part of the Plaintiff for that purpose, previous to the said trial; and it is further the opinion of this Committee that a jury of freemen would have been no more liable to objection on account of interest or bias in favour of the City, than a Jury of foreigners might be on account of prejudice to the City and its privileges in favour of foreigners, under prosecution upon the City Bye-laws, to compel them to be freemen by reason of their exercising any one of the free arts and misteries of the City."

I rather sympathize with this Minute, and agree that the Recorder did not put what I have thought was the real question to the Jury, viz. that stated by Mr. Williams, Mr. Alexander's Counsel, in Court on Nov. 22, 1752, whether the attornies-at-law were entitled to exercise the art of Scriveners in the City of London without being free. But it was sufficient.

The report made by Mr. Mason to the Committee of the Law Society gives the other side of the case.

The report is as follows :—

“ 1760 (17 Dec^r). At a meeting of the Committee held at the Devil Tavern at Temple Bar.

“ Mr. Mason represented to the Committee that the action brought at the instance of the Scriveners' Compy, in the name of Sir Thomas Harrison, the Chamberlain of the City of London, against Mr. John Smith, in order to compel the Attorneys and Solicitors exercising the conveyancing branch of their profession in London into the freedom of the City and of the Scriveners' Compy contrary to all former usage, was on Thursday, the 11th December, tried before the Recorder, by a jury of merchants of London, who upon the full merits of the question gave their general verdict, without the least hesitation, for the Defendant Mr. Smith, and that Mr. Norton conducted the defence for the Attorneys and Solicitors with suitable zeal and distinguished abilities. The Committee resolved that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Norton for his generous and eminent services in their favor, and that a piece of plate of £50 value be presented to him at the same time by the Committee. It was also represented that Mr. Morton, Mr. Yates, Mr. Harrison, and Mr. Hyde all assisted with great abilities as Councill for the Defendant, and it was resolved that the thanks of the Society be also returned to those gentlemen for their generous assistance, and that a proper present be made to them at the same time by the Committee. The thanks of the Society were also returned to Mr. ffilmer, Mr. Wilbraham, Mr. Capper, Mr. Harper, Mr. Booth, and Mr. Webb, for their attending as witnesses on the part of the Defendant. The thanks of the Society were also returned to the Trustees of the British Museum, for having at the instance of Mr. Webb, one of their numbers, and formerly a member of the Society, permitted their officer, Dr. Morton, to attend the trial with many of the ancient Chartæ repositæ there, the same having been introduced by Mr. Webb, in his evidence, and considered a very material part of the Defendant's case. It was resolved that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Mason for his unwearied application and apparent services in favour of the Society, and it was referred to the Committee to consider an

appropriate compliment to be made to him, and report the same to the next General Meeting of the Society."

The next Minute of a Special General Meeting shows how the members who had been discharged of their membership, to enable them to give evidence, were reinstated :—

" 1760 (17 Decr.). At the Special Genl. Meeting of the Society at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar.

"The minutes of the proceedings of the Special Genl. Meeting, on the 2nd June, relating to the discharges of several members of the Society, in order to enable them to be witnesses in the trial of the action at the instance of the Scriveners' Compy being read, it was resolved to restore the said gentlemen to be members of the Society, and to the same rights and privileges to all intents and purposes as they wd have had in case they had not been discharged, and the following gentlemen then attending were introduced."

This is the last official stage in the proceedings; and I would only remark that I have sought in vain in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and in contemporary publications, for any such an account of the trial as appeared on the termination of the proceedings in error. It may be that the title of the proceedings, "Harrison v. Smith," and in the Mayor's Court, did not attract notice; or it may be that the nature of the case did not convey the impression to the public of the real important question which was at issue. Or it may be that Mr. Bentham wrote the previous accounts, and for obvious reasons did not write on this occasion. Whatever may have been the reason, no notice seems to have been taken of it.

And now we come to the pleasant part of the litigation, and one which reminds us of the amenities which, in days long distant, some of us may remember to have occasionally crowned the end of a law-suit.

A suitable piece of plate was to be given to each of the Counsel, and the price of it graduated according to the position of the recipient.

This is all declared in the Minute of a Meeting of Jan. 21st, 1761 :—

" 1761 (21 Jany.). At a meeting of the Committee, The Minutes of the Special Genl. Meeting of the 17th Decr were read and the Committee took into consideration the two resolutions then made with reference to the sevl pieces of plate to be presented to the Society's counsel who attended the trial at the Guildhall, and it was unanimously agreed that the sevl pieces of plate

so to be presented should be silver cups and covers of the following respective values :—

“ Mr. Norton’s	50 guineas
“ Mr. Morton’s	30 guas
“ Mr. Yates’	25 guas
“ Mr. Harrison’s	20 guas
“ Mr. Hyde’s	15 guas

amounting in all to £147.”

Each of the cups had an appropriate Latin inscription ; these duly appear in the Records.

It is very much to be regretted that the domicile of these Cups is not at the building of the Incorporated Law Society.

One is almost sorry to record the fact that Mr. Mason died about this time.

When I first came to the profession there was an old practitioner who used to urge upon me the necessity, at the conclusion of a piece of business, of making out the Bill of Costs by using the Latin maxim *Finis coronat opus*.

The making-out of the Bill of Costs in this case was entrusted to Mr. Hannan, Mr. Mason’s son-in-law. There are several entries upon the subject. One, so late as the year 1764, shows that members of our profession were no more willing to make costs out then than we are supposed to be now.

“ 1764 (23 *May*). At a Meeting of the Comittee. At the same meeting a Bill of Costs in the case of the Chamberlain of London against Smith having been prepared, in pursuance of the order of the Society, by Mr. Hannan, the Comittee resolved that the same be forthwith taxed and the judgment in that action entered on the record, and that Mr. Hannan, who was in possession of the papers, be desired to attend such taxation.”

Unfortunately, the Scriveners’ records do not contain the Bill of Costs—I wish they did,—nor have I succeeded in discovering by whom the Costs were defrayed. I think in part, at all events, by the Corporation.

After the Minute of December 11th, the subject is never again referred to in the Scriveners’ Records. Mr. Bentham’s bill was paid, and that is all.

This is the end of the story, and I must be forgiven if, in telling it, I have told very little of it in my own words, but have drawn almost exclusively upon the old Records. The story itself could have been told in a space almost as short as the concise case stated for the opinion of Counsel; but, if I had done this, I think I should have deprived the story of half its charm.

Now I hope I may be allowed to make a few reflections upon the whole business.

An antiquary, a Past-Master of the Worshipful Company of Scriveners, an Attorney of the Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and the Exchequer at Westminster, and a Solicitor of the High Court of Chancery, and also a Member of the Incorporated Law Society, may be allowed to have mixed feelings upon the whole proceedings and their result.

It is possible that the battle had to be fought. It was not in the nature of things that the Attornies and Solicitors in the City should have been content to be under a different control to their brethren outside the walls and liberties. But I think a broader view might have been taken by both sides. The Lawyers might have recognized as they did later, the advantage of a Corporate existence—the Scriveners might have tried to conciliate instead of repel. There are some indications that the Scriveners' Company had a vision before them of a strong and very powerful corporate body, working under their Charter, and comprising the whole body of Attornies and Solicitors—an end worth trying for. This never seems to have dawned upon the Lawyers, nor did the Scriveners' proceedings suggest it. Speaking in the year 1896, the proceedings of the Scriveners' Company bear a strange analogy to those of the German Emperor in trying to force England into a Quadruple Alliance. You may coax even an unwilling person to join you—it is difficult to persuade him by kicks. The tactics employed might and probably would have been successful in 1660, but were fatal a century later.

But, as I said before, the battle may have been necessary, and probably had the effect of all battles—the knitting closer together the conquering party. In this view of the case, I think it was of distinct advantage to the Lawyers. They were victorious—they felt their strength, and were strengthened for further successes.

The litigation with the Scriveners' Company did not, however, occupy the whole of the time of the Society, and many Acts of Parliament relating to Solicitors and questions of Practice were considered and action taken on them.

I shall now shortly refer to a few other interesting topics.

At the close of the year 1754 it is recorded that the Society was possessed of £200 Three Per Cent. Consolidated Bank Stock Annuities.

In 1756 there is an entry to the effect that Mr. Wade, a member of the Society, who being called to the Bar as Counsel and being present, "in a very genteel and obliging manner" offered his services to attend the Society's affairs on all occasions in Court, and to give them his utmost assistance, and likewise declared his readiness to give his attendance on any Committee on receiving notice for that purpose.

In 1761 the Society determined to aid Mr. Danby Pickering, the Editor of the Cambridge Edition of the Statutes, and recommended it to the members of the Society to encourage the same by becoming subscribers. This was because the Society was desirous to encourage the laudable endeavours of Cambridge to reduce the present exorbitant price of the Statutes.

At this date also, for the first time, application appears to have been made to members whose subscriptions were unpaid.

On July 8, 1763, there is a Minute of a remonstrance by the Attornies and Solicitors against the rule of the Bar precluding Attornies and Solicitors from being called until they should have discontinued practice two years.

"After the ordinary business had been disposed of, it was referred to the Committee to consider of and pursue such methods as they should think proper to obtain the repeal of any order or orders made by the Benchers of the several Inns of Court, tending to preclude Attorneys and Solicitors from being called to the Bar until they should have discontinued practising as such for the space of two years. In the draft Minutes appears a form of resolution which was cancelled in favour of that just given, and which is as follows:—

"Ordered that it be referred to the Committee to draw up a proper remonstrance, to be delivered to the Benchers of the sevl Inns of Court, against the Order or Resolution made by them to prevent Attorneys or Solicitors being called to the Bar till two years after they shall have left off practising as Attorneys or Solicitors; and to desire the repeal of so much of the Order as relates to them, and that the Committee do further therein as they shall think proper."

The Committee came to the determination that a memorial ought to be presented to the several Societies of Lincoln's Inn, Inner Temple, Middle Temple, and Gray's Inn, relating to the said Order.

The next three Minutes in 1765 refer further to this:—

“The matter of the application to the sevl Inns of Court upon the Memorials presented, relating to their late Order of the 30th June 1762, tending to preclude attorneys and solicitors being called to the Bar, being taken into consideratn, it was resolved that, in the opinion of the Comittee, some member of the Society who had been admitted a student in either of the Inns of Court and had duly conformed in all respects to the rule of the House to which he belonged apply to such House for admission to the Bar notwithstanding the abovementd order, and if refused, that a mandamus be brought, or such other legal applon be made, as should be thought necessary, at the expense of the Society, to try the validity of such Order.

“After the ordinary business had been disposed of, it was referred to the Committee to take the advice of counsel as to what methods were proper to be pursued in order to try the validity of the order of the several Inns of Court of the 30th June 1762 tending to exclude attorneys and Solicitors from being called to the Bar, as mentioned in that Order.

“The order of reference made to the Comittee at the last Genl Meeting was read, and the Comittee settled a case for the advice of Counsel, with regard to the proper methods to be pursued to try the validity of the order of the Several Inns of Court of the 30th June 1762, and the Secry was ordered to make two copies of the Case and the extracts from Dugdale's *Origines Judiciales*, and to lay the same before Mr. Sergeant Glynn and Mr. Sergt. Leigh for their opinions thereon.”

Reference is subsequently made to the opinion given by Mr. Serjeant Glynn and Mr. Serjeant Leigh upon the case, and the thanks of the Society were ordered to be returned to the learned Serjeants for the great pains they had taken, and the Prolocutor and such members of the Committee as could attend were desired to wait on the learned gentlemen for that purpose. There is no entry of the opinion, and I should think it likely that it was unfavourable.

In the following June, 1766, report was made of a speech by Mr. Serjeant Davy, who had been a friend of the Society, in which he certainly expresses himself not very favourably to the Attornies, and upon which they determined to take very decided action.

This was the speech :—

“You gentlemen who are on the outside of the curtain do not see the tricks and management within ; we that are on the inside see the whole, and I will take it upon me to say, that out of the many mistakes that happen in the management of causes, 19 out of 20 happen by the ignorance of attorneys.’ And it was resolved that in the opinion of the Society, any Counsel at the Bar making use of such like reflections upon the attorneys in general ought not to be employed as counsel by any member of the Society.”

Two other versions of Serjt. Davy’s statement are also given :—

Seagrove. “Clients often do not know, but we gentlemen of the Bar know, the great misfortunes that attend clients by the negligence of Attorneys.”

Palmer. “You that are of the outside of the curtain do not know what we see that are on the inside of the curtain. I will take upon myself to say, that 19 cases out of 20 that are lost are so by the ignorance or negligence of the Attorneys.”

Some one drew the Serjeant’s attention to the effect of this oration, for at the General Meeting of the Society on Feb. 20, 1767, a letter from Mr. Serjeant Davy was submitted to the Society. A copy of this letter and the Minute passed upon it is subjoined :—

“DEAR SIR,

“Understanding that the Society of Attorneys and Solicitors are now meeting, I take the liberty of desiring you to present my most respectful compliments to them ; and to assure them that it gives me the utmost concern to have incurred their displeasure by means of an unguarded and very improper expression which dropped from me last Summer in the course of an unpremeditated reply, which I am extremely sorry for.

“I also declare that I never meant to cast the least reflection on the profession in general, or any gentleman concerned in it, but on the contrary I have always held the attorneys and solicitors in the most esteem and gratitude.

“It is but by general report that I have heard of their displeasure, and therefore I hope it will not be deemed improper

that I thus address the Society through the medium of a friend. If I knew a more respectful method of applicatn I would gladly embrace it.

“ I am, Sir,

“ Your most obliged and most obedient humble Servant,
“ W. DAVY.

“ *Feb. 20, 1767.*”

“ The Society taking into conson the above letter, resolved unanimously to accept the same as a suitable and proper acknowledgment and apology.”

With the Minutes is another draft of this resolution, to the following effect :—

“ Resolved that Mr. Sergt. Davy having in public Court, and by a letter now received from him, expressed his concern for the words he spoke on a late trial, and declaring that the same were contrary to his sentiments, and inadvertently dropped from him, it is the opinion of the Society that he has made proper satisfaction.”

I suppose some friends of the Serjeant's modified this draft resolution, so it remains a draft only.

Shortly afterwards we find the Society endeavouring to get the hours and days of attendance at the Seal Office for sealing Writs altered, and the General Penny Post Office, lately removed from Chichester Rents in Chancery Lane, to be replaced.

Some question there was in 1770 as to considering the present mode of putting in and justifying bail in the several Courts in the Kingdom, and there is this Minute—“ No Jew to be bail for any person but a Jew.”

In the year 1771 the Secretary summoned a meeting of the Committee for the following Wednesday at seven o'clock, at the Horn Tavern in Fleet Street, by desire, to consider whether an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench or Common Pleas could be obliged to serve as a militiaman.

In 1772 the Committee took into consideration the order for reference relating to a convenient place for the Society to attend in at their next Meeting, and being of opinion that Clifford's Hall was a proper place in point of situation, they resolved to apply to the Principal and Rules of the Society of Clifford's Inn at their next Parliament, for the use of their Hall for the above purpose. The permission was given, and the Hall appears to have been used on

subsequent occasions, until at length the Society gravitated to the Freemasons' Tavern.

In February 1777 a letter, with a Bill of Charges for the proceedings to strike one Robert Simpson off the Rolls, is set out *in extenso*. Mr. Serjeant Davy, the gentleman we have heard of before, gave his services for nothing, but his clerk was paid 2s. 6d.

These documents are as follows :—

“SIR,

“Inclosed is my charge relative to the matter of complaint against Robert Simpson, wch you'l please either to lay before the Society or the Gentlemen of the Committee as you shall think proper.

“I am, Sir,

“Your most humble servant,

“(signed) GREG. GEERING.

“Capel Court, Bartho Lane,

“4 July, 1776.”

“In the Common Pleas.

“The Charge of Gregory Geering, a member of the Law Society, in the matter of Complaint against Robert Simpson, one, &c.

1774, June. Paid stamp for my afft. to move for rule to show cause why Simpson shd not be struck off the Roll of Attys. and oath	2	7
June 9. Paid for Rule	3	0
June 21. Paid stamp for my clerk's afft. to get rule enlarged, and that service thof at Simpson's lodgings might be good service, and oath	2	7
Paid Rule	3	0
Nov. 7. Paid stamp for my clerk's afft. of service, rule, and oath	2	7
Gave Sergt. Davy's clerk	2	6
	<u>16</u>	<u>3</u> ”

In the following years the Society considered the laws relating to the admission of Solicitors, and presented a memorial to the Treasury, stating the inconvenience which had arisen from the want of a place in England where stamps impressed pursuant to the laws of Ireland could be procured. In pursuance of this request, the Lord-Lieutenant directed the Commissioners of Stamps in Ireland to appoint a stationer in Chancery Lane to distribute Irish stamps.

The internal affairs of the Society occupy a good deal of the Minutes in 1780, and the succeeding years. I select one example.

In 1781 a General Meeting appears to have been held for the purpose of considering the conduct of Mr. James Farrer, at which meeting "a Motion was made and seconded" that Mr. James Farrer having been appointed Steward of the Society, and having refused to take upon himself that office without assigning a sufficient reason for such refusal, be expelled from the Society. The previous question, whether the motion should be put being moved and seconded, it was carried in the affirmative, and the Secretary was ordered to wait on Mr. Farrer and inform him of the resolution. Mr. Lowton moved that the above question be postponed to the next meeting, and that Mr. Farrer be informed thereof by the Secretary.

However, Mr. Farrer does not seem to have fallen in with the views of the Society, for on June 22 following there is a Minute :—

"22 June, 1787.

"Called on Mr. James Farrer, who say^d it would be extremely inconvenient for him to attend this meeting, and that he must decline acting at all."

The subject of the subscription to the Society, which I shall refer to later, and the arrangements for transacting the business of the Society, come under review at the same period; and it was resolved in 1789

"That the time limited for doing business in this Society, as mentioned in the regulation of the 20th July, 1764, be enlarged from 7 o'clock until 9 o'clock in the evening."

I said that the Society appears in full working order at the conclusion of the Records, and I shall illustrate this by two examples, which will in fact conclude this part of the introduction.

In 1798, on May 24th, a special meeting of the Society was held, to consider a report of the Committee upon the subject of an application to the proper authorities for increasing the fees of Attornies and

Solicitors in the Courts of Law and Equity. I think these fees were only those arising out of Court business, and not the general scale of charges.

The following is a Minute of what took place:—

“The Committee having read two memorials prepared by Messrs. Hardcastle and Brace, and another presented by Mr. Robt. Smith, and it appearing to the Committee that the present fees of attorneys and Solrs practising in the sevl Courts of Law and Equity were founded on immemorial custom and usage only, and that as the present fees were estbd at an early period, upwards of a century ago, when the value of money was such as rendered the then allowance adequate to its purpose; but that the personal and peculiar imposts laid on the practisers within the last few years, and other causes, which occasion an immense increase of their capital, render an increase of their fees absolutely necessary. It was resolved that a Memorial be settled by the Committee, and presented forthwith to the Lord Chancellor, and another to the same effect to the Master of the Rolls, praying such relief in the premises as shd be deemed expedient and just.”

This question occupied the Society throughout the whole of the remaining period covered by the Records, and is constantly referred to in the Minutes.

The Memorial originally was to have been settled at a Meeting of the Committee on June 15, 1798, but as only three members attended, the Meeting was adjourned to the 22nd, when the Memorial was prepared, adopted, and considered, and it was unanimously resolved to present it forthwith to the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls. The Lord Chancellor at that time being Lord Loughborough.

On reflection, however, the Committee determined to submit the Memorial afresh to a General Meeting, which was duly held, and which authorized the Prolocutor to sign the Memorial, and to attend the Lord Chancellor, and the Master of the Rolls, with the Standing Committee. The Memorial was presented, although the date is not given, and the Secretary of the Society was informed that the Lord Chancellor had some doubt whether his power extended to varying the fees, and the Prolocutor was to ask for an appointment to see the Lord Chancellor upon that point.

At the General Meeting in the following June, 1799, the Prolocutor

had to report that though he had made application to the Lord Chancellor, he had not been able to get an appointment, nor apparently was he able to do this for another twelve months, not indeed until the month of February 1801. "At a meeting then the Prolocutor reported the result of a conversation with the Lord Chancellor upon the subject of the Memorial, and that the Chancellor had expressed his wish to give every assistance in his power to the profession, but had some doubt respecting his authority, and referred to a Book of Orders of Lord Hardwicke's time in 1741. The Prolocutor explained that the Book of Orders referred only to the officers of the Court of Chancery, and not to the fees of Solicitors, which were fees of right by ancient and immemorial custom of Common Law, and that he conceived his Lordship on considering the subject would find it so, and that his Lordship had the right of control over the Solicitors and their fees. It was proposed also to send to the Chancellor a letter written by Mr. Robert Smith of Basinghall Street, which threw much light upon the subject, and which the Lord Chancellor wished to see." The letter was read to a meeting on February 27, but unfortunately it is not with the papers, as I confess it would have much enlightened me.

Another delay was here interposed, for Mr. Pitt's Government went out of office, and together with it Lord Loughborough.

The Prolocutor reported this at the General Meeting in the July following, and that he had urged as much as lay in his power, and as far as with decency and propriety he could, on his Lordship to decide upon the prayer of the Memorial previous to his resigning the Seals. Failing to obtain this, the Prolocutor pressed his Lordship to give an expression of opinion. The only reply to this was that he had his doubt whether the Chancellor would increase the fees of Solicitors without the authority of Parliament.

The Memorial was then presented to the new Lord Chancellor, Lord Eldon, who promised to take it into his consideration.

Matters were in the same condition in July 1802, and it only got so much further in 1803, that an assurance was given to the Prolocutor that in the present vacation the Memorial would be taken into consideration, and more effective measures adopted respecting it.

In 1805 nothing had been done, but the Society determined to approach the Lord Chief Justice with a view to a reconsideration of the Common Law fees also.

Just at this moment Mr. Addington's Government, that had replaced Mr. Pitt's, went out of office, together with Lord Eldon, who before

going, namely in February 1806, mentioned his intention of communicating to his successor, what he proposed to do both in substance, and in form respecting the Solicitors' costs.

It appears incidentally that the Chancellor was going out immediately after February 6. In the meantime the Memorial to the Lord Chief Justice, and the Common Law Judges, was also being proceeded with.

On February 25 in that year, it was reported that Mr. Sands and Mr. Meggison, in the absence of the Prolocutor, had waited upon the Judges for their answer, and that the Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Ellenborough, had intimated that the subject of the Memorial had been taken into consideration by himself, and some of the other judges, but they had not come to any determination upon it, as it appeared to them one of very considerable importance to the public, and they entertained not only great doubt of their powers to grant the relief prayed for, but also as to the expediency of such a measure, but would consult with the Judges of the other Courts, and that a communication should be made when they came to a decision. The Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, and the Chief Baron of the Exchequer gave similar answers.

In the following June, Lord Erskine being then appointed Chancellor, a copy of the Memorial was prepared to be delivered to his Lordship if necessary, and the Committee requested the Prolocutor, Mr. Lowten, and Mr. Kinderley to wait upon the Lord Chancellor respecting the Memorial presented to Lord Eldon.

In February 1807, at a Committee Meeting the Secretary read the Minutes of the Meeting with the Lord Chancellor, and the Secretary was directed to use his best endeavours to obtain the signature of the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls to the list of fees before the General Meeting.

That the list of fees as altered, was satisfactory may be gathered from the fact that on March 6 the Committee determined that an address of thanks from the Society should be presented to the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls for their early attention to the Memorial.

The addresses are set out in the Minutes. The Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls are thanked, the first for the promptitude with which his Lordship had taken the Memorial into consideration, for the liberal spirit manifested by the Order, and for the kind condescension with which his Lordship at all times had received the Committee. The Master of the Rolls was thanked for his ready

concurrence in the Order, and the condescension with which his Honour had at all times received the Committee.

But the satisfaction of the Society is evidenced in quite as genuine a way by the resolution which follows at the next meeting, that "Lord Erskine" should be a standing toast at the Dinners, and that his health should be drunk at the General Meetings.

This so far was satisfactory, but the Common Law matters did not progress, and on April 30 the Committee considered the propriety of applying to the Judges for their determination upon the Memorial for an increase of the fees of the Attornies, and an address was to be presented to their Lordships. The Memorial is set out in the Records, and is as follows :—

"To the Right Honble Ed. Lord Ellenborough, Lord Chief Justice of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, and to the rest of the Judges of that Honble Court.

"The Humble Memorial of the Socy of Attorneys and Solicitors, resident in and near the Metropolis, commonly called the Law Society, sheweth

"That your Memorialists, in the month of May 1805, took the liberty to submit to your Lordships a representation of the inadequacy of the Common Law costs in a variety of instances, and to solicit your Lordships to authorise an increase thereof.

"That during the time that your Lordships have had the said Memorl under yr conson yr Memorialists have, upon a similar representation to the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls, with respect to the costs allowed in the Court of Chancery, obtd an order for the increase of their fees in that Court.

"Your Memorialists therefore humbly pray that yr Lordships will be pleased to take the said representation of your Memorialists into yr early consideration, and to grant such relief as to your Lordships shall seem just and reasonable."

In the following July nothing had been done by the Judges. In 1808 Mr. Batty, a member of the Committee, informed a meeting that, in consequence of a communication from one of his friends, he had reason to expect that in case another application was made to Lord Ellenborough for an increase of the fees in the Court of King's Bench it would be attended to.

On February 27, 1809, the Secretary reported that Lord Ellenborough had been attended, who informed the Committee that he had given the Memorial much consideration and thought it deserving of attention, and that redress should be given, as in many instances Attornies were very inadequately paid, but as an individual Judge he could do no more upon the subject than give it his recommendation and support as far as he could, consistently with a due regard to the public, upon whom law proceedings bore very severely, on account of heavy stamp duties.

It is clear from what follows that the Judges made some slight alteration, but it was not satisfactory, for, in 1810, the Committee took into consideration the List of Fees that had been put up in the Master's office, purporting to be the alteration in the costs in the King's Bench, and the propriety of addressing the Judges upon the inadequacy of the proposed increase. Further inquiry was to be made from the Master of the particulars and amounts of the increased fees.

At the last meeting recorded in these Minutes on July 10, the Master had given some information, but the meeting considered that the increase was totally inadequate to the just expectations of the profession, and referred it to the consideration of the next General Meeting, whether it would not be advisable to make a further representation to the Judges on the subject, immediately after their return from the circuits, and endeavour to obtain their determination prior to the meeting of Parliament, in order that if no adequate relief was granted by the Courts the Society might subject their claims on behalf of themselves and the profession generally to the consideration of Parliament.

Here the records end.

The subject is of course only historical, but it is interesting as showing the manner in which the unincorporated Society persisted in its endeavours for the benefit of the profession. It is much to be regretted that Mr. Smith's essay upon the law and practice of costs as then understood is not with the papers. I have always understood that it was necessary as far back as Henry III.'s time to legislate upon the subject of costs in certain cases, and this was extended in the reign of his son Edward I. The theory was that a Plaintiff should be put to no expense in recovering his verdict. The gross amount of costs in Common Law was to be settled by a jury, in Chancery by the Lord Chancellor. At a later period the costs came to be taxed by the Judges, at Common Law, and by the Chancellor in Chancery. In

Henry VIII.'s reign there was further legislation on the subject, and costs were given the Defendants as well as the Plaintiff. I do not know precisely when the Judges themselves ceased to tax the costs, but in the reign of William and Mary they were taxed by a Master or officer appointed by the respective Judges for the purpose.

I should have ventured to think, therefore, that the actual giving of costs was a matter not of Common Law right but by Statute, and that the duty of the Judge was to see that the successful litigant got an indemnity.

How far and to what extent Mr. Smith's essay was historical and antiquarian I do not know, but it seems to have convinced two successive Chancellors.

This matter is however, as I observed, now only historical, and the object of mentioning it was rather to show that up to the end of these Minutes the Society was in full active work, and to describe the nature of it, than for any practical purpose.

The other interesting matter I wish to refer to before I quit these Minutes, is quite at the end of them. It is told in several Minutes, and in a correspondence. It commences as follows:—

“ At a Meeting of the Committee on Thurs. the 2nd Novr. 1809.

“ The Secretary laid before the Committee the following notice:—

“ *House of Commons,*

“ 15th June 1809.

“ Notice has been given, that it will be proposed in the next session of Parl^t, To limit the Time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills, to the First Fourteen Days next after the day of the commencement of the Session—allowing as usual one month further for Presenting Private Bills; whereby the Parties in the country may have the printed Bills in their hands at an earlier Period of the Session.

“ Also that some one of the Clerks attending The House should be employed by the Parties having business before The House, as a Parliamentary Agent or Solicitor; who may be ready to answer any questions and give any explanations which may be required, in the course of the business depending.

“ The Committee resolved to have the above notice printed, and a copy sent to each member of the Society, and to call a Genl Meeting of the Society to be held at the Freemasons' Tavern, on Friday the 17th Novr to take the same into consōn.”

In due time the Committee referred the subject to a General Meeting.

The first Meeting to consider it was abortive, and was adjourned. The Minute of the adjourned meeting is as follows :—

“ At an adjourned Genl. Meeting on the 14th December 1809.

“ It was resolved that in the opōn of the Meeting the interests of the public as well as the justice due to the professn called upon the Society to resist by every means in its power, the resoln to be submitted to the House of Commons, that some one of the Clerks attending the House should be employed by the Parties having business before the House as a Parly. Agent or Solicitor, who may be ready to answer any questions and give any explanations which may be required in the course of the business depending, and that in the opōn of the meeting it wd be expedient in the first place to submit a representatn to the Chancr of the Excheqr, stating the injustice and impolicy of the proposed measure, and the inconveniences which wd probably result from it. That a Select Committee be appointed to prepare such representn and submit the same to a future meeting for its conson, the following gentn being appointed to such Committee, Mr. Prolocutor, Mr. Lowndes, Mr. Kaye, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Foster.”

The Select Committee met shortly after, and I think I am right in inferring from the proceedings at this and the following meetings, that the leading spirit was Mr. Kaye, at this time in his prime :—

“ At a meeting of the Select Committee held at the White Hart Tavern in Holborn on Tuesday the 19 Dec. 1809 Mr. Kaye produced to the Committee a draft of a representation to the Chancr of the Exchequer, which the Come took into consideration, and at 11 o'clock adjourned the further conson of it to the following Thursday the 21st at the same place. The Secretary was directed to call a General Meeting of the Society for Thursday the 28th Dec^r at 2 o'clock at the Freemasons' Tavern to take the same into consideration.”

Before the General Meeting there was another meeting of the Committee held on St. Thomas's Day :—

“ At a meeting of the Select Committee at the White Hart Tavern, in Holborn, on the 21st December 1809.

“Mr. Sandys having been added to the Committee, they considered the draft of the representn to the Chancr of the Exchr to be submitted to the Genl Meetg, and they resolved to recommend to the Genl. Meeting that copies of the representation shd likewise be sent to the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Attorney Genl, the Solr-Genl and other members of the profession in Parl. They also recommended that a Committee be appointed at the next meetg to sign the recommendn to the Chancr of the Exchr and the Speaker of the House of Commons, and to request an audience with both or either of them as the Committee may deem expedient and also to communicate with members of the profession in Parl.”

The representation was approved of by the General Meeting, as appears from the following Minute :—

“At the General Meeting of the Society held at the Freemasons’ Tavern on Thurs. the 28th December 1809.

“The Secretary read the draft of the representation to the Chancr of the Exchqr and it was resolved that the representn met with the perfect concurrence of the meetg and the recommendns of the Select Committee be adopted. Mr. Sandys was added to the Committee. The thanks of the meetg were returned to Mr. Kaye for his great care and attention in connection with the representn, and also to the Committee for the pains they had bestowed in investigating the subject, and the trouble they had taken in furthering the views and wishes of the Society.”

The Committee proceeded to act, and the result was reported to a meeting held on Jan. 17th :—

“At a Meeting of the Select Committee on the 17th January 1810.

“The Secy laid before the Committee the answers reced by Mr. Estcourt from the Speaker and the Chancr of the Excheqr, to the letters of the Select Committee accompanying the representations of the Society, of which the following are copies :—

“*Kidbrooke, 30 Decr. 1809.*

“SIR,

“I received this day a Letter and Statement signed by yourself and four other Gentlemen which shall certainly have the fullest consideration ; it is not my intention to be in London

until within two or three days before the Meeting of Parliament ; but I will not fail to appoint an early day after my arrival for my seeing you upon the subject according to your request.

“ I have the Honor to be, Sir,

“ Your obedt Servant,

“ CHAS. ABBOTT.

“ Edmd Estcourt, Esqr.

“ *Downing Street, Jany. 3, 1810.*

“ DEAR SIR,

“ I have recd the representations of yourself and others against the proposed regulations for requiring the employment of one of the Clerks of the House of Commons as an agent for conducting business before the House, and I write to answer you that I will take care to have the benefit of a conference with you before anything further is done upon the subject.

“ I have the honor to be, Sir,

“ Your most obedt humble Servant,

“ S. PERCEVAL.

“ Edmund Estcourt, Esq.

“ Mr. Kaye laid before the Committee a correspce which had passed betn the Attorney-Genl and himself, of which the following is a copy :—

“ *Linc. Inn, Jany. 11, 1810.*

“ DEAR SIR,

“ Upon talking with the Solr-Genl upon the subject which you mentioned to me, I agree with him in thinking that it is not adviseable that we should see you until you have had your communication with the Speaker and Mr. Perceval, and that an earlier meeting w^d be far from useful. We will therefore consider it to stand postponed for the present.

“ Yours sincerely,

“ V. GIBBS.

“ J. Kaye, Esqr.

“ DEAR SIR,

“ I am sorry that you and the Solicitor-Genl shd decline to communicate with the Select Committee of the Law Society until after their conference with the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker. I plainly perceive that if these conferences should prove unsatisfactory to the Committee, they will then be

told that you cannot oppose a measure proposed by the Chancr of the Excheqr sanctioned by the Speaker, and that if the conferences should prove satisfactory that your interference will not be requisite. The delay you have interposed is therefore in substance, and effect, a rejection of the application. What reception are the Committee to expect from the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker, when neither the merits of their case nor their personal character could even obtain them an audience of the two leading Members of their own Profession? Until the receipt of your Letter the Committee entertained a confident opinion that you and the Solr-Genl would have afforded them your best advice and most cordial support, so far as you shd consider their resistance to the proposed measure founded on Justice and Public Policy, and that they wd have bn authorised to state your decided opinion on the subject to the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker. I need not observe to you what a mortifying disappointment it must be to the Committee to find themselves in such a case abandoned (I had almost said treated with contempt) by the Gentlemen placed at the head of their profession. I confess I did not expect that a mere application for an interview from the Gentlemen composing the Committee wd have experienced such a reception from you, as with one exception I believe there could not have been a more respectable selection of a Committee for the purposes entrusted to their management.

“I am, Dear Sir,

“Your very obedient servt,

“JOSEPH KAYE.”

“11th *Jany*, 1810.

“The Attorney-Genl and Solr Genl have not the slightest objection on their own account to seeing and communicating with the Select Committee of the Law Socy on Wednesday next, and hearing their reasons which they have to urge agst the regulation proposed by Mr Perceval; but they are satisfied that the Committee will upon reflection feel how very improper it wd be for the Attorney and Sol.-Genl. on an *ex parte* representation, to give a decided opinion upon a question which it may afterwards become their duty as Members of the House of Commons to examine and determine upon in Parl.

“They have felt no small degree of surprise that their motive

for proposing to defer the meeting should have been so misconceived and commented upon.

“The Solicitor-Genl has another attendce on Wednesday which obliges him to desire that this may stand for half after one.

“*Russell Square,*
“*Jany. 12, 1810.*”

“The Committee prepared and sent to the Attorney-Genl. and Solr-Genl. the following letter :—

“TO THE ATTORNEY AND SOLR-GENL.

“GENTLEMEN,

“We have considered your communications to Mr. Kaye of the 11th and 12th inst, on the subject of our representation to the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker, and as you think it is not adviseable that you should see us until after our communication with the Speaker and the Chancr of the Excheqr we acquiesce in your judgment, trusting, however, that you will have the goodness to communicate with those gentlemen on the subject to promote the object we have in view.

“We have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

“Your obedt servants,

“(Signed by the Come).”

“At a Meeting of the Select Come at Alice’s Coffee House, Westminster Hall, on Friday the 26th Jany., 1810, Mr. Kaye, Mr. Forster, and the Secretary attending, the following correspondence was read :—

“DEAR SIR,

“I have seen the Speaker to-day, and he assures me that the duty which is intended to be imposed on the Clerks of the House is merely that which at present lies upon no one to perform, that it will be no more than what is deemed necessary for the security of those whom the Bills may affect, that it will not exclude the usual Parliamentary Agents from any part of their employment, that they may name what clerk they please for this particular duty, and that the fees of such Clerk

will be regulated. I take the earliest opportunity of sending you this information.

“Yours sincerely,
“V. GIBBS.

“*Sunday ev'g, Jany. 21st, 1810.*

“JOSH KAYE, ESQRE.”

“DEAR SIR,

“I am much obliged by your communication of the result of your conversation with the Speaker, and I am extremely glad to hear that he is so favourably disposed towards our branch of the Profession. I, however, hope and trust it is his intention to see us on the subject, and to give us a copy of the proposed amended regulation, and allow us time to consider it before it is submitted to the House. May I entreat the favour of you to take an early opportunity of mentioning this expectation to the Speaker, and that you will inform me of his determination?

“Unless our rights are defined and protected by the words of the proposed Resolution, the intention of the Mover (however favourable) will be of no service to us, and the inconvenience and injustice we have anticipated will certainly result from it. We also rely upon Mr. Perceval favouring us with an Interview before the measure in its amended state is submitted to the House. Will you have the goodness to inform him of this the first opportunity?

“I am, Dear Sir,

“Your faithful and obedient Servant,
“JOSEPH KAYE.

“*Tokenhouse Yard, 22nd Jan., 1810.*

“MR. ATTORNEY-GENERAL.”

“*Russell Square,*

“*Wed'y Morn'g, Jany. 24th.*

“DEAR SIR,

“The Speaker will certainly see you before the business of this regulation comes on. Mr. Perceval told me before that he intended doing it. I apprehend from the Speaker that the matter will be referred to a Committee, and that the form of the Resoln must be settled there. You will of course take measures for getting an appointment made with each of them.

“Yours sincerely,
“(signed) V. GIBBS.”

- “At a meeting of the Select Committee held in the Lobby of the House of Commons on the 28th May, 1810.
- “The Committee received an intimation from a Member that the Come of the House to whom the Private Bill Regulations were referred wd sit that day at two o'clock ; the Committee met in order that if they should conceive the interests of the Profession affected by the proposed Regulations, they might suggest their objections before the Report was made to the House. They inspected a paper laid before them, entitled ‘Propositions for Private Bills, classed under six heads, viz. 1st, Regularity and notoriety of Proceedings ; 2, Examn of Bills and Breviates ; 3, Committee Proceedings ; 4, Reports ; 5, Ingrossments and passing ; 6, Fee fund of Private Bill Office.’ The Select Committee offered some suggestions and alterations to the Committee of the House which were adopted, and the Report was carried up the same day.”

The abrupt ending of the records prevents our having the report of the Committee to the General Meeting, but the result was satisfactory.

Those who, like myself, know Mr. Joseph Kaye very well by reputation, will have no doubt in attributing to him a correspondence which, both in its tone and result, reflects credit upon our profession.

The correspondence has a personal interest to me. Mr. Joseph Kaye's letters, though one is dated from Tokenhouse Yard, were probably penned in the room in which I am now sitting, which was his room ; and Sir Vicary Gibbs' reply, from the house which I occupy in Russell Square, which was built for him. It curiously enough happens also that Kidbrooke, from which Mr. Abbott writes, was the residence of the late Mr. Henry Freshfield. Although my grandfather Mr. Freshfield's name is not mentioned in this matter, I know that he was personally concerned and active in it. I have often heard him refer to it, and regret that in later days the business which had been secured to our profession had fallen into the hands of the Bar. It is, I think, clear from these extracts that the Society was in full vigour.¹

I propose now to conclude with a few general observations upon the Society, and with one or two remarks.

The internal management of the Society throughout seems to have been simple enough. As I observed at the outset, it is to be inferred

¹ Where the missing portion of our Records between 1810 and 1825 is I do not know, but the publisher of a pamphlet, which came into my hands after this Introduction was in type, was able to refer to it. As the subject-matter of this pamphlet is very interesting, I have had it printed as an Appendix to this Introduction, p. ci.

from the first Minute that the Society was in existence at the date of it, and was probably mainly of a convivial nature. Out of this grew the organization of a Society with extended and different objects. The business was to be managed by a Committee of twenty-one members. This body was to meet once a month, or oftener, to transact such business as was covered by the objects of the Society, and to report what it had done to the next General Meeting. The Society, probably in continuance of an existing custom, was to meet twice a year, after Hilary and Trinity terms.

The retention of the Stewards seems to point to the convivial part.

Assuming, which I think one may fairly do, that the Minutes are in this respect complete, the General Meetings seem to have been regularly held twice a year, in February and June or July, with an occasional extraordinary meeting; but the Committee seems to have kept very little up to the ideal. I observe that in the year 1739-40 there were only two Committee meetings. In the year 1740-41 only one meeting was held. In the year 1741-42 there were five meetings. In the year 1742-43 there were three meetings. There appear to have been none in 1744. In 1745-46 there were five. In 1747-48 there were seven.

During the years 1747 and 1748 the attendance at the Committee had been so irregular that a special report was made "to the General Meeting to the effect that the Committee could not forbear expressing their concern that few of the members' names put to the Committee do attend the service, and yet it hath sometime happened that there are not a sufficient number of members attending to form a Committee, whereby the affairs of the Society are delayed, and the Committee do earnestly request that at the next General Meeting an order may be made touching the premises as shall seem expedient."

The Minute of the succeeding General Meeting in 1748 says nothing as to this, but at the first meeting of the Committee after the General Meeting it was resolved—"that the first Monday in every month in the year, except the months of January, August, September, and October be stated Committee nights."

Notwithstanding this, I do not find that a single Meeting was held on the first Monday in any month in that year, except, possibly, in November; and in the following year the meetings were as irregular. It seems, therefore, that our ancestors experienced the same difficulty that we do in securing an attendance of members at purely voluntary meetings, nor do I find that this improved as time went on, for the attendance in the succeeding years of 1751, -52 and -53 are just as irregular.

The same irregularity continues all through the remainder of the century.

In the year 1800 there was a further rule made to secure, if possible, the greater regularity of the Committee Meetings:—

“That there be four such meetings in the year, viz. on the second Friday in each term at 8 o'clock in the evening.

“That the whole Committee (consisting of 24) be summoned for each of such meetings, and that a rota of attendance be formed, consisting of six members of the Committee, in the order they stand on the list, who shall attend either in person or be represented by some other member of the Committee, or forfeit 5s. for every default.

“And in order that each member of the Committee may be apprized of the meeting on which he is on the rota, the same shall be noticed on the summons for each meeting.

“That each member of the Committee be forthwith furnished with a list of the whole Committee.”

I think this modified arrangement produced a better result; but even so, I find that a few years later an important matter was referred, not to the Committee, but to a select Committee of five, which from internal circumstances seems to me to have illustrated the saying of a well-known organizing Church dignitary, that he liked in the management of a concern to have it delegated to a Committee of three, with a quorum of one, and he to be that one.

Throughout the period covered by the Minutes, the Committee seem to have exercised their power of acting; they acted and reported.

The Chairman of the Meeting, as I have mentioned, was called the Prolocutor. He is rather taken for granted than put forward; his name is not even always mentioned, and he appears to have been appointed by the General Meeting itself.

The office of the Secretary is only incidentally mentioned, and his functions are never defined. He seems to have summoned the meetings, and kept the accounts of the Society, which were audited twice a year before the General Meeting, and were presented to the meeting by the Prolocutor. There are also named in the Minutes a Deputy-Secretary and an Assistant-Secretary, but whether these last two were different officers, or the same under different names, I am not sure.

The function of the four Stewards seems to me to have been confined to the feasts. There is among the records a circular issued

by the Secretary to the Stewards in 1772, which probably was in the usual form, and shows what their duties were:—

“SIR,—You are desired to meet your bretheren, the Stewards, for the feast of the Law Society on Tuesday next, at 8 o'clock in the evening, at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, to make a return of what tickets you have disposed of, and to give your final orders for the feast, and to spend the evening there.

“I am, Your most humble servt.,

“EDW. BOWMAN.”

They appear to have been chosen in such a way that there were representatives both of the City and Middlesex.

The penalty for refusing to discharge the duty of Steward was expulsion.

The subscription to the Society seems to have been so far voluntary, that the only way of collecting it was to threaten exposure and expulsion. Each member had a ticket for each General Meeting, which ticket cost 5s., and on one occasion the ticket was 10s., and entitled the member to a dinner at each feast; but this was apparently an experiment, and did not succeed.

The subscription to the Society seems not to have been fixed, but contributions were collected from the members from time to time, as circumstances required.

The first mention is in the year 1742-43, when it was ordered that a collection should be made at the next General Meeting, from the members of the Society who had not already contributed towards the funds of the Society.

This was duly done at the meeting in July 1743, when it was ordered that an account should be laid before the Committee, before each General Meeting of the receipts and applications of all monies received by the Deputy-Secretary, and that they should report the same, and the clear balance in his hands, from time to time. It was declared to be the sense of the meeting that every member who had not already contributed ought to contribute rateably, according to the resolution of the last meeting.

I think the word “rateably” must be used in a sense different to that in which we use it now. I think it here means equally.

It will be found that at one time the subscription was 10s. 6d. a year, at another two guineas and a half, at another three guineas. There was an entrance fee of two guineas and a half, which was

afterwards increased to five guineas. This last increase was fixed by a Resolution of the Society in 1789, to the effect that every member should on or before the next General Meeting pay into the hands of the Prolocutor the sum of three guineas, in order to establish a fund to answer the purposes of this Society, and that all new members should pay the sum of five guineas on their admittance into the Society.

The subscriptions were subsequently reduced to two guineas, and in 1809 the Committee, taking into consideration the flourishing state of the finances of the Society, were of opinion that it was no longer necessary to receive a subscription every year, but that each alternate year one guinea would be sufficient ; and they therefore recommended the Society to order that in the year 1810 the subscriptions be one guinea, the following year two guineas, and so on. This seems not to have succeeded, for at the end of the present book it is stated that in order to support the credit and respectability of the Society and to defray the contingent expenses lately incurred in protecting and supporting the general interests of the profession, and to make provision for similar expenses in the future, it would be advisable to continue the subscription of the members at two guineas per annum, instead of one guinea each alternate year.

The subscriptions appear to have been gathered at the General Meetings after dinner, and the names of all members subscribing, and of those who had not subscribed or paid, were read out to encourage defaulters to pay. But this was not always successful, and in the Appendix is a list of those who had not paid, and their excuses for not paying the money. Among them I find a relation of my own, Mr. George Jemmett, who appears to have left London to go to reside at Ashford, where some of his family still live. His letter of explanation is in the Appendix. He did not like being considered a defaulter.

There are records from time to time of members withdrawing from the Society.

With regard to the number of members, this also is not settled by these Minutes. There certainly were lists of the members of the Society, as one was lost when the Society's Trunk was stolen, and the fact of making one is mentioned in the year 1809. The number cannot, I think, be calculated from the list of diners, because it seems that guests were invited by the Committee. All the members would be entitled to come as a matter of right, and were bound to come, but among the members for whom dinners were ordered would be included

the guests. I think the largest recorded number of diners is 120. For the last ten years the numbers attending the dinner vary from 80 to 120.

In 1756, 82 members attended the General Meeting; in 1806, 95 members attended.

In the Appendix is an alphabetical list of members not upon the Committee, undated, but made between the years 1770 and 1780. The number is 129; and if to these are added the 24 members of the Committee, the number would be 153. I do not think at the end the number could have exceeded 200.

There is very little indication as to the manner in which the Society behaved in General Meeting, but there is an ominous entry in 1777. Mr. Wishaw, an important member, moved as "an Exhortation only" the following resolutions:—

"Decency Rule and order to be observed at all general meetings. At the time of general business every member who thinks proper to speak on any subject proposed, be candidly heard, without interruption.

"No member to speak twice on any subject, unless by way of reply or to explain what he has advanced.

"That the Prolocutor be supported in his conduct while in the Chair."

Something I must say upon the convivial aspect of the Society. I have mentioned that the feasts took place upon the occasion of each General Meeting. Probably the feast was the only way of getting the members to attend. These feasts—for so they were called, certainly at the outset—were managed by the Stewards; but I think that towards the end the Committee took a considerable part in the matter, the duty of the Stewards being only ministerial.

Very little is said about the dinner at first, except that its price was to each member 5s. There was, apparently, a deficiency, owing to the attendance, I presume, of guests, which was defrayed out of the general funds of the Society. Every member was expected to take a ticket, whether he attended or not, and the penalty was expulsion. Two members were expelled for this cause in 1800. The price of the dinner was fixed by the Committee, and varied. I have said that towards the latter part the dinner becomes a more marked feature, and more is said about it.

In 1799 dinner was ordered for sixty persons, at 6s. a head, and four guineas was fixed for dessert.

The day for the summer dinner, in the same year, had to be

advanced, because many members of the Society belonged to the Bloomsbury and Inns of Court Military Association, and were obliged to attend a General Field-day.

It was provided for eighty, at 5*s.* a head, and there were seven haunches of venison.

The dinner-hour was in the following year at half-past four.

In 1806 the dinner cost 6*s.* a head, and there were six haunches of venison.

In 1808 the dinner cost 7*s.* a head, and 1*s.* 6*d.* for dessert.

In 1809 directions were given for dinner for 120 persons, at 6*s.* 8*d.* a head, exclusive of venison and dessert. Dessert and ice at 2*s.* a head ; seven haunches of venison and two necks.

The venison, in each case, was an extra paid for by the Society out of its own funds.

There is nothing said about the wine consumed.

There is mention made in one entry of port wine, which cost 5*s.*, which I shall refer to presently, and one mention in 1806 that a member, "Mr. James, was ordered to attend in his place. Three days' notice to Mr. James to come to meeting to pay his dozen of claret."

Mr. James was a member of the Committee. This opens a consideration of the manner in which at convivial clubs at this date the wine and even the dinner was provided.

This was done usually by fines or bets—fines for non-attendance, or bets upon subjects harmless or even stupid ; the wager being a dozen, or a rump and a dozen, and sometimes a dinner. I have said that the bets were usually of a harmless nature—upon such subjects as the distance of one town from London by one of two alternative roads, occasionally upon legal matters. Sometimes, as the evening advanced, the wagers were of a kind which could hardly be repeated here, nor were the jokes of the most refined description. My authority for this is a rough minute-book of a legal club which came into my hands, and some of the members of which appear as members of our Society. The only absolute order in our records as to liquor to be used is of a negative character, in 1808. "The Committee resolved to recommend the Stewards in future to discontinue the use of spruce beer, soda-water, cider, and sherry at the dinners at General Meetings." A good regulation, I think.

But it was not only at the General Meetings that conviviality was exercised.

The Committee obviously dined together on the occasion of their meetings.

h

In 1797 there is a memorandum from Mr. Lowndes, a member of the Committee, to Mr. Eams, the Secretary, as to attending the meetings, and there is this addition—"Mr. L. has ordered a dish of fish, a leg of mutton, and a tart for dinner to-morrow."

In 1798 there is an entry—"Paid for a room 13s." This was in respect of a meeting to be held at the Crown and Anchor, but at which only one member attended.

On a similar occasion, when only one member attended, in 1805, the expenses are more particularized—"The use of the room, 10s. 6d. Wax lights, 6s. Port, 5s. Total, £1 1s. 6d." Then 1s. (probably for attendance) is added, making £1 2s. 6d.

It will be noted that although only one of the Committee attended, it was impossible for him and the Secretary, being two Christian men, to separate without having something to drink. If the 5s. represented the price of a bottle, I do not think we can say that our brethren exceeded, for one bottle of port between the Secretary and a Committee-man would not interfere with their return home.

In 1806 there was an innovation in the nature of an audit dinner, probably to obviate the necessity of auditing the accounts at the General Meeting.

This Minute is as follows:—

"At the same meeting it was also resolved to hold a Dinner at the Crown and Anchor on the 25th Feb. 1806, for auditing the accounts, and settling all business previous to the Genl. Meeting instead of a meeting on the evening as theretofore, and to receive the reports of the Prolocutor or Deputation of the Committee on the Monday. The Dinner was to be held at five o'clock, and the whole of the Committee was to be summoned a week before, and to send an answer three days before whether they intended to dine or not, the Secretary then to order Dinner for as many as wd attend."

Subsequently, in the same year, this dinner came to be considered as apparently an innovation, for there is a memorandum that the Committee will dine together at their own expense previous to the General Meeting.

This subject of conviviality might, I think, be very much enlarged on, but I would not like to deprive the members of the Society of the interest of finding out a good deal for themselves.



To Give
 With the Practitioners in the Several
 Courts of Law and Equity on
 the 24th day of July - 1791 at the Court
 Tavern in the Strand At four o'clock precisely

T. & M. Millings & Co.
 Auctioneers

This Ticket will admit only Mr. Theobald Broom

The Minutes properly end with the "ordering of a dinner for 120 Gentlemen at 7s. 6d. a head each, exclusive of 2s. a head for dessert."

I said something at the commencement about the places of meeting. The dinners first were held at a tavern, afterwards at Clifford's Inn Hall, and at length, in 1806, "the consideration of a proper house for the Society to meet in for the future was held, and the Committee being of opinion that the Society will be well accomodated at the Freemasons' Tavern, they gave directions for the next dinner at that place."

I cannot quite tell what was the reason of their quitting Clifford's Inn Hall. I think it must have been in some way connected with the inconvenience of the attendance.

Among other matters referred to in the Appendix, is a relation of the circumstances in which the books and property of the Society were stolen from the Secretary (Mr. Bowman's) house. The Minute Book of the Society was lost; the Book of the names of the members alphabetically, a bundle of general Minutes, copper-plate for the tickets, and some tickets not filled up; a copper-plate for the Committee letters, and some blank letters, returns, and accounts, and such-like.

A reward of a guinea was offered, and as it was paid it is to be assumed that the property was recovered. The papers were kept in a trunk, which was called the Law Society Trunk, and it will be interesting to record the fact that here and in other places the Society is called by the same name as it is at present, only omitting the word "incorporated." Among the Records are some dinner tickets. I have had one of them reproduced as an interesting memento.

There is abundant evidence of the vitality of the Society up to the very close of these records. It will be found that consideration was being had as to a provision for decayed members, for the improvement of articulated clerks, and in the Appendix there is a sort of outline proposal for the foundation of a College for the education and examination of persons to be admitted Solicitors.

As to the estimation in which the Society was held, I see among the Scriveners' papers that even so early as 1750, or thereabouts, the Society was talked of as a powerful one, and neither the Scriveners' Company nor the Corporation under-estimated the strength of their opponents.

It only remains for me to apologize for the length of time this introduction has been in hand. If I had had my own way, I should have kept it longer, and further illustrated what is to me the most

interesting part of it—namely, the contest between the Lawyers and the Scriveners. Some further materials as to this I have obtained from the Archives of the Corporation and other sources, and these I propose to place at the disposal of the Society.

There still remains a very large field which I have scarcely touched upon ; viz. the extent to which the Society influenced the course of events in the seventy years of its recorded existence.

Hardly a year passed in which it did not interfere to assist and amend the administration of law and justice. But the members of the Society can work these matters out. I attempted one or two but time would not serve. And now I lay down my pen with a sense of profound gratitude to our ancestors, who practically made our profession what it now is.

What it was, and the estimation it was held in in the last century, may be gathered from the opinion of contemporary writers. "Sir," a distinguished monarch of Great Britain is reported to have said, "you would not have me knight a damned Attorney."

APPENDIX TO THE INTRODUCTION

COMMUNICATIONS

BY

THE LAW SOCIETY

WITH THE

KING'S COUNSEL

PRACTISING IN CHANCERY

PRINTED IN LONDON BY G. WOODFALL, ANGEL COURT, SKINNER
STREET, IN THE YEAR 1822.

COMMUNICATIONS

BY

THE LAW SOCIETY

ETC., ETC.

These Communications originated in the following Resolutions of the Law Society.

EXTRACT from the MINUTES of the GENERAL COMMITTEE of the LAW SOCIETY, of the 18th day of February, 1822.

Complaints having been repeatedly made to the Committee of the Law Society of the great injury and expense to which the Suitors are exposed, as well as the inconvenience experienced by the Profession, from the absence of Counsel within the Bar in the Lord Chancellor's and Vice Chancellor's Courts, when matters in which they hold Briefs are to be heard,

Resolved—That a respectful representation on the subject be made to the King's Counsel practising in those Courts, requesting them to take the same into their serious consideration, and to make such an arrangement as will in future remove the injury and obviate the inconvenience complained of.

That this Resolution be communicated by the Secretary, and that he report the Answer he may receive to the Society, at the next General Meeting on the 1st of March ensuing.

EXTRACT from the MINUTES of the LAW SOCIETY.—At a GENERAL MEETING of the LAW SOCIETY, held at the Albion Tavern in Aldersgate Street, on Friday, the 1st day of March, 1822.

The Members of this Society learn with regret that no Answer has been received from the King's Counsel at the Chancery Bar, to the Resolution of the Committee of the 18th ultimo. They, therefore,

feel it proper to renew their intreaty to the Counsel, to take the subject into their immediate consideration, and to acquaint the Secretary, for the information of this Society and the Profession at large, whether they may in future be found in the Court of the Lord Chancellor, or in that of the Vice Chancellor, so that the Suitors and the Profession may, at all times, rely upon their assistance in the Court in which they accept Briefs.

Resolved—That the above intimation of the Society be communicated by the Secretary to the King's Counsel at the Chancery Bar, and that a General Meeting of the Society be held at the London Coffee-house, Ludgate Hill, at Twelve o'Clock precisely, on the 22d of March instant, to receive the Report of the Secretary, and to adopt such measures as may be deemed expedient thereupon.

Pursuant to these Resolutions, the Secretary, on the 19th of February and 5th of March, 1822, addressed Letters to the following Gentlemen :

AGAR, WILLIAM,	OWEN, WILLIAM,
BENYON, SAMUEL YATE,	SHADWELL, LANCELOT,
CULLEN, ARCHIBALD,	SUGDEN, EDWARD B.
FONBLANQUE, JOHN,	TROWER, JAMES,
HART, ANTHONY,	WETHERELL, CHARLES,
HEALD, GEORGE,	WINGFIELD, WILLIAM,
HORNE, WILLIAM,	and
MARTIN, HENRY,	WILSON, GIFFIN, ESQRS.

inclosing the above Extracts, and intimating that he should feel honored by any communication the Counsel addressed might think proper to make to him upon the subject.

To the second of these Letters, the following Answers were received by the Secretary.

Lincoln's Inn, 8th March, 1822.

SIR,

I have received both the Letters which you have done me the honor to address to me by the direction of the Law Society, and I am very sorry that I was prevented by accidental interruptions from acknowledging the first, as I had fully intended. I have often considered the subject mentioned in the Society's Resolution, but I have never formed any settled opinion upon it; and I own I had

not conceived it necessary to do so, as it appeared to me that the remedy for the inconvenience alluded to was in the hands of yourselves and clients. But I have no difficulty in saying, for myself, in answer to the question put to me, as to my future intentions, that they are to be always in the Vice Chancellor's Court, except in particular cases, and where my attendance in the Lord Chancellor's Court will not interfere with any business that I may have in the Vice Chancellor's.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient humble Servant,
ARCHIBALD CULLEN.

To W. B. Flexney, Esq.

SIR,

From the time I received your first Letter, my attention has been turned most anxiously to its subject, and upon the fullest consideration, I am not able to point out any mode of proceeding which will remove the evils complained of without introducing others; but in any view of the subject I cannot induce myself to think that it is consistent with justice, much less with honor, to undertake to lead a cause and either forsake it altogether, or give it an imperfect, hasty, and divided attention; consequences that inevitably result from the attempt to conduct causes before two judges sitting at the same time in different places. I have therefore resolved to refuse any business which may tend to prevent me from giving my undivided attention in Court to matters that may be heard before the Lord Chancellor. If some remedy could have been adopted with the general concurrence of the leading Members of the Profession, no one would have more rejoiced in the unanimity than myself: that however seems hopeless; it is left to every individual to frame and to follow his own resolution, and I shall abide by mine.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,
LANCELOT SHADWELL.

*Lincoln's Inn,
March 20th, 1822.*

To W. B. Flexney, Esq.

At the General Meeting of the Society held on the 22d of March, agreeably to the Notification in the Resolution of the 1st of March, the Prolocutor was directed to reply to the Letters of Mr. Cullen and Mr. Shadwell, and which he did in the following terms:

New Bank Buildings, 26th March, 1822.

SIR,

At a General Meeting of the Law Society, held on the 22d instant, I was directed, as their Prolocutor, to acknowledge the receipt of your Letter to the Secretary, and to present to you the cordial thanks of the Society for the liberal and candid terms in which you have communicated your honorable intentions in regard to your future attendance in the Courts of the Lord Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor.

I can most sincerely assure you, that the communications which have been made by the Society to the King's Counsel practising in those Courts, have proceeded from an anxiety to do justice and give satisfaction to the Suitors, and to prevent that interruption in, and inattention to, the conduct of judicial proceedings, which a divided attention to business in two Courts, sitting in different places at the same time, must inevitably produce. It was the wish of the Society to communicate to the Bar the inconvenience complained of, with all possible respect, feeling that it is the interest as well as the duty of our branch of the Profession to promote the dignity and independence of the Bar.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

(Signed) JOSEPH KAYE.

To A. Cullen, Esq.

A similar reply was sent to Mr. Shadwell; and no Answers being received to either of the Letters written by the Secretary from any of the other Gentlemen, the Prolocutor was directed to address a Letter to each, and which he did to the following purport.

SIR,

At a General Meeting of the Law Society, held on the 22d instant, I was directed, as their Prolocutor, to express to you the regret of the Society at your not having taken notice of the applications made to you through the Secretary, respecting the injury and inconvenience pointed out in the Resolutions of the Society of the 18th of February and the 1st instant. I can most sincerely assure you that those communications have proceeded from an anxiety to do justice and give satisfaction to the Suitors, and to prevent that interruption in, and inattention to, the conduct of judicial proceedings, which a divided attention to business in two Courts sitting in different places

at the same time, must inevitably produce. It was the wish of the Society to communicate to the Bar the inconvenience complained of, with all possible respect, feeling that it is the interest as well as the duty of our branch of the Profession to promote the dignity and independence of the Bar. If, therefore, the remedy proposed by the Society for removing the inconvenience alluded to, should not appear to you to be that which is the most desirable and the best calculated to attain that object, I hope you will have the goodness to favor me with your sentiments on the best mode of accomplishing it. The Law Society are convinced that the Gentlemen whom they have directed me to address upon this occasion, are incapable of entertaining a wish to promote their emolument by a system of practice that must be productive of injustice, expense, and dissatisfaction to their clients; and that the best means of attaining the object sought by the Society, will ultimately receive your approbation and concurrence. May I entreat the favor of you to communicate to me your determination on the subject as soon as convenient.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
JOSEPH KAYE.

*New Bank Buildings,
26th March, 1822.*

*To A. Hart, Esq. and the other King's Counsel above named, except Mr. Cullen
and Mr. Shadwell.*

The only answer received to this Letter was from Mr. Fonblanque, of which the following is a copy :

SIR,

I trust that it is not necessary for me to assure you that my not answering the Letters addressed to me by Mr. Flexney, as Secretary of the Law Society, is not ascribable to any want of respect to that institution, of the respectability and utility of which I am fully sensible; but it did appear to me, that their Resolutions upon the present occasion, assumed a right in their collective character to require that to be done, for which, individually, in the discharge of their professional duty, they certainly may properly stipulate. Under that impression, I thought that I should best consult the dignity and independence of the Bar (which you, and I am confident most sincerely, profess yourself anxious to promote), by abstaining from any act that might be construed a recognition of such right of interference. Your Letter, however, has satisfied me that it was the wish

of the Society to communicate to the Bar the inconvenience complained of with all possible respect, and rather to solicit their sentiments on the remedy proposed by the Society, than to call upon them implicitly to adopt and carry it into effect. In this allowed view of the subject, the same feeling that induced my silence, now intitles you to my opinion ; for I cannot but think that if there be any thing in the present practice of the Bar that is obstructive to the due and satisfactory administration of justice, that it is their duty, and I am confident it is their inclination, if possible, to remove it. The object of the Society, as stated in your Letter, is "to prevent that interruption and inattention to the conduct of judicial proceedings, which a divided attention to business in two Courts, sitting in different places at the same time, must inevitably produce." I will not affect to say, that inconvenience may not occasionally arise, from the practice of any Gentleman's attending more than one Court, but you cannot but be aware that it has been usual in all times for King's Counsel practising in the Court of Chancery, to attend also Equity proceedings in the Court of Exchequer. The present Chancellor and his cotemporaries did so for many years, until they found that their business in one Court did not allow of their attendance in the other, and then they withdrew from the Exchequer, and confined themselves to the Court of Chancery; and I am confident that the same liberal sense of propriety that informed the conduct of the Bar at that period, will regulate the conduct of those in the lead of business at the present. It may, however, be proper here to remark, that much more may be said in defence of the practice of attending the Courts of the Chancellor and of the Vice Chancellor, than could be urged in defence of the practice of attending those of the Chancery and Exchequer; for it cannot escape your attention, that when a gentleman has received a Retainer in a suit in Chancery, he ought to be found in whichever of the Courts proceedings may be going on, and that must depend on the Chancellor: I really, therefore, do not see how he can, consistently with his implied engagement, absent himself from either, should his attendance be necessary.

The Members of your Society might indeed relieve him from this obligation, but other professional Gentlemen, who are not Members of the Law Society, might insist upon it. Another inconvenience is also obvious; upon an Appeal from a Decree of the Vice Chancellor, the Gentleman who advised it, as also the Gentleman in whose favor the decree was pronounced, would be excluded from re-arguing it before the Chancellor, and it may also deserve consideration, that if all the

Gentlemen within the Bar, should at any period elect to practise in the Vice Chancellor's Court, the Chancellor would be left destitute of that assistance that he might fairly expect, both in his own Court and in the House of Lords. I do not mean to state that such is likely to be the case, but in framing Regulations it is material to advert to possibilities.

I have thrown out these observations (to which many more might be added) under the persuasion that you will give them all the weight that they may deserve, and if in the result they should satisfy you that the proposed remedy is not calculated to remove the alleged inconvenience, without the risk of inducing a still greater, I think that the real interest of the Suitors will be best consulted by referring them to the honor and integrity of the Bar, who are, I am confident, intitled to full credit for most zealously partaking of every feeling that has the interest of justice for its object.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient humble Servant,
JOHN FONBLANQUE.

Temple,
30th March, 1822.
To Joseph Kaye, Esq.

At a MEETING of the GENERAL COMMITTEE of the LAW SOCIETY,
held on the 16th of April, 1822,

It was resolved—That the Prolocutor be requested, with the assistance and concurrence of Mr. Brooks and Mr. Lavie, as a Subcommittee, to write an Answer to the foregoing Letter of Mr. Fonblanque, and also to wait upon the Lord Chancellor, to obtain his Lordship's sentiments on the measure which had been proposed to the King's Counsel at the Chancery Bar.

The following Letter was addressed accordingly to Mr. Fonblanque.

SIR,

I submitted the Letter which you did me the honor to address to me on the 30th ultimo, to the Law Society, who have desired me to communicate to you their sentiments on the topics it contains.

You appear to have put too rigid a construction upon the Resolutions of the Society when you consider them as assuming a *right* to *require* any thing to be done by the Bar upon the subject to which those Resolutions refer. The Society merely meant to represent, with all due respect, the inconveniences complained of, and to express

their earnest request that the Bar would remove those inconveniences by confining their practice to one of the Courts mentioned. To this rule, if adopted, perhaps some exceptions might be introduced that would be beneficial to the Suitors, whose interests I submit ought to be the leading object both of the Bar and the Solicitors. You admit our right to stipulate individually for what we solicit, but decline attending even to our recommendation when conveyed as the united sentiments of a considerable body of extensive Practisers.

You admit "that if there be any thing in the present practice of the Bar that is obstructive to the due and satisfactory administration of justice, it is their duty if possible to remove it." I submit that the present practice of the leading Counsel receiving Briefs generally in Causes in both Courts, has clearly that tendency. If the leading Counsel for any of the parties in a Suit is absent when a Cause is called on, or a motion of importance made, the Court is requested by the junior Counsel to postpone the hearing, and this repeatedly, so that the hearing is frequently not only delayed from week to week, but from Term to Term, and many of the delays complained of in the Courts of Equity have their origin in this source. The practice we complain of is an obstruction to the speedy administration of justice, and it also operates as a very heavy tax upon the Suitors. They not only have to pay their Solicitors and Clerks in Court, for attendances productive of no benefit, but have also to pay Counsel additional fees by way of Refreshers, and otherwise. You refer me to the inconvenience formerly occasioned by the same Counsel practising in the Courts of Chancery and Exchequer.—To this it may be answered that the existence of one inconvenience can neither be justified nor tolerated by the precedent of another. The inconvenience you refer to has ceased, in consequence of the injustice and delay it produced; and I am old enough to remember that the present Chancellor and Mr. Mansfield, nearly forty years ago, refused Exchequer Briefs, except upon an express understanding, that they would not be expected to attend the discussion, unless disengaged in the Court of Chancery: and the Court of Exchequer made it a rule never to wait for, or postpone business on account of the absence of Counsel attending the Chancery Bar.

With respect to your observation as to a Retainer, I beg leave to observe that it would equally apply to Causes heard at the Rolls, although many King's Counsel never attend that Court. The Gentlemen also who now exclusively attend the Lord Chancellor's Court, or the Vice Chancellor's Court, never go into the other on

account of a Retainer, nor are they expected by the Solicitors so to do. No complaint has ever been made, that I am aware of, against any Counsel for confining himself to one Court.

The case of an Appeal, I think, may be fairly considered an exception from a general rule, as the Counsel who obtain a Decree, or sign a Petition of Appeal against one, may reasonably be expected to sustain the interest of their clients before the Appellant jurisdiction.

The Solicitors are under no apprehension of either Court of Chancery being left without Counsel, by the whole Bar practising exclusively in the other, and therefore do not feel any necessity to provide against so extreme a case, by exposing their clients to the injustice and expense resulting from the present system.

You will collect from what I have said, that the Gentlemen whom I represent, after giving the utmost attention to your observations, are by no means satisfied "that the proposed remedy *is not* calculated to remove the alleged inconvenience without the risk of inducing a still greater." They have made their appeal for a remedy to the "honor and integrity of the Bar," in confidence that such appeal will ultimately obtain for the Suitors the relief to which they are intitled. The Bar must perceive that in urging the desired arrangements, the Solicitors are not consulting their own pecuniary interests: on the contrary, the advantage and satisfaction of the Suitors, by promoting speedy justice at the least possible expense, is the sole object of our appeal to the Bar. The Solicitors have the highest confidence in the honor and integrity of the Bar, and when that learned Body come coolly to consider the subject, the Solicitors feel confident that they will not only make such arrangements as will remove the injustice and inconvenience complained of, but will approve the conduct of those who have made the application, instead of, as at present, considering them as having acted improperly.

The Bar must be aware that from the immediate intercourse between the Suitors and the Solicitors, the latter are exposed to all the complaints which the former may make respecting any delay or disappointment in the conduct of their business, and it therefore becomes the indispensable duty of the Solicitors to remove those complaints, if practicable; or, at least, to show that they have done every thing in their power to accomplish that object. If, however, the expectations of our branch of the Profession, should be disappointed by the perseverance of the Bar in the system complained of, we shall have the satisfaction of having done all in our power to remove the

just complaints of the Suitors against the delay and expense to which they are frequently subjected.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
(Signed) JOSEPH KAYE.

*New Bank Buildings,
20th April, 1822.
To John Fonblanque, Esq.*

Pursuant to the preceding Resolutions, Mr. Kaye and Mr. Lavie waited on the Lord Chancellor, and Mr. Horne having desired to have the result of that interview communicated to him, the following Letter was addressed to Mr. Horne, which details what passed at the meeting with the Lord Chancellor.

Thursday, 23rd May, 1822.

SIR,

Agreeably to your request we now lay before you the substance of the conversation we had this morning with the Lord Chancellor, respecting the recent communications between the Law Society and the King's Counsel practising in the Court of Chancery, with regard to their electing to attend either the Court of the Lord Chancellor, or that of the Vice Chancellor. His Lordship did not make the smallest objection either to the measure taken by the Solicitors, or to the manner in which the subject had been brought forward; but he declined complying with our application that he should apprise the Bar of his approval of what we requested, assigning as a reason that he thought it inconsistent with his situation to point out or suggest any particular line of conduct for the Bar to pursue, whatever he might think it right to say individually to any Gentleman at the Bar who might speak to him on the subject. His Lordship added that he considered himself as having sufficiently expressed his sentiments upon our application, by having frequently informed the Bar, in open Court, that business should never be put off on account of the absence of Counsel, and which resolution he expressed his determination strictly to adhere to. His Lordship further observed that the honor and integrity of the Bar should induce them to do what was proper for the correct and beneficial administration of justice, and the advantage of the Suitors: and that the Solicitors had it in their power to influence the Bar to do what was proper.

His Lordship noticed his own practice when formerly requested to attend the Court of Exchequer, which was, to inform the Solicitors

that he would not receive a Brief in that Court, but upon condition that he would not be expected to attend, unless disengaged in the Court of Chancery.

We have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your very obedient humble Servants,
(Signed) JOSEPH KAYE.
GERMAIN LAVIE.

To William Horne, Esq.

At a GENERAL MEETING of the LAW SOCIETY, held at Freemasons' Tavern, on Friday the 12th of July 1822, the whole of the foregoing proceedings being read,
It was resolved—That the same be printed, and a copy sent to each Member of this Society, and that a General Meeting of the Society be held on Monday the 4th of November, to take the same into consideration.

THE RECORDS OF THE SOCIETY OF
GENTLEMEN PRACTISERS
IN THE
COURTS OF LAW AND EQUITY.

At a meeting of the Society of Gentlemen Practisers in the Courts of Law and Equity, held on the 13th February, 1739, the Meeting unanimously declared its utmost abhorrence of all male and unfair practice, and that it would do its utmost to detect and discountenance the same; and to that end it was agreed that a General Meeting be had twice a year, viz. on the next day after every Hillary and Trinity Term, unless such day happened to be on a Sunday, and then on the day following, and that the Steward for the time being should appoint the place of such meeting, and that twenty-one members should be appointed to meet once a month, or oftener, if thought proper, to consider of such methods as might best answer the purposes aforesaid, who were to report the same and their opinion thereon at the next General Meeting, and that any five of them should be a sufficient Committee. That four stewards should be appointed for each half-yearly Meeting.

The stewards for the next meeting were Mr. Ashton, Mr. Bayly, Mr. Peters, Mr. Whishaw.

Committee.

Mr. Barber.	Mr. Callard.	Mr. Luke.	Mr. Cranston.
„ Thomas.	„ Tyley.	„ Taylor.	„ Plaxton.
„ Denton.	„ Cromwell.	„ Crews.	„ Geo. Wilson.
„ Wakelin.	„ Staples.	„ Coppinger.	„ Hunt.
„ Stone.	„ Newland.	„ Gorden.	„ Baldwyn.
„ Perkins.			

At a General Meeting of the Society held on the 11th July, 1740, at which the following were present:—

	Mr. Ashton.		
	„ Whishaw.	} Stewards.	
	„ Peters.		
	„ Bayly.		
Mr. Perkins.	Mr. Spateman.		Mr. Tovey.
„ Crewys.	„ Wilson.	„ Westley.	„ Pye.
„ Callard.	„ Watson.	„ Buck.	„ Waddilove.
„ Dowse.	„ Cooper.	„ Wainwright.	„ Tyley.
„ Hone.	„ Lauder.	„ Rochester.	„ Powell.
„ Taylor.	„ Hunt.	„ Austen.	„ Lloyd.
„ Luke.	„ Round.	„ Denton.	„ Withorn.
„ Whishaw, Jun.	„ Cransthorne.	„ Thomas.	„ Scrace.
„ Barber.	„ Jacob.	„ Banister.	„ Baldwyn.
„ Smith.	„ Woodcock.	„ Randall.	„ Thos. Johnson.
„ Cock.			

It was agreed that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Perkins for his services done to the Practisers in the several courts of Law and Equity, and that the former Committee be continued.

Mr. Perkins, Mr. Callard, Mr. Dowse, and Mr. Crewys were appointed stewards for the next meeting, with power to fix the date of the next General Meeting. The Committee were instructed to return to the stewards one month before the next meeting the names of such persons as they should think proper to be at the next General Meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee held on the 22nd December, 1740, Present:—

Mr. Perkins.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Cranston.
„ Plaxton.	„ Tyley.	„ Wakelin.	„ Barber.
„ Crewys.	„ Thomas.	„ Stone.	

A Bill for regulating trials at Nisi Prius, and for the more effective summoning of juries was considered, and was referred to Mr. Denton, Mr. Wakelin, Mr. Stone, Mr. Cranston, and Mr. Baldwyn for consideration, and to report their opinions and observations thereon to the Committee at their next meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee held on the 21st of January, 1740,* Present:—

* It should be noticed with reference to these dates, that the year commenced under the "old style" on the 25th of March.

Mr. Plaxton.	Mr. Luke.	Mr. Taylor.	Mr. Cromwell.
„ Perkins.	„ Denton.	„ Wakelin.	„ Baldwyn.
„ Crewys.	„ Callard.	„ Stone.	„ Barber.

The Bill was again considered, and a deputation was appointed to attend the gentlemen in the House of Commons who had the Bill under their consideration, and to give them their assistance in settling the Bill.

At a Meeting of the Society held on the 13th February, 1740. Present :—

		Mr. Perkins.	
		„ Callard.	} Stewards.
		„ Dowse.	
		„ Crewys.	
Mr. Dutton Soman.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. E. Gale.	
„ Watson.	„ Waddilove.	„ Treageagle.	„ Garden.
„ Lauder.	„ Hunt.	„ Barnes.	„ Wishaw.
„ Munday.	„ Gale.	„ Cornthwayte.	„ Tyley.
„ Withorne.	„ fforth.	„ Baldwyn.	„ Glass.
„ ffisher.	„ Hamilton.	„ Cecile.	„ R. Banister.
„ Gandy	„ Peters.	„ Anderson.	„ Cromwell.
„ Cock.	„ Wishaw.	„ Adamson.	„ Mitchell.
„ Jodrell.	„ J. Sharp.	„ Spateman.	„ Cranston.
„ Limbrey.	„ Ashton.	„ Enstick.	„ Luke.
„ Smith.	„ Bayley.	„ Sharpe.	„ Webb.
„ Round.	„ Coppinger.	„ G. Banister.	„ Taylor.
„ Cooper.	„ Denton.	„ Perkins.	„ Mead.
„ Greenhill.	„ Thomas.	„ Randolph.	„ Barber.
„ Lloyd.	„ Wakelin.		
		Mr. Mead.	} Stewards for the next meeting.
		„ Mitchell.	
		„ Sharpe.	
		„ Spateman.	

A clause proposed to be inserted in the Bill was considered, and referred back to the Committee, and Mr. Peters, Mr. Gale, Mr. Glass, Mr. Lauder, and Mr. Webb were added to the Committee, and the Committee were desired to meet and consider the clause on the following Wednesday night, at 7 o'clock. The thanks of the Society were ordered to be given to the Honourable Mr. B. Bathurst for his readiness to serve the Society, and Mr. Crewys, Mr. Peters, Mr. Baldwyn, and Mr. Lauder were desired to attend him for that purpose.

On the 18th of June, 1741, at a General Meeting of the Society at The Crown and Anchor Tavern, St. Clement's, at which the following members were present :—

	Mr. Mead.	} Stewards.
	„ Mitchell.	
	„ Sharpe.	
	„ Spateman.	
Mr. Bayley.	Mr. Watson.	Mr. Rowse.
„ Morse.	„ Wilson.	„ Banister.
„ Commelyn.	„ Ambler.	„ Wade.
„ Briggs.	„ Dowse.	„ Robinson.
„ Waddilove.	„ Plaxton.	„ Wakelin.
„ Pye.	„ Perkins.	„ Cornthwaite.
„ Tiley.	„ Paris.	„ Banister of Fetter
„ Gale.	„ Webb.	„ Lane.
„ Wells.	„ Cromwell.	„ Baldwin.
„ Wood.	„ Thomas.	„ Giles Taylor.
„ John Townsend.	„ Atkinson.	„ Launder.
„ Hunt.	„ Denton.	„ Crewis.
„ Biscoe, Junr.	„ Johnson.	„ Peters.
„ Pierce.	„ Westley.	„ North.
„ Elton.	„ Luke.	„ Ashton.
„ Bridgen.	„ Marsh.	„ Austin.
„ Cock.	„ Prior.	„ Palmer.
„ Allen Pusey.	„ Baskerville.	„ Grose.
„ Jodrell.	„ Timms.	„ Adamson.
„ Prickard.	„ Dickinson.	„ Newton.
„ Randolph.	„ Skinner.	„ Waldo.
„ Cooper.	„ Tilley of the	„ Whishaw.
„ Geekee.	„ City.	„ Howell.
„ Weobly.	„ Plumtree.	„ Neal.
„ Powell.	„ Woollaston.	„ Henry Barns.
„ Lloyd.	„ Firth.	„ Myers.
„ Richard Whishaw.	„ Coward.	„ Baker.
„ Woolfe.	„ Evingdon.	„ Banister of Took's
„ Prime.	„ Raymond.	„ Court.
„ Tomkins.	„ Ed. Gale.	
	Mr. Plaxton.	} Stewards for the next meeting.
	„ Powell.	
	„ Webb.	
	„ Cooper.	

Names of gentlemen proposed to be of the Committee—

Mr. Plaxton.	} Stewards elect.
„ Powell.	
„ Webb.	
„ Cooper.	

	Mr. Perkins.	Mr. Theo. Johnson.	Never attended.
Never attended.	„ Ashton.	„ Giles Taylor.	
	„ J. Whishaw.	„ Cromwell.	
	„ Peters.	„ Luke.	Never attended, and would
	„ Bayley.		not appear at the last Meeting,
Left off.	„ Callard.		nor take ticket.
Never attended.	„ Dowse.	„ Barber.	
	„ Crewys.	„ Rd. Woolfe.	Never attended, and
	„ Mead.		same objection.
	„ Mitchell.	„ Baldwin.	Dead.
	„ Sharpe.	„ Coppinger.	
	„ Spateman.	„ Launder.	
?	„ Ambler.	„ Prickard.	
Dead.	„ Myers.	„ Geekee.	
	„ Wilson.	„ Thomas.	
	„ North.	„ Denton.	

At the bottom are the figures $\frac{24}{33}$ which seems to show that nine of the gentlemen were left out, and the remaining 24 were elected to form the Committee.

Ordered that the Committee should meet as often as they thought proper, and take into consideration any matters relating to the benefit of suitors, and the honour of the profession, any five to be a quorum, the Secretary at the request of any member of the Committee to summon a meeting of the Committee.

On the 29th of Novr. 1741, at a Meeting of the Committee, at which the following members were present :—

Mr. Crewys.	Mr. Spateman.	Mr. Taylor.	Mr. Cromwell.
„ Bayley.	„ Ambler.	„ Coppinger.	„ Barber.
„ Plaxton.			

A case was taken into consideration which had been sent to the Secretary by Mr. George Baskerville, relating to irregularity on the part of a practicer ; but Mr. Baskerville not having named the Person complained of, the Secretary was desired to inform himself from the said Mr. Baskerville who the said Person was, and to desire the said Mr. Baskerville and the Person complained of to be present at the next Meeting of the Committee.

At a General Meeting of the Society at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, on the 16th February, 1741, at which the following members were present :—

Mr. Powell.	} Stewards.
„ Webb.	
„ Plaxton.	
„ Cooper.	

Mr. Hill.	Mr. Lewis.	Mr. Kingly.
„ David Thomas.	„ Round.	„ Pickhard.
„ Tilly.	„ Coward.	„ Geekee.
„ Perkins.	„ Cicill.	„ Rd. Whishaw.
„ Barns.	„ Randolph.	„ John Townsend.
„ Fothergill.	„ Mead.	„ Whishaw.
„ Cromwell.	„ Geo. Wilson.	„ Whitehorne.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Watson.	„ Biscoe, Junr.
„ Wells.	„ Coppinger.	„ Sharpe.
„ Collier.	„ Staples.	„ Wise.
„ Tiley.	„ Westley.	„ Cooper.
„ Glass.	„ Taylor.	„ Mundy.
„ Wm. Smith.	„ Firth.	„ John Robinson.
„ Bannister of Fetter Lanc.	„ Spateman.	„ Marsh Dickinson.
„ Briggs.	„ Wood.	„ Cartwright.
„ Sanderson.	„ Cartwright.	„ Prince.
„ Stannyforth.	„ Wm. Thomas.	„ Jenkins.
„ Sparrow.	„ Bayley.	„ Ashton.
„ Fotherly Baker.	„ Unwin.	„ Crewys.
„ Paris.	„ Waddilove.	„ Perkins.
„ Barber.	„ Pardoe.	„ Rayner.
„ Neal.	„ Moore.	„ Newton.
„ Prior.	„ Hood.	„ Skinner.
„ Adamson.	„ Lloyd, Essex Street.	„ Dutton Seaman.
„ Adamson.	„ Thos. Lloyd.	„ Lacon.
„ Morse.	„ Waldo.	„ Bowman.
„ Rouse.	„ Grove.	„ Bannister.
„ North.	„ Joshua Sharpe.	„ Hayton.
„ Garden.	„ Cock.	„ Lewis.
„ Wainwright.	„ Theodore Johnson.	„ Cradock.
„ Stannynough.	„ Alexander.	„ Laramore.
„ Luke.	„ Weobly.	„ Myers.
„ Banister.	„ Jenkins.	„ Peters.

A resolution was passed that an application be made to leave out of the next Land Tax Act so much of it as incapacitated Attorneys and Solicitors from being Comrs. for executing the 5^d Act. It was also ordered that every member of the Society should use their utmost endeavours to procure the above resolution being carry'd into execution, and the Standing Committee were desired to draw up such reasons as they should think proper. The Committee met on the 24th of the same month at the Old Devil Tavern, Temple Bar. Present:—

Mr. Plaxton.	Mr. Peters.	Mr. North.	Mr. Coppinger.
„ Webb.	„ Crewys.	„ Taylor.	„ Geekee.
„ Sharpe.	„ Ambler.	„ Cromwell.	„ Thomas.
„ Cooper.	„ Myers.		

The resolution of the 16th February, together with the clause therein mentioned and reasons reduced into writing severally by many then present, were considered, and the Deputy Secretary was ordered to digest the reasons into one set and lay them before the next meeting. The Committee met again at the same place on the 3rd of March following. Present :—

Mr. Peters.	Mr. Taylor.	Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Webb.
„ Coppinger.	„ Wilson.	„ Sharpe.	„ North.
„ Myers.	„ Cromwell.	„ Crewys.	

The reasons so reduced were read and agreed to, and the Deputy Secretary was ordered to cause copies to be made and sent to the Committee for the purpose of being delivered to the Members in the House of Commons. It was also ordered that the Committee meet when the Land Tax Bill was read a first time, in order to consider what measures had been taken and were to be taken that the said reasons may have their due weight. On the 16th March, 1741, the Committee met again at the Old Devil Tavern. Present :—

Mr. North.	Mr. Myers.	Mr. Peters.	Mr. Bayley.
„ Cromwell.	„ Whishaw.	„ Giles Taylor.	

The Land Tax Bill which had been brought into the House of Commons was considered. It was ordered that Mr. Perkins, Mr. Sharpe, Mr. Peters, Mr. Crewys, Mr. Whishaw, Mr. Giles Taylor, Mr. Cromwell, Mr. Barber, Mr. Bayley, Mr. Coppinger, and Mr. Thomas, or any three of them, be specially appointed and desired to attend at the House of Commons from time to time as occasion should offer on the Land Tax Bill, and to get the Members of Parliament to attend in order that the clause relating to Attorneys and Solicitors might be left out of the said Bill, and to use their endeavours for proper Members to move and second the Motion. It was also ordered that Mr. North, Mr. Sharpe, Mr. Myers, and Mr. Bayley should attend the Speaker of the House of Commons with the reasons against the clause “to-morrow morning at nine o’clock.” Mr. North and Mr. Myers were desired to attend the Lord Mayor of London, Sir John Barnard, and Mr. Alderman Lambert, three Members representing the City of London, with the reasons against the clause, and Mr. Cromwell and Mr. Peters were desired to attend Mr. Alderman Heathcote, the other Member for the City, with the said reasons, and the Secretary was directed to use his endeavours to obtain notice from time to time of the progress of the said Bill, and to give notice to the said Committee.

The Committee met again at the Old Devil Tavern, on the 10th of June, 1742. Present :—

Mr. Peters.	Mr. Wishaw.	Mr. Cromwell.
„ David Thomas.	„ Howell.	

A clause was read touching the admission of persons to act as Attorneys which had been added to a Bill to review the Acts for explaining the laws for punishing persons who should destroy Turnpikes, &c. Mr. Coppinger, Mr. David Thomas, and the Deputy Secretary were directed to forthwith reduce into writing reasons against the said clause, and the Deputy Secretary was instructed to cause copies of such reasons to be made and sent to the Committee in order that they might be sent to the Members of the House of Commons.

At a meeting of the Committee at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, on the 14th July, 1742. Present :—

Mr. Mead.	Mr. Geo. North.	Mr. Spateman.	Mr. Barber.
„ Geo. Wilson.	„ J. Wishaw.	„ Cooper.	„ Thomas.
„ Sharpe.	„ Webb.	„ Taylor.	„ Bailey.
„ Crewys.	„ Cromwell.	„ Howell.	„ Denton.

Mr. Crewys acquainted the Committee that their assistance was desired by an Honble. member of the House of Commons “for the preparing heads of a Bill for the more easy recovery of small debts,” and the Committee were unanimously of opinion that if such a Bill were properly framed it would be of public utility, and they resolved to give their utmost assistance for promoting the same ; and Mr. Crewys was desired to “acquaint the Honble. member with the sd resolutions, and to return him the thanks of the Committee for the mark of his regard to them.”

At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, on the 16th July, 1742. Present :—

	Mr. Geo. North.	} Stewards.
	„ Giles Taylor.	
	„ Geo. Wilson.	
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Evingdon.	Mr. Rowse.
„ Andrews.	„ Firth.	„ Robinson.
„ Bailey of Lyon's Inn.	„ Fothergill.	„ Randolph.
„ Thos. Bayly.	„ Edwd. Gale.	„ Sharpe.
„ Briggs.	„ Geekie.	„ Spateman.
„ Biscoe.	„ Garden.	„ Smith.
„ Baskerville.	„ Grove.	„ Seaman.
„ Banister of Took's	„ Green.	„ Sanderson.
Court.	„ Hunt.	„ Stanninough.
„ Barns.	„ Howell.	„ Tiley.

Mr. Fotherly Baker.	Mr. Horton.	Mr. Thomas.
„ Barber.	„ Henzoll.	„ Timms.
„ Bridgen.	„ Jodrell.	„ Vaughan.
„ Bowman.	„ Johnson.	„ Wells.
„ Cock.	„ Lloyd, No. 7,	„ Wood.
„ Cooper.	Lincoln's Inn.	„ Weobly.
„ Cromwell.	„ Launder.	„ Whishaw.
„ Coward.	„ Lake.	„ Watson.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Mead.	„ Webb.
„ Crewys.	„ Mason.	„ Westley.
„ Coppinger.	„ Mariott.	„ Wade.
„ Cranston.	„ Mockson.	„ Wakely.
„ Collier.	„ Moore.	„ Whitehorn.
„ Craddock.	„ Newton.	„ Wainwright.
„ Chester.	„ Neale.	„ Wishaw, Richd.
„ Dowse.	„ Perkins.	„ Waddilove.
„ Dickinson.	„ Pardoe.	„ Ward.
„ Dickinson of	„ Petre.	„ Watson.
Symond's Inn.	„ Peters.	

No other business appears to have been done except the appointment of Stewards for the next meeting, viz.—Mr. Tyms, Mr. Launder, Mr. Cromwell, and Mr. Coward.

The Committee met on the 3rd Novr., 1742, at the Golden Lyon, Chancery Lane. Present :—

Mr. Sharpe.	Mr. Perkins.	Mr. Peters.	Mr. Crewys.
„ Barber.	„ Cromwell.	„ Whishaw.	„ David Thomas.
„ Ambler.	„ Geo. Wilson.	„ Webb.	

They took into consideration a practice lately attempted to be introduced of Clerks in Court being admitted as Sollicitors, and as such taking clerks. Mr. Perkins, Mr. Sharpe, Mr. Crewys, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Whishaw, and Mr. Peters were desired to wait upon his Honour, the Master of the Rolls, to remonstrate against this practice, and Mr. Crewys was desired to wait upon his Honour to know his pleasure when he would be attended. At the same meeting Mr. Peters, Mr. Barber, Mr. Cromwell, Mr. Thomas, and the Deputy Secy were appointed to prepare the draft of a Bill for the more easy recovery of small debts.

The next meeting of the Committee was on the 19th of January, 1742. Present :—

Mr. Taylor.	Mr. Spateman.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Peters.
„ Launder.	„ Barber.	„ Thomas.	„ Crewys.
„ North.	„ Bayley.	„ Howell.	

The heads of the Bill for the more easy recovery of small debts was read, and it was ordered that copies of such heads were to be made and sent to Mr. Taylor, Mr. North, Mr. Howell, Mr. Bayley, Mr. Launder, and Mr. Crewys, who desired the same, such members being requested to return them to the Deputy Secretary as soon as they could, and the Deputy Secretary should then summon the Committee to meet and settle the same.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 2nd of Febr., 1742. Present :—

Mr. Sharpe.	Mr. Peters.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Webb.
„ Howell.	„ North.	„ Cooper.	„ Crewys.
„ Spateman.	„ Bayley.		

The heads of the Bill were again read and considered, and several amendments were made thereto, and the further consideration of the matter was adjourned to “this day seven'th.” The Committee accordingly met again on the 9th of Febr., 1742. Present :—

Mr. Cooper.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Spateman.	Mr. Peters.
„ Geo. Wilson.	„ Thomas.	„ Crewys.	„ Whishaw.

The heads of the Bill were again read, and several amendments made thereto, and the further consideration of same was again adjourned. The Committee accordingly met again on the 16th of Febr. Present :—

Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Crewys.	Mr. Howell.	Mr. Webb.
„ Whishaw.	„ Barber.	„ Coppinger.	„ Sharpe.
„ Cooper.			

The heads of the Bill being read and further considered, and several amendments made thereto, it was ordered that the Committee again proceed thereon, and on the List of Fees therein referred to.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Old Devil Tavern, Temple Barr, on the 23rd February, 1742. Present :—

Mr. Tims,	} Stewards.
„ Launder.	
„ Coward.	
„ Cromwell.	

Mr. Coppinger.	Mr. Moxon.	Mr. Taylor.	Mr. Randolph.
„ Mason.	„ Waldo.	„ Weobly.	„ Stanyought.
„ Whishaw.	„ Powell.	„ Palmer.	„ Thomas.
„ Tiley.	„ Mundy.	„ Lloyd.	„ Denton.
„ Scrase.	„ Collier.	„ Plaxton.	„ Smith.
„ Bowman.	„ Peters.	„ Waddilove.	„ Rainer.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Neale.	„ Austin.	„ Geekie.
„ Morse.	„ Baily.	„ Sharpe.	„ Lenard.

Mr. Gale.	Mr. John Whishaw.	Mr. Skinner.	Mr. Pattison.
„ Pardoe.	„ Jackson.	„ Wade.	„ Webb.
„ Crewys.	„ G. Petre.	„ Withorne.	„ Barnard.
„ Howell.	„ Anderson.	„ Rouse.	„ Sanderson.
„ Mead.	„ Wood.	„ Fothergill.	„ Biscoe.
„ Cranston.	„ Cooper.	„ Wakelin.	„ Alexander.
„ Wells.	„ Dickenson.	„ Barber.	„ Seaman.
„ Cock.	„ North.	„ Ryder.	„ Newton.

Stewards appointed for the next Meeting—

Mr. Dutton Seaman.	Mr. John Skinner.
„ Jos ^a . Geekie.	„ James Mundy.

It was ordered that all proper and necessary enquiries be made by the Committee to discover any Attorneys or Sollicitors who had been or should be surreptitiously admitted: that every member of the Society should use their utmost endeavours to discover and discountenance any such practice, and that the Committee should use such ways and means as they should find most necessary to prevent such practices in the future: and that the Committee should consider of fit and proper persons to be added to the Committee in the room of such as were dead or of those who never attended, and to report thereon at the next meeting. It was also ordered, that a collection should be made at the next Generall Meeting from each of the members of the Society who had not already contributed towards a proper fund for discharging all the expences for the Generall Good and Service of the Society—the resolution to be openly read at the next Generall Meeting immediately before the Dinner.

At a meeting of the Committee held on the 1st July, 1743. Present:—

Mr. Sharpe.	Mr. Coppinger.	Mr. Mead.	Mr. Spateman.
„ Geekie.	„ David Thomas.	„ Barber.	„ Cromwell.

Upon reading the order of the last General Meeting, whereby the Committee were directed to consider of fit and proper persons to be added to the Committee in the room of such who were dead or of those who never attended, and upon reading over the list of the Committee, and due consideration thereupon had, the Committee were of opinion that the seven following gentlemen, viz.

Mr. Cranston.	Mr. Leonard.	Mr. Scrace.	Mr. Watson.
„ Heaton.	„ Round, and Mr. Wells.		

should be added to the Committee instead of the following seven gentlemen, viz. Mr. Myers and Mr. Baldwin, who were dead, and Mr. Callard, Mr. Dowse, Mr. Theodore Johnson, Mr. Luke, and Mr. Woolfe, who never attended.

At a Generall Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, on the 6th of July, 1743. Present:—

	Mr. Dutton Seaman.	} Stewards.	
	„ Skinner.		
	„ Mundy.		
	„ Geekie.		
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Hunt.		Mr. Sharpe, Southampton Buildings.
„ Austin.	„ Hopkins.		„ Spateman.
„ Alexander.	„ Houghton.		„ Saunderson.
„ Baily.	„ Jodrell.		„ Stanninought.
„ Barnes.	„ Johnson.		„ Scrace.
„ Biscoe.	„ Jackson.		„ Sparrow.
„ Baskerville.	„ Launder.		„ Tyley, Symond's Inn.
„ Edwd. Bowman.	„ Mead.		„ Thomas.
„ Joseph Barnard.	„ Mason.		„ Taylor.
„ Combes.	„ Marriott.		„ Vaughan.
„ Cork.	„ Moore.		„ Rd. Whishaw, Took's Court.
„ Cooper.	„ Peirce.		„ Watson.
„ Cromwell.	„ Powell.		„ Wilson.
„ Crewys.	„ Perkins, Lincoln's Inn.		„ Webb.
„ Coppinger.	„ Pardo.		„ Withorne.
„ Cranston.	„ Petre.		„ Wainwright.
„ Craddock.	„ Peters.		„ Whishaw, Cursitor Street.
„ Denton.	„ Patteson.		„ Waddilove.
„ Fothergill.	„ Palmer.		„ Weston.
„ Gale, Newcastle Court.	„ Wm. Perkins.		
„ Garden.	„ Rouse.		
	„ Ryder.		

Stewards appointed for the next meeting :—

Mr. Theodore Johnson. Mr. Sparrow. Mr. Coppenger. Mr. Pattison.

The additions to the Committee, nominated, as before stated, were considered and approved, and the resolution as to the collection of subscriptions was also read, and £28 17s. 6d. was collected. It was ordered that an account should be laid before the Committee before each Generall Meeting, of the receipt and application of all moneys received by the Deputy Secretary, and that they should report the same and the clear balance in his hands from time to time. It was declared to be the sense of the meeting that every member who had not already contributed ought to contribute rateably according to the resolution of the last Generall Meeting.

List of the Committee.

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Mr. Plaxton—Dead. | 2. 4. Mr. Perkins. |
| 2. „ Howell. | 3. 5. „ Sharpe. |
| 3. „ Ashton. Q. | 6. „ Peters. |

4	7.	Mr. Wishaw.	17.	21.	Mr. Coppinger.
5.	8.	„ Baily.	22.	„	„ Launder. Q.
6.	9.	„ Crewys.	18.	23.	„ Pickard.
7.	10.	„ Mead.	19.	24.	„ Geekie.
8.	11.	„ Webb.	20.	25.	„ David Thomas.
9.	12.	„ Mitchell.	21.	26.	„ Denton.
10.	13.	„ Spateman.	22.	27.	„ Cranston.
	14.	„ Ambler, infirm, dead.	23.	28.	„ Heaton.
11.	15.	„ Cooper.	29.	„	„ Leonard. Q. See return that he never attended.
12.	16.	„ Geo. Wilson.	24.	30.	„ Round.
13.	17.	„ North.	25.	31.	„ Scrace.
14.	18.	„ Giles Taylor.	26.	32.	„ Wells.
15.	19.	„ Cromwell.	27.	33.	„ Watson.
16.	20.	„ Barber.	28.	36.	„ Nico. Johnson.

By order of 14 Feb., 1743, added to the Committee—

29. Mr. Barnes. 30. Mr. ffothergill. 31. Mr. Withorne.

At a meeting of the Committee held on the 15th December, 1743, at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavern. Present :—

Mr. Taylor.	Mr. Webbe.	Mr. Barber.	Mr. Cromwell.
„ Meade.	„ Geckie.	„ Bayley.	„ Coppinger.
„ Thomas.	„ Pickard.	„ Wells.	„ Watson.
„ Crewys.	„ Howell.	„ Johnson.	„ Wishaw.
„ Peters.			

It was reported that the Clerks in Court had renewed their application to be admitted Solicitors. The resolution of the Committee passed on the 3rd Novr., 1742, as well as the Memorial drawn up by the Committee therein named, were read. It was ordered that the Deputy Secretary prepare briefs on the plan of the said Memorial, to be delivered to such Council as the gentlemen in the said resolution named, or any of them, should direct, and to give such retainers and such fees with the briefs to Counsel as they or any of them should think fitt, and that notice be given to the Committee of the day and time of the hearing of the matter before His Honour the Master of the Rolls.

At a meeting of the Committee held on the 22nd December, 1743, at the King's Head, Chancery Lane. Present :—

Mr. Sharpe.	Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Wishaw.
„ Crewys.	„ Wells.	„ Cromwell.	„ Perkins.
„ Peters.	„ Johnson.	„ Watson.	

A proposall made by Mr. Lambourne, the Solicitor for the Clerks in Court, about the matter of a conference to be had between the Solicitors and the Clerks in Court, was taken into consideration. It was referred to the former Committee who were appointed to meet His Honour, to meet and confer with the like number of the Clerks in Court, at 6 of the clock on the evening of the first Seal Day before Hilary Term at the King's Head Tavern, near Symond's Inn, the Deputy Secretary to give notice to the Committee of the above resolution, and to lay before each of them a brief, and to give proper notice to Mr. Lambourne of the effect of the resolution. The Deputy Secretary was also directed to send to each member a printed Act for the better regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors. A meeting was accordingly held on the 12th of January, 1743, between the Solicitors and the Clerks in Court, when Mr. Perkins, Mr. Peters, Mr. Wishaw, and Mr. Crewys (Mr. Sharpe and Mr. Wilson being absent on extraordinary occasion) did according to the last order meet Mr. Brackley, Mr. Cranmore, Mr. Roycroft, Mr. Cheveley, Mr. Horsmanden, and Mr. Henley, the Committee of the Clerks in Court; but the conference being generall, and the Committee of Clerks declining to enter into particular reasons or arguments, the Committee of Solicitors withdrew.

At a Generall Meeting held at the Devil Tavern on the 22nd February, 1743.
Present :—

	Mr. Thomas Johnson.	} Stewards.
	„ Sparrow.	
	„ Paterson.	
	„ Coppinger.	
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Rouse.
„ Alexander.	„ Gale of N. C.	„ Randolph.
„ Batty.	„ Court.	„ Ryder.
„ Bailey.	„ Grose.	„ Robinson, Southampton
„ Gilbert Burton.	„ Hunt.	„ Buildings.
„ Baskerville.	„ Hopkins.	„ Spateman.
„ Bannister,	„ Hussey, Mayor's	„ Skinner.
„ Took's Court.	„ Court.	„ Smith.
„ Barber.	„ Jackson.	„ Stanninought.
„ Barnard.	„ Jessor.	„ Tyley.
„ Bowman.	„ Lloyd, Lincoln's	„ Thomas.
„ Barns.	„ Inn, No. 7.	„ Taylor.
„ Philip Burton.	„ La Grange,	„ Tyms.
„ Edmond Benson.	„ Lyon's Inn.	„ Wells.
„ James Backhouse.	„ Mason.	„ Wood.
„ Bertie Burgh.	„ Marriott.	„ Wishaw,
„ Cooper.	„ Moore.	„ Took's Court.
„ Cromwell.	„ Maddock.	„ Watson.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ North.	„ Wilson.
„ Crewys.	„ Neale.	„ Webbe.

Mr. Craddock.	Mr. Perkins,	Mr. Wakelyn.
„ Combes.	Lincoln's Inn.	„ Withorne.
„ Denton.	„ Palmer, Temple.	„ Waldo.
„ Dickinson,	„ Powell.	„ Whishaw,
Cook's Court.	„ Wm. Perkins,	Cursitor Street.
„ John Duncombe,	Lincoln's Inn.	„ Waddilove.
Furnival's Inn.	„ Palmer, City.	„ Watson.
„ Evendon.	„ Pardo.	„ Wyane, Moor Fields,
„ Ereskine.	„ Petre.	New Broad Street.
„ Fothergill.	„ Peters.	

Stewards appointed for the next meeting—

Mr. Barber. Mr. Marriott. Mr. Waldo. Mr. Evendon.

A report was made by the Committee, that an Account had been laid before them of the receipt and application of the Society's money, and that the Deputy Secretary had received the sum of £70 12s. 4d., and paid and disbursed £49 11s. 0d., and that the balance in his hands due to the Society amounted to the sum of £21 1s. 4d. A late rule of the Court of Common Pleas made for the more easy proving of acknowledgments of fines was read, and the Society having been informed that Mr. Trevanian of Cheltenham had been very instrumental towards laying the foundation for the said rule, it was ordered that the thanks of the Society be returned to Mr. Trevanian. It was also ordered that it be referred to the Committee to consider of the satisfaction to be made to the Deputy Secretary for the trouble he had had about the affairs of the Society, and in soliciting several matters recommended to him by the Committee, and to report their opinion at the next Generall Meeting.

At a General Meeting held at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, on the 29th of June, 1744. Present:—

Mr. Barber.	} Stewards.
„ Marriott.	
„ Waldo.	
„ Evendon.	

Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Copinger.	Mr. La Grange.	Mr. Swaile.
„ Alexander.	„ Cranston.	„ Moxon.	„ Tyley.
„ Briggs.	„ Craddock.	„ Moore.	„ Thomas.
„ Biscoe.	„ Denton.	„ Mainwaring.	„ Taylor, Giles.
„ Baskerville.	„ Erskine.	„ Nuthall.	„ Tyms.
„ Bowman.	„ Fothergill.	„ Powell.	„ Taylor, William.
„ Barnard.	„ Geekie.	„ Pardo.	„ Wood.
„ Barns.	„ Grose.	„ Peters.	„ Whishaw, John.
„ Burton.	„ Gale.	„ Parmintor.	„ Webb.
„ Backhouse.	„ Grubb.	„ Randolph.	„ Wakelyn.
„ Burgh.	„ Jodrell.	„ Sharpe.	„ Withorne.

Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Johnson.	Mr. Spateman.	Mr. Whishaw, Rd.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Jackson.	„ Skinner.	„ Weston.
„ Crewys.	„ Lloyd.	„ Smith.	„ Wynne.

Stewards for the next meeting :—

Mr. Wood.	Mr. Barnes.	Mr. Heaton.	Mr. Briggs.
-----------	-------------	-------------	-------------

A report was made of the late determination of the Right Honble. the Master of the Rolls (upon the hearing of Councill) touching the admission of some of the Clerks in Court to be admitted Solicitors, and the thanks of the Society were voted to Mr. Noel and Mr. Clerk, for their readiness and services as councill of the Society in opposing the admission of such Clerks, and that Mr. Sharpe, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Crewys, Mr. Peters, Mr. Whishaw, and Mr. Wilson be desired to attend Mr. Noel and Mr. Clerk, and acquaint them with this resolution. A report was made by the Committee that an Account had been laid before them of the receipt and application of the Society's money, showing that a balance of £34 6s. 8d. remained in the hands of the Deputy Secretary. Upon a report of the Committee, it was ordered that the sum of twenty guineas be allowed to the Deputy Secretary, agreeable to the said report.

At a General Meeting held at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, on the 15th February, 1744. Present :—

	Mr. Wood.	} Stewards.
	„ Barnes.	
	„ Heaton.	
	„ Briggs.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Gale.	Mr. Randolph.
„ Adamson.	„ Grub.	„ Robinson,
„ Baily.	„ Hunt.	Chancery Lane.
„ Baskerville.	„ Howell.	„ Roberts.
„ Bannister,	„ Hood.	„ Sharpe.
Took's Court.	„ Haywood.	„ Spateman.
„ Baker.	„ Hopkins.	„ Smith.
„ Barber.	„ Holt.	„ Scrace.
„ Bowman.	„ Johnson.	„ Swaile.
„ Barnard, Jones.	„ Jackson.	„ Tyley.
„ Burton, Philip.	„ Lucas.	„ Tomkins.
„ Backhouse.	„ Mead.	„ Thomas.
„ Bourgh.	„ Mason.	„ Taylor, Giles.
„ Cooper.	„ Marriott.	„ Taylor, Wm.
„ Cromwell.	„ Moore.	„ Wills.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Mundy.	„ Whishaw, Rd.
„ Crewys.	„ Moore.	„ Wilson.

Mr. Coppinger.	Mr. North.	Mr. Webb.
„ Combes.	„ Powell.	„ Wakelyn.
„ Denton.	„ Pardo.	„ Withorne.
„ Dickinson, City.	„ Petre.	„ Wainwright.
„ Dobbins.	„ Palmer, City.	„ Whishaw, John.
„ Erskine.	„ Rouse.	„ Weston.
„ Fothergill.	„ Robinson,	„ Woodhouse.
„ Geekie.	Cursitor Street.	
„ Grose.		

Stewards Elect.

Mr. Fotherley Baker.	Mr. John Wakelyn.
„ Marsh Dickenson.	„ Christopher Denton.

It was ordered that the resolution touching the contributions of members of the Society be read immediately after dinner at every Generall Meeting untill each member hath contributed his half-guinea. The Deputy Secretary reported that he had that day received £4 14s. 6d., which he had placed to the credit of the Society. Upon reading the Order of the General Meeting of the 23rd Febr., 1742, it was resolved that it be referred to the Committee to enquire whether any persons, and who, had been admitted Attorneys or Sollicitors who were not duly qualified, and to report to the next General Meeting with their opinion thereon, what may be proper to be done to remove such persons from the office of Attorneys and Sollicitors, and to prevent the admission of unqualified persons for the future.

At a General Meeting held at the Devil Tavern on the 10th July, 1745.
Present:—

	Mr. Barber.	} Stewards.
	„ Marsh Dickinson.	
	„ Wakelin.	
	„ Denton.	
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Duncombe.	Mr. Randolph.
„ Alexander.	„ Evendon.	„ Sharpe.
„ Briggs.	„ Fothergill.	„ Spackman.
„ Biscoe.	„ Geekie.	„ Skinner.
„ Baskerville.	„ Grose.	„ Scrace.
„ Bannister.	„ Gale.	„ Sparrow.
„ Bowman.	„ Hunt.	„ Swail.
„ Barns.	„ Heaton.	„ Shaylor.
„ Batty.	„ Houghton.	„ Tyley.
„ Burton.	„ Hopkins.	„ Thomas.
„ Bourgh.	„ Holt.	„ Taylor.
„ Baldero.	„ Jackson, John.	„ Tyms.
„ Butler.	„ Lloyd.	„ Taylor.

C

Mr. Benton.	Mr. Le Grange.	Mr. Townsend.
„ Banister.	„ Marriott.	„ Tyms, Junr.
„ Cooper.	„ Moxon.	„ Wood.
„ Cromwell.	„ Mundy.	„ Whishaw, John.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ New.	„ Withorne.
„ Crewys.	„ Powell.	„ Wainwright.
„ Coppinger.	„ Parkins, Wm.	„ Whishaw, Rd.
„ Cranston.	„ Paterson.	„ Waddilove.
„ Craddock.	„ Pardo.	„ Weston.

Ordered that Mr. Whithorne, Mr. Hopkins, Mr. David Thomas, and Mr. Edwd. Grose be the stewards for the next General Meeting.

A report was read by the Prolocutor that a sum of £19 12s. 9d. remained in the hands of the Deputy Secretary. At the same meeting it was ordered that the resolution of the preceding General Meeting touching the undue and irregular admission of Attorneys and Solicitors be referred back to the Committee for consideration, and that every member of the Society should give notice in writing to the Deputy Secretary of the Society of the names and places of abode of such person or persons who, they knew or had been informed, were admitted as aforesaid, that the same might be laid before the Committee the more effectually to enable them to make such report as by the said Order was directed. Mr. Prolocutor having acquainted the Society that Mr. Barber was desirous to resign the office of Secretary of the Society, it was ordered that Mr. Richard Whishaw should succeed him in the office. It was unanimously agreed that the thanks of the Society be returned to Mr. Barber for his care in the faithful discharge of the duties of the said office, and that a copy of the order should be forthwith sent to him.

The Society having been informed that the clerk or servant of a member of the Society had attended Mr. Steward Wakelyn with a ticket, and desired the said Steward to return the sum of 5s. for the same in regard to his master being out of town or unable to attend, It was thereupon desired that Mr. Steward Wakelyn should forthwith offer the sum of 5s. to the said member, and in case the said member should accept the money, or by the admission of the said member it should appear to the satisfaction of Mr. Wakelyn that the said clerk or servant had acted in the manner aforesaid by the directions or with the privity of the said member, then or in either of the said cases it was ordered that Mr. Steward Wakelyn should inform the Secretary of the name of such member, to the intent that such name may be struck off the List of Members of the Society.

It was ordered that no member of the Society should presume to give or deliver over his ticket to any other member of the Society or to any other person whatsoever, and it was declared to be the sense of the Society that no person be admitted on a ticket but the member or person to whom the same

was delivered, "and whose name shall appear to be wrote at the foot of the Ticket."

At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern on the 14th Febr., 1745. Present :—

	Mr. Hopkins.	} Stewards.	
	„ Whithorne.		
	„ Thomas.		
	„ Grose.		
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Du-Buc.		Mr. Petre.
„ Alexander.	„ Fothergill.		„ Paterson.
„ Biscoe, Junr.	„ Geekie.		„ Pardo.
„ Baskerville.	„ Garden.		„ Randolph.
„ Barber.	„ Gale.		„ Robinson.
„ Bowman.	„ Hunts.		„ Robert.
„ Barnard.	„ Harrison, Junr.		„ Spateman.
„ Barns.	„ Hamersley.		„ Smith, Wm.
„ Burton.	„ Jodrell.		„ Saunderson.
„ Bourgh.	„ Jackson.		„ Scrace.
„ Butler.	„ Jesser.		„ Scott.
„ Benton.	„ Launder.		„ Tyley.
„ Butler, St. Mary Ax.	„ Le Grange.		„ Taylor, Giles.
„ Brown.	„ Letch.		„ Tymms.
„ Cooper.	„ Layton.		„ Wells.
„ Cromwell.	„ Lucas.		„ Watson.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Marriott.		„ Wilson.
„ Crewys.	„ Mathews.		„ Webb.
„ Coppinger.	„ Neal.		„ Wakelyn.
„ Combes.	„ New.		„ Whishaw, Rd.
„ Calverley.	„ Pierce.		„ Weston.
„ Calley.	„ Powell.		„ Woodhouse.
„ Denton.	„ Perkins.		„ Waters.
„ Dobbins.	„ Perkins, Wm.		

Mr. Crewys was unanimously elected and chosen the Prolocutor for the time only, and he reported that £19 14s. 7d. was the ballance remaining in the hands of the Secretary. The Orders of the last and former General Meetings as to the undue and irregular admission of Attorneys and Sollicitors were read, and such Orders were made standing orders of the Society.

Mr. Wakelyn reported that, pursuant to the Order made at the last General Meeting, he had attended the Member therein mentioned, who refused to receive back the 5s. therein referred to, and disavowed the behaviour of his clerk or servant.

It appearing to the satisfaction of the Society that one Landen Jones "hath been convicted of an offence for which he hath suffered the punishment of the

pillory," and that he had been struck off the Roll of Attorneys of the Court of Common Pleas, and yet continued to practise as a Solicitor in Chancery, It was resolved that an application should be made to the High Court of Chancery and any other Court in which the said Landen Jones should practice, to have his name struck off the Roll in such Court or Courts, and that it should be referred to the Standing Committee to carry such resolution into execution. Mr. Barns, Mr. Steward Whithorne, and Mr. Fothergill were added to the Committee in the stead of Mr. Plaxton, Mr. Peters, and Mr. Ambler, who were dead.

At a meeting of the Committee at the King's Head Tavern, Chancery Lane, on the 5th May, 1746. Present :—

Mr. Barber.	Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Barns.	Mr. Cromwell.
„ Thomas.	„ Whithorne.	„ Fothergill.	

a copy of the record of the conviction of the said Landen Jones, the several rules of the Court of Common Pleas, two affidavits of the said Landen Jones, sworn in the Court of Common Pleas and referred to by one of the said rules, and the draft of a Notice of Motion for striking the said Landen Jones off the Roll or Book of Solicitors in Chancery, were read, and It was ordered that the Secretary cause the Notice of Motion to be served personally on the said Landen Jones, and that he should prepare briefs and "attend Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Clerke therewith," and that it be an instruction to the Secretary that he do signify in the said briefs or otherwise that the said Notice was given and that Motion be made on behalf of the Solicitors of the said Court of Chancery.

The Committee met again on the 4th June, 1746, at the same place. Present :—

Mr. Coppinger.	Mr. Watson.	Mr. Fothergill.
„ Denton	„ David Thomas.	„ Whithorne.

They considered several affidavits left with the Secretary by a Mr. Burnett with regard to Mr. James Hodgson having been admitted an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench without serving a clerkship, and Mr. Burnett being called in, the Committee were of opinion that an affidavit or affidavits be laid before them showing whether and in what manner the said James Hodgson did spend his time in London or elsewhere during his supposed clerkship, and the Committee apprehended that it would be material if it could be made appear that the said James Hodgson did not do any business for his supposed master during the time of his pretended clerkship.

At the next meeting of the Committee at the same place on the 16th June, 1746. Present :—

Mr. Whishaw.	Mr. Fothergill.	Mr. Cromwell.
„ Spateman.	„ Whithorne.	

The consideration of the case of James Hodgson was resumed, and Mr. Burnett who attended, informed the Committee that Hodgson had acted as a writer for hire in several places in and about London during the time of his pretended clerkship, and that he doubted not to verify this by affidavit before the next term. The Committee resolved to lay the matter before the next General Meeting of the Society.

The Committee then proceeded to inspect and audit the Account of the Secretary, and found his receipts, including the balance of his last Account, to amount to £39 16s. 8d., and his disbursements, including the Bill of charges in the application against Landen Jones, to amount to £15 18s. 10d., and that there remained in the Secretary's hands £23 17s. 10d.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, on 20th June, 1746. Present :—

Mr. Dobbins.	} Stewards.
„ Watson.	
„ Neal.	
„ Alexander.	

Mr. Bayley.	Mr. Duncombe.	Mr. Ryder.
„ Briggs.	„ Evendon.	„ Spateman.
„ Baskerville.	„ Eyre.	„ Skinner.
„ Baker.	„ Fothergill.	„ Smith, Carey St.
„ Barber.	„ Geekie.	„ Saunderson.
„ Bowman.	„ Grove.	„ Scrace.
„ Barnard, City.	„ Gale.	„ Sparrow.
„ Barnes.	„ Howell.	„ Swaile.
„ Battey.	„ Hopkins.	„ Tiley.
„ Burton.	„ Hammersley.	„ Tomkins.
„ Bourgh.	„ John Jackson.	„ Thomas.
„ Butler.	„ Letch.	„ Taylor, Giles.
„ Benton.	„ Mason.	„ Taylor, Wm.
„ Banister, Took's	„ Mundy.	„ Townsend.
Court.	„ Marie.	„ Tymms.
„ Burnett.	„ Matthews.	„ Wills.
„ Cromwell.	„ New.	„ Wood.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Powell.	„ Whishaw.
„ Crewys.	„ Petre.	„ Webb.
„ Coppinger.	„ Paterson.	„ Whishaw, Rd.
„ Cranston.	„ Palmer.	„ Waddilove.
„ Craddock.	„ Pardo.	„ Weston.
„ Combes.	„ Parry.	„ Wynne, City.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Praed.	„ Whitchurch.
„ Chambers Vernon.	„ Plumtree.	„ Wakelyne.
„ Denton.	„ Randolph.	„ Whithorne.

It was reported by the Prolocutor that Landen Jones was during the preceding Easter Term struck off the Roll of the Court of Chancery.

The Minutes of the Committee touching the admission of James Hodgson to be an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench being read, the affair was referred back to the Committee to do therein as they should think proper.

The Prolocutor then reported the result of the audit by the Committee, and the Secretary received their contributions from eleven members then present, viz.—Messrs. Burnett, Chambers Vernon, Cruddenden, Eyre, Howell, Marie, Parry, Praed, Plumtree, and Whitchurch.

It was ordered at the same meeting, that the Secretary lay before every Generall Meeting in Hilary Term an account of all persons admitted Attorneys in the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, and Sollicitors in Chancery during the Trinity and Michaelmas Terms preceding, and do at the Generall Meeting after every Trinity Term lay before the Society a like account of such Attorneys and Sollicitors as should be admitted in such Courts in the Hillary and Easter Terms preceding.

At a meeting of the Committee at George's Coffee House in Chancery Lane, on the 7th Novr., 1746. Present :—

Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Whithorne.
„ Geekie.	„ Howell.	„ Barns.

An affidavit of Mr. Swift, with whom James Hodgson served for hire as a writer during part of his supposed clerkship with Mr. Richardson, being read, the Committee were unanimously of opinion that there were circumstances in the case to induce a suspicion that Mr. Hodgson was not duly qualified, yet in regard he was so long since admitted as in the year 1742, and Mr. Richardson the Master who certified being dead, that it would not be proper that any application be made by the Society for striking the said Mr. Hodgson off the Roll.

At a meeting of the Committee at George's Coffee House in Chancery Lane, held 11 February, 1746. Present :—

Mr. Prolocutor.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Theo. Johnson.	Mr. Whithorne.
„ Cromwell.	„ Thomas.	„ Giles Taylor.	

The Committee proceeded to inspect and audit the account of the Secretary, and found his receipts (including the balance of his last amount) amount to the sum of £29 6s. 4d., and his Disbursements to amount to the sum of £3 17s. 10d., and there now remained in the Secretary's hands £25 8s. 6d., being a clear balance of the cash of the Society.

At a Generall Meeting of the Society held on the 18th Febr., 1746. Present :—

	Mr. Tomkins.	
	„ Round.	} Stewards.
	„ Cornthwaite.	
	„ Scrace.	
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Geekie.	
„ Alexander.	„ Gale.	„ Philips, Roberts.
„ Briggs.	„ Heaton.	„ Peter Roberts.
„ Barber.	„ Harrison.	„ Skinner.
„ Bowman.	„ Hamersley.	„ Smith.
„ Barnes.	„ Hipperly.	„ Sanderson.
„ Burton.	„ Johnson.	„ Scott.
„ Burgh.	„ Jackson.	„ Strickland.
„ Butler,	„ Lucas.	„ Tily.
Southwark.	„ Ietch.	„ Thomas.
„ Benton.	„ Layton.	„ Taylor.
„ Beeche.	„ Mead.	„ Chambre Normon.
„ Cooper, City.	„ Morse.	„ Wells.
„ Cromwell.	„ Matthews.	„ John Whishaw.
„ Combe.	„ New.	„ Watson.
„ Crawford.	„ Powell.	„ Wilson.
„ Cowper, Sy. Inn.	„ Palmer, City.	„ Rd. Whishaw.
„ Calverly.	„ Perkins, Junr.	„ Waddilove.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Petre.	„ Weston.
„ Denton.	„ Paterson.	„ Whitchurch.
„ Dobbins.	„ Pardoe.	„ Waters.
„ Eyre.	„ Plumtree, Temple.	„ Whithorne.
„ Fothergill.	„ Randolph.	

After the usual business had been gone through, the Society was informed that one Mr. Wm. Sparry was employed as an Attorney by William Kelly for the recovery of a debt of £30 from one Joseph Hoyle, and that Sparry received of his client £8 for the cost of the action, and afterwards received the £30 from the Defendant; that Kelly employed Mr. Beech, a member of the Society, to sue Sparry for the said money, and that Mr. Beech obtained judgment against Sparry by confession, with a stay of execution, and the time expiring execution issued; but on application to the Sheriff it appeared that Sparry was entered in the Sheriff's List as a servant to the Minister of the King of Prussia, and it being alleged that there was reason to apprehend that the said Sparry had been surreptitiously admitted an Attorney, it was referred to the Committee to enquire whether Sparry was duly admitted an Attorney of any of the Courts at Westminster, and if he were, whether any application were proper to be made to the said Court for his being struck out of the Roll, and that the Committee take such steps for discouraging a practice so derogatory to the honour of the profession as to them should seem meet,

and if they should think fit, to move to have the said Sparry struck out of the Roll, and it was ordered that the Committee be enabled to do so without any further order of the Society.

At a meeting of the Committee at George's Coffee House in Chancery Lane, the 10th July, 1747. Present:—

Mr. Denton.	Mr. Fothergill.	Mr. Scrace.	Mr. Johnson.
„ Wells.	„ Watson.	„ Whithorne.	

The Committee proceeded to inspect and audit the account of the Secretary, and found his receipts, including the balance of his last account, amounted to the sum of £40 4s. 6d., and his payments and disbursements amounted to the sum of £4 15s. 2d., and that there remained in the Secretary's hands £35 9s. 4d., being a clear balance of the cash of this Society.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, on the 15th of July, 1747. Present:—

	Mr. Tiley.	} Stewards.
	„ Wells.	
	„ Morse.	
	„ Butler.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Cruttenden.	Mr. Praed.
„ Briggs.	„ Callamy.	„ Plumtree.
„ Biscoe, Junr.	„ Crewys, Thos.	„ Randolph.
„ Baskerville.	„ Denton.	„ Rider.
„ Banister, Took's Court.	„ Duncomb.	„ Roberts, Ship Yard.
„ Barber.	„ Dobbins.	„ Rigge.
„ Bowman.	„ Eyre.	„ Sharpe, John.
„ Barnard, City.	„ Fothergill.	„ Spateman.
„ Barns.	„ Geekie.	„ Smith, Wm.
„ Burton.	„ Grose.	„ Sanderson.
„ Burgh.	„ Gunter.	„ Stanninought.
„ Baldero.	„ Hunt.	„ Sparrow.
„ Benton.	„ Heywood.	„ Swaile.
„ Butler,	„ Hopkins.	„ Strickland.
St. Mary Ax.	„ Hamersly.	„ Thomas.
„ Brown,	„ Johnson.	„ Timms.
Bucklersbury.	„ Jackson.	„ Vernon.
„ Beech.	„ Jesser.	„ Wishaw, John.
„ Bentham,	„ Kendall.	„ Watson.
Aldgate.	„ Le Gregs.	„ Wilson.
„ Bassett.	„ Letch.	„ Webb.
„ Cooper, City.	„ Mason.	„ Wishaw, Rd.
„ Cromwell.	„ Marie.	„ Waddilove.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ North.	„ Weston.
	„ New.	„ Whithorn.

Mr. Henry Crewys.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Wynter.
„ Craddock.	„ Palmer, City.	„ Wade.
„ Crawford.	„ Patterson.	
„ Cowper, Symond's Inn.		

It was ordered that the complaint made by Mr. Beech be forthwith taken into consideration by the Committee, and that Mr. Beech be desired to lay the state of the facts and proper evidence to support same before the Committee. It was also desired that Mr. Wynter, one of the members of the Society, should attend the Committee on this matter.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Anchor and Baptist's Head, on the 16th November, 1747. Present :—

Mr. Coppinger.	Mr. Fothergill.	Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Wells.
„ Denton.	„ Barnes.	„ Cromwell.	

The “several late Acts of Parliament made in the 12th year of the late King, and in the 5th, 6th, and 13th years of his present Majesty,” as to vexatious arrests, were read, and the Committee agreed that an application should be made to Parliament to revive the same, and several amendments were proposed to be made therein, and in other respects for the ease and benefit of suitors, the minutes of which were then read. The Secretary was ordered to forthwith draw out the proposed Amendments in pursuance of the Minutes, and to cause copies to be sent to such of the Committee as were then present for their consideration.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 18th Novr., 1747. Present :—

Mr. Taylor.	Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Barns.	Mr. Howell.
„ Cromwell.	„ Scrace.	„ Fothergill.	„ Sharp.
„ Denton.	„ Wells.		

The Amendments proposed at the last meeting were read, and, with amendments, many of them were agreed to. The Secretary was ordered to make copies of the Amendments, and the Committee resolved to wait upon Mr. Attorney and Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Nowell and Sir Richd. Lloyd, and other Members of the House of Commons therewith.

At a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday the 10th February, 1747. Present :—

Mr. Prolocutor.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Thomas.
„ Geekie.	„ Denton.	„ Fothergill.

The order of the 18th Febr., 1746, made on the complaint against Mr. Sparry and the subsequent order of the 17th July, 1747, being read, Mr. Beech attending the Committee and acquainting them with the circumstances of the said Sparry's admission, and it not appearing to the Committee that the said Sparry was surreptitiously admitted, and forasmuch as the Minister by whom

the said Sparry was protected had several months previously left the kingdom, whereby the protection ceased, and Mr. Beech having since taken out one or more executions against the said Sparry, and for divers other causes the Committee were unanimously of opinion that it would not be possible for any application to be made by the Society for striking the said Sparry off the Roll.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern on the 19th Feb., 1747. Present :—

	Mr. Jesser.	
	„ Craddock.	
	„ Smith.	
	„ ffothergill.	
Mr. Adams.	Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Plumtree, Temple.
„ Biscoe.	„ Gunter.	„ Randolph.
„ Baker.	„ Graves.	„ Robinson.
„ Barber.	„ Hunt.	„ Skinner.
„ Barnes.	„ Hopkins.	„ Seaman.
„ Burton.	„ Hammersley.	„ Saunderson.
„ Butler, Southwark.	„ Johnson.	„ Strickland.
„ Bowman.	„ Jackson.	„ Strangways.
„ Beech.	„ Innes, Southwark.	„ Sheffield.
„ Bassett.	„ Le Grange.	„ Thomas.
„ Baylee, Temple.	„ Lucas.	„ Taylor, Wm.
„ Benn.	„ Letch.	„ Timmis.
„ Cromwell.	„ Lawrence.	„ Vernon.
„ Coppinger.	„ Lewis.	„ Whishaw.
„ Crawford.	„ Matthews.	„ Watson.
„ Cooper, Symond's Inn.	„ Neal.	„ Webb.
„ Cruttenden.	„ New.	„ Whishaw, Rd.
„ Callamy.	„ Newton,	„ Waddilove.
„ Crofts.	„ Owen.	„ Weston.
„ Chambre.	„ Powell.	„ Wakelynn.
„ Denton.	„ Palmer, City.	„ Wade.
„ Dobbins.	„ Perkins, Junr.	„ Wells.
„ Eyre.	„ Petre.	„ Wake.

The Orders of the last General Meeting and the Committee's reports since that date, and the Amendments referred to in the proceedings of the Committee on the 18th November, were read; and it was ordered that the Committee should take the said Amendments and any others which they should judge expedient for the ease and benefit of suitors into consideration, and should use their best and utmost endeavours to have the same carried into law. It was ordered that the Committee should meet for that purpose

on Friday the 4th of March at 6 o'clock in the evening, at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavern, Chancery Lane, when and where any members of the Society were asked to attend and offer any amendments they should think proper.

It was recommended from the Chair to the gentlemen of the Society, that they should forthwith communicate with the Secretary in writing on or before the 4th March such heads or minutes of Amendments as might occur to them, in order that the same might be laid before the Committee.

Mr. Skinner, Mr. Letch, and the Secretary were added to the Committee.

At a General Meeting of the Society held on the 13th July, 1748.
Present :—

	Mr. Waddilove.	} Stewards.	
	„ Lagrange.		
	„ Biscoe.		
	„ Tims.		
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Crofts.		Mr. Palmer, City.
„ Ayton.	„ Chambre.		„ Petre.
„ Altham.	„ Collier.		„ Parminter.
„ Brigs.	„ Denton.		„ Pardo.
„ Baker.	„ Dobbins.		„ Parry.
„ Bowman.	„ Fothergill.		„ Praed.
„ Barnard, City.	„ Fell, Castle Yard.		„ Plumtree, Temple.
„ Barns.	„ Ford.		„ Penfold.
„ Burgh.	„ Fell, Gray's Inn.		„ Spateman.
„ Butler, Southwark.	„ Geekie.		„ Smith, William.
„ Benton, Shoe Lane.	„ Grose.		„ Saunderson.
„ Banister, Totn. Lane.	„ Gardener.		„ Scrace.
„ Burnet.	„ Haywood.		„ Strickland.
„ Brown, Lincoln's Inn.	„ Hopkins.		„ Sloper.
„ Basset.	„ Johnson.		„ Stubs.
„ Benn.	„ Innes.		„ Thomas.
„ Bothom.	„ Jesser.		„ Taylor, William.
„ Cooper, City.	„ Randall.		„ Tiley.
„ Cromwell.	„ Letch.		„ Watson.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Langmore.		„ Wilson.
„ Cooper, Symond's Inn.	„ Marriot.		„ Web.
„ Calverly.	„ Morton.		„ Wh'shaw, Rd.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Matthews.		„ Weston.
„ Callamy.	„ Monk.		„ Wynne.
	„ Neal.		„ Woodhouse.
	„ Powell.		„ Whitchurch.
	„ Perkins, London.		„ Wells.

The Prolocutor reported that there was a net balance of £45 9s. 2d. in the hands of the Secretary. The Secretary on behalf of the Committee reported that the Committee had made progress in the matter referred to them touching the amendments in the law, and desired that the order of reference might be further continued, which was ordered accordingly.

It was also ordered that it be referred to the Committee to take such ways and means as to them should seem expedient for obliging Attorneys or Agents in the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, upon suing out process for arrests, or requiring common appearances, and upon filing common or special bail pieces, or entering common appearances, to signify the place of abode of such Attorney or Agent in town.

At the same meeting a case * transmitted by Mr. Nuthall was referred to the Standing Committee, who were to do therein as they should think proper, and it was ordered that when the Committee were to meet to consider the case, the Secretary should give notice to Mr. Nuthall, Mr. Brown, Mr. Ford, and Mr. Fell of Gray's Inn, to attend the Committee.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 27th July, 1748. Present :—

Mr. Webb.	Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Barnes and
„ Fothergille.	„ Thomas.	the Secretary.

Mr. Nuthall, Mr. Brown, Mr. Ford, and Mr. Fell attended, and a copy of an entry in Mr. Hume Campbell's book, subsequent to Mr. Nuthall's letter having been produced and read, and Messrs. Nuthall, Brown, Ford, and Fell having been severally heard, the further consideration of the matter was adjourned to the first week in Michaelmas Term, and the Secretary was ordered to cause a sufficient number of copies of the complaint to be made and delivered in the meantime to such of the Committee as usually attend.

The Committee met again on the 18th Novr., 1748, at the usual place. Present :—

Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Wade.	Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Whishaw.
-------------	-----------	-------------	--------------

Messrs. Nuthall, Brown, Ford, and Fell attending, to proceed with the consideration of Mr. Nuthall's case, but for want of a quorum (four members only being present) the meeting adjourned to the following Wednesday, at 8 o'clock in the evening precisely.

On the 23rd Novr., 1748, the Committee accordingly met. Present :—

Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Letch.	Mr. Fothergill.	Mr. Whishaw, Richard.
„ Thomas.	„ Wade.	„ Cromwell.	

They took into further consideration the memorial of Mr. Nuthall, and were unanimously of opinion that a copy of the Memorial should be delivered to Mr. Hume Campbell, and that his answer be desired thereto in a reasonable

* See Appendix.

and convenient time. It was also ordered that the Committee be adjourned to the 2nd December, at 5 o'clock, in order to appoint a select number of the Committee to attend Mr. Hume Campbell, and that the Secretary cause a copy of their minutes to be delivered to each of the Committee.

At the meeting of the Committee on Friday, the 2nd of Decr., 1748, at the Crown and Rolls Tavern. Present :—

Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Heaton.	Mr. Rd. Wishaw.
„ Wade.	„ Skinner.	

A Select Committee was appointed to attend Mr. Hume Campbell, pursuant to the order made at the last meeting, and the Secretary was ordered to request Mr. Waldo and Mr. Rayner to attend Mr. Campbell with the Committee.

The Select Committee consisted of Mr. Crewis, Mr. Webb, Mr. Geekie, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Cromwell, Mr. Wade, Mr. Heaton, Mr. Skinner, and ye Secretary.

The Committee met again on the 3rd Feb., 1748. Present :—

Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Hayton.	Mr. Richard Wishaw.
„ Crewis.	„ Wade.	„ Rayner.	

“The Committee this evening attended Mr. Hume Campbell on the subject of the Memorial of Mr. Nuthall, and the Committee think it proper that the answer of Mr. Campbell be reported by some one of the said Committee at the next Generall Meeting, and that Mr. Crewys be desired to do the same.”

At a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday, the 16th Novr., 1748. Present :—

Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Wishaw, Rd.
„ Thomas.	„ Wade.	

The Committee having taken notice that the Act of Parliament for regulating of Attorneys and Solicitors, which was continued by an Act of the 12th year “of his present Majesty,” would expire in the following Session of Parliament, they thought it extremely proper that application should be made to the Standing Committee of the expiring laws for the further continuance of the said Act of Parliament.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 8th Febry., 1748. Present :—

Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Wishaw, Rd.
„ Cromwell.	„ Wade.	

They were of opinion that clauses should be offered to the consideration of Parliament for the more effectually obliging the clerks of Attorneys and Solicitors to an actual and menial service of their masters, until such time as each of them were regularly assigned over to another Attorney or Solicitor,

and the Secretary was ordered to prepare the draft of such a clause, and lay the same before the Committee for their consideration.

The Committee also were of opinion that a clause should be offered to the consideration of Parliament, for preventing broken tradesmen and other loose and disorderly persons from soliciting, carrying on, or defending causes or other matters relating to the proceedings in the Courts of Law or Equity by means of some Attornies or Agents who encouraged such practices under pretence of authorities under the hands of the parties being sent and delivered to such Attornies and Agents, and it was desired that Mr. Wade should draw such clause as soon as he conveniently could.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday the 17th Feb., 1748. Present :—

Mr. Skinner.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Letch.
,, Geekie.	,, Wade.	

The account of the Secretary was inspected and audited, and his receipts, including the balance of the last Account, amounted to £55 14s. 8d., and his disbursements £14 14s. 2d., and there remained in his hands £41 os. 6d.

The clauses intended to be offered to Parliament, and to be added to the Bill for continuing the laws for regulating Attornies and Solicitors, were read and considered, and the Committee thought it expedient that they should be laid before the next General Meeting of the Society for their approbation and direction.

“The Committee cannot forbear expressing their concern that few of the Members named to be of the Committee do attend the service, and yet it hath sometimes happened that there are not a sufficient number of Members attending to form a Committee, whereby the affairs of the Society are delayed, and the Committee do earnestly request that at the next General Meeting such order may be made touching the premises as shall seem expedient.

At the General Meeting of the Society held on the 22nd February, 1748, at the Devil Tavern. Present :—

	Mr. Benton.	}	Stewards.
	,, Moxon.		
	,, Palmer.		
	,, Parmenter.		
Mr. Atwood.	Mr. Denton.		Mr. Nicol.
,, Ayton.	,, Edgar.		,, Owen.
,, Altham.	,, ffothergil.		,, Powel.
,, Baskerville.	,, ffell, Castle		,, Paterson.
,, Bowman.	,, Yard.		,, Palmer,
,, Burton.	,, ffell, Gray's Inn.		,, Cha. Lane.
,, Burgh.	,, Geekie.		,, Pardoe.
,, Baldero.	,, New.		,, Plumtree.

Mr. Butler,	Mr. Gunter.	Mr. Penfold.
Southwark.	„ Gardiner.	„ Partridge.
„ Brown,	„ Grubb.	„ Ryder.
Bucklersbury.	„ Hunt.	„ Robinson,
„ Burnet.	„ Heaton.	Post Office.
„ Bentham.	„ Hopkins.	„ Rayner.
„ Brown,	„ Hammersley.	„ Robinson, Junr,
Lincoln's Inn.	„ Hipperly.	„ Spateman.
„ Bassett.	„ Highmore.	„ Skinner.
„ Botham.	„ Ivet.	„ Smith, Wm.
„ Barber, Junr.	„ Johnson.	„ Seaman.
„ Cooper, City.	„ Jackson.	„ Strickland.
„ Cromwell.	„ Jones.	„ Stubbs.
„ Crewys, Henry.	„ Joynes.	„ Thomas.
„ Coppinger.	„ Jacma.	„ Taylor, Wm.
„ Craddock.	„ Kendall.	„ Tovey, City.
„ Cooper,	„ Lucas.	„ Watson.
Symond's Inn.	„ Letch.	„ Waddilove.
„ Calverly.	„ Layton.	„ Weston.
„ Cruttendon.	„ Life.	„ Wakelin.
„ Calamy.	„ Letchmore.	„ Wade.
„ Crewys, Thos.	„ Marriot.	„ Wells.
„ Chambre.	„ Matthews.	„ Watkinson.
„ Cox, City.	„ Monk.	„ Whishaw, Rd.
„ Cox, Hatton Garden.		

Mr. Paterson was unanimously requested to take upon him the office of Prolocutor; the Assistant Secretary received from eighteen Members *ros. 6d.* each for the use of the Society as their contributions. Stewards were appointed for the next meeting; Mr. Prolocutor reported the result of the audit of the Secretary's Accounts, and the Minutes of the preceding General Meeting and of the subsequent Committee Meetings were read.

Mr. Henry Crewys, in pursuance of the request of the Committee, delivered his report of Mr. Hume Campbell's answer to Mr. Nuthall's Memorial, and the same was read, and it was resolved: "That this Society are satisfied with Mr. Campbell's behaviour on this occasion;" and the Report was ordered to be entered at length in the Minutes of the day, and the thanks of the Society were given to the Members of the Committee for the trouble they had taken in the matter.

The clauses prepared by the Committee, and intended to be presented to Parliament to be added to the Bill for continuing the Laws for regulating of Attornies and Sollicitors, were read, and were referred back to the Committee for their further consideration, and the Committee were ordered to meet for that purpose on the Fryday evening following at the Anchor and Baptist's

Head Tavern in Chancery Lane, at 6 o'clock, and at the same time take into consideration any other clauses or matters offered to them by any Member of the Society, and to do therein as they should think proper. It was ordered that the Committee from time to time, until the next General Meeting, have power to nominate any other Member or Members of the Society to be of the said Committee, and that Mr. John Rayner, Mr. Pardoe, and Mr. Charles Brown of Bucklersbury, be added to the Members of the Committee.

The Report as to Mr. Nuthall's Memorial and Mr. Campbell's Answer given in the Minutes is as follows :

“To the Society of Practisers in the Several Courts of
Law and Equity.

“Gentlemen,

“Pursuant to your Order at the last General Meeting, your Committee have several times met and considered Mr. Nuthall's Memorial relating to Mr. Hume Campbell, and have been attended by Mr. Nuthall, and also by Mr. Brown, Mr. Ford, and Mr. Fell therein named, and have examined into the allegations of the said Memorial ; and the Committee being of opinion that it would be proper to attend Mr. Campbell thereon, a Select Committee was appointed for that purpose, who have accordingly attended him, and your Committee do represent that the said Committee were received by him in the most genteel manner ; and one of the Committee proceeded to open to him the occasion of their then attending him, and stated to him the whole substance and effect of the said Memorial, which Mr. Campbell heard with attention.

“Mr. Campbell was pleased to declare his regard for this Society, and that he did not know or apprehend that he had done anything in his profession that should give them the least displeasure.

“That he had accidentally seen the said Memorial, and that he had not till then been apprised that any memorandum was entered in his Retainer Book as stated in the Memorial, and that the instant he knew it he directed his clerk to strike it out of the book, and was extremely concerned that any such should have been made.

“That the entry of such memorandum was occasioned by the officiousness of his clerk, whom he had directed upon, or soon after receiving Mr. Nuthall's letter (stated in the Memorial), not to take any fees or retainer from Mr. Nuthall without previously acquainting him therewith, and that he had never directed his clerk to make any such entry or memorandum.

“That he looked upon himself as retained by the clients of Mr. Brown solely who originally employed him, but that he esteemed Mr. Nuthall's being concerned jointly with Mr. Brown, being occasioned by other insurers or underwriters coming in to defend subsequent to the retainer given by Mr. Brown, and to avail themselves of Mr. Brown's retainers, which they ought not as he apprehended, and returned Mr. Brown's retainer that he, Mr.

Nuthall, or the partys may retain in such manner as they should think fit, as a dispute had arisen as to the retainer as is stated in the Memorial.

“That if Mr. Nuthall had applied to him in case there was any impropriety in returning the Retainer, he would have heard all sides and done what was right, or would have left the determination of any question arising thereupon to any Gentleman of the Bar, and been Determined by his opinion, but he owned that he did think the letter he received from Mr. Nuthall, previous to any application made to him, a little unkind, but had no resentment to Mr. Nuthall, though he might reasonably expect a personal application from him.

“And concluded with hearty wishes for the prosperity of the Society, declaring whether in or out of Parliament, he should in all places and all times be ready to serve the Society in the best manner he was able, not only as bound in point of gratitude, but that he considered the worthy part of the profession, whether Attornies, Solicitors, or Counsel, as one Body.

“And in order further to satisfy your Committee, Mr. Campbell directed his clerk to produce the Retainer Book, and it appeared thereby, very much to the satisfaction of your Committee, that the memorandum complained of was totally erased.

“All which is submitted by order of the Committee.

“RD. WHISHAW,
“Secretary.”

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday the 24th Febr., 1748, at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavern, Chancery Lane. Present:—

Mr. Geekie, in the	Mr. Mead.	Mr. Wade.	Mr. Skinner.
Chair.	„ North.	„ Rayner.	„ Letch.
„ Cromwell.	„ Pardoe.	„ Scrace.	„ Brown.
„ Spateman.	„ Howell.	„ Watson.	„ Rd. Whishaw.
„ Denton.	„ ffothergill.		

It being reported by Mr. Brown, that Mr. Samuel Jordan, who was not admitted an Attorney, had with the consent of Mr. Butler of St. Mary Axe, in his name commenced and prosecuted several actions, the Committee were of opinion that the consideration of proper methods to prevent such a practice and to remedy that evil should be taken at the expense of the Society, and that at some one of the meetings to be held before the next Term, the Committee further proceed therein, and Mr. Brown was desired to give the Committee full information as to the facts.

Several clauses intended to be presented to Parliament were read, and with regard to the clause concerning clerks' actual service during the continuance of their articles, the Committee were of opinion that the same should not be offered to Parliament as a clause, but as a declaration of the intention of the Legislature in the former Act, with regard to the actual service of clerks under

their articles, and the same was altered accordingly, and the Amendment agreed to by the Committee.

The other clause for preventing unqualified persons acting as "Attorneys or Solicitors" was agreed to, and a clause was offered and agreed to, that an affidavit of the due execution of all articles of clerkship be filed in the respective Courts. The Assistant Secretary was ordered to make copies of such clauses, to be delivered to Sir John Strange, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. Campbell, for their approbation, and Mr. Skinner was desired to wait on those gentlemen with such copies.

The next meeting of the Committee was held on the 6th of March, 1748, at the same place. Present :—

Mr. Crewys.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Denton.
„ Heaton.	„ Rayner.	„ Whishaw, Rd.

The Deputy Secretary informed the Committee that he had delivered the copies of the clauses intended to be presented to Parliament to the Attorney and Solicitor-General, Sir John Strange, Sir Richd. Lloyd, Mr. Brown, Mr. Noel, Mr. Clerke, Mr. Campbell, Mr. ffazakerly, and Mr. Wilbraham, and that several of those gentlemen were of opinion, that it would be proper to reconsider those clauses and reduce them into one clause. The clauses were accordingly reconsidered, and Mr. Rayner at the request of the Committee agreed to settle and complete the same. The clause relating to "unqualified persons" was read, and the consideration of it was postponed until the Deputy Secretary had had a talk with Mr. Wade thereon, and had told him the sentiments of the Committee; and the matter was then to be laid before Mr. Harper with the other clauses, and Mr. Wade was desired to attend Mr. Harper thereon.

It was resolved at the same meeting that the first Monday in every month in the year, except the months of January, Augt., Sept., and October, be stated Committee nights.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 17th March, 1748. Present :—

Mr. Paterson, in the	Mr. Brown.	Mr. Whishaw.	Mr. Cromwell.
Chair.	„ Denton.	„ Johnson.	„ Wade.
„ Thomas.	„ Moxon.	„ ffothergil.	

At the request of the gentlemen of the Six Clerks' Office, nine of the sworn clerks of that office—

Mr. Chevely.	Mr. Wainwright.	Mr. Whitfield.
„ Comyns.	„ Blissett.	„ Clarke.
„ Legh.	„ Awse.	„ Robinson.

had a conference with the Committee, and they proposed and delivered to the Committee a clause, to be added to the Bill for the better regulation

of Attornies and Solicitors, the chief purport of which clause was that they and their clerks, when out of their time, may be admitted as Solicitors of the Court of Chancery, and be at liberty to take two clerks under them when so admitted, and offered their reasons for the Committee concurring therein, and not opposing the same. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to cause the substance of such clause be sent to the members of the Committee, and to desire their attendance on the following Tuesday evening at 4 o'clock, in order that the Committee may resolve upon an answer to be given to the gentlemen of the Six Clerks' Office on next Wednesday, in relation to such clause.

The Deputy Secretary laid before the Committee the clauses settled by Mr. Harper. The clause relating to unqualified persons was again read, and it was ordered that the same, together with the Act for the regulation of Attornies and Solicitors, be laid before Mr. Harper for his perusal.

On the 21st March, 1748, the Committee met again. Present :—

Mr. Geekie, in the	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Johnson.	Mr. Rayner.
Chair.	„ Wade.	„ Whishaw.	„ Paterson.
„ Denton.	„ Cromwell.		

The Committee took into consideration the clauses proposed by the gentlemen of the Six Clerks' Office, and were unanimously of opinion not to join or concur with these gentlemen in promoting the said clauses, and unanimously resolved to oppose the same if offered to Parliament. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to inform the Gentlemen of the Six Clerks' Office of this resolution, and he was also ordered to obtain copies of any other clauses which should be offered to Parliament by the Gentlemen of the Six Clerks' Office, and communicate such clauses to the Committee with the utmost dispatch.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 14th April, 1749. Present :—

Mr. Paterson, in the	Mr. Webb.	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Coppinger.
Chair.	„ Wade.	„ Heaton.	„ Barnes.
„ Rayner.	„ Whishaw.	„ Brown.	„ Geekie.
„ Pardoe.			

Several reasons in writing were offered to the Committee against increasing the number of Attornies and Solicitors, which were considered by the Committee, and several Amendments made.

The Committee again met on the 18th April, 1749. Present :—

Mr. Paterson, in the	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Cromwell.
Chair.	„ Brown.	„ Whishaw.	„ Coppinger.

Further considered, the several reasons laid before them at the preceding meeting, and several others then delivered, and settled and agreed on reasons

to be offered to Parliament against a clause in the expiring Law Bill, tending to increase the number of Attornies and Solicitors. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to forthwith procure 1200 copies of the said reasons as settled to be printed, and to deliver to each member of the Committee ten copies of such printed reasons, and that he wrote letters to the members of the Committee to meet at Alice's Coffee House, Old Palace Yard, Westminster, to attend the members of the House in relation to the clauses in the expiring Law Bill.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 29th of May, 1749. Present :—

Mr. Cromwell.

Mr. Pardoe.

Mr. Wishaw.

The Deputy Secretary produced several clauses which were added to and engrossed in the expiring Law Bill, but for want of a sufficient number of members to constitute a Committee the consideration of those clauses was postponed.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday the 16th June, 1749. Present :—

Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Letch.

Mr. Cromwell.

Mr. Wade.

„ Chas. Brown.

„ Rd. Wishaw.

„ Denton.

The accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary were audited.

The Committee considered several letters sent to the Secretary by Mr. John Alexander, a member of the Society, informing him that a complaint had been lodged against him in the Lord Mayor's Court, at the suit of Sir John Bosworth, Chamberlain of the City of London, in a plea of debt on demand for £5, which Mr. Alexander apprehends is grounded on a bye law of the said City, which directs that "no person shall follow any art, trade, occupation, mistery or handicraft, without being free of the said City," and that it being a matter of general concern, and of great consequence to the gentlemen of the Society, Mr. Alexander hoped that they would agree to defend it. The Committee apprehended that the prosecution was commenced at the instigation of the Scriveners' Company against Mr. Alexander for acting as a Scrivener in the said City not being free thereof nor of that Company, and resolved that Mr. Alexander be acquainted, that in their opinion the defence of the said prosecution should be carried on at the general expense of the Society, and that Mr. Alexander immediately retain Sir John Strange, Sir Richd. Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, Mr. fford, Sergeant Skinner, and Mr. Sergeant Prime, if not already retained on the other side, and such of the City Counsel as he should think proper, and take their opinion on the case, and the proper method of defence.

At the General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, on the 21st June, 1749. Present :—

	Mr. John Powell.	
	„ Wm. Hunt.	
	„ Edward Wade.	
	Mr. Christopher Robinson absent at York.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Chatfield.	Mr. Petre.
„ Atwood.	„ Cooke, Thos.	„ Palmer, Wm.
„ Adams.	„ Cooper, John.	„ Pardoe.
„ Altham.	„ Denton.	„ Plumtree.
„ Biscoe, Elisha.	„ Dobbins.	„ Penfold.
„ Baskerville.	„ Edgar.	„ Partridge.
„ Baker.	„ ffothergill.	„ Poole.
„ Bowman.	„ fford.	„ Randolph.
„ Barnard.	„ Geekie.	„ Roberts, Peter.
„ Barnes.	„ Gardiner.	„ Robinson, Inn-
„ Batty.	„ Grubb.	Holder.
„ Burton.	„ Goodwin.	„ Robinson.
„ Burgh.	„ Howell.	„ Smith.
„ Benton, Shoe Lane.	„ Hood.	„ Saunderson.
„ Butler, Samuel.	„ Hayward.	„ Scrace.
„ Brown, Chas.	„ Hopkins.	„ Strickland.
„ Burnet.	„ Hammersley.	„ Smart.
„ Brown, Lincoln's Inn.	„ Howard.	„ Tyley.
„ Barber, John.	„ Johnson.	„ Thomas.
„ Buckle.	„ Innes.	„ Taylor, Wm.
„ Cooper, ffra.	„ Jacmar.	„ Timms.
„ Cromwell.	„ Lloyd.	„ Tovey.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Legrange.	„ Ustick.
„ Coppinger.	„ Letch.	„ Wishaw, John.
„ Cranston.	„ Letchmore.	„ Watson.
„ Calverly.	„ Life.	„ Wishaw, Richard.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Mason.	„ Waddilove.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Moxon.	„ Weston.
„ Callamy.	„ Matthews.	„ Wynn.
„ Collier.	„ Monk.	„ Woodhouse.
„ Cox, City.	„ New.	„ Wake.
„ Cox, Hatton Garden.	„ Owen.	„ Watkinson.
	„ Perkins, Wm.	„ Wharton.

The Prolocutor reported the result of the audit, and the Deputy Secretary received certain contributions.

The Prolocutor reported that the Committee had considered the several clauses intended to be presented to Parliament, and that those clauses had been perused and settled by Counsellor Harper, and had been presented to

Parliament, and were included in the Reviving Act, which had since passed into law. The thanks of the Society were returned to the Committee for the care they had taken in promoting those clauses.

The Minutes of the Committee in relation to the prosecution of Mr. Alexander being read, the Society ratified the Order made by the Committee on that occasion, and it was resolved that the defence of Mr. Alexander be defrayed by the Society, and a Select Committee was appointed, viz. :—

Mr. North.	Mr. Hopkins.	Mr. Attwood.	Mr. Pardoe.
„ Rayner.	„ Howell.	„ R. Whishaw.	„ Powell.
„ Wade.	„ Coppinger.	„ Hunt.	„ Lloyd.
„ Baker.	„ Barnes.	„ Denton.	„ Benton.
„ Webb.	„ Johnson.	„ Woodhouse.	„ New.
„ Wynn.	„ ffothergill.	„ Waddilove.	„ T. Cowper.
„ Round.	„ Mason.	„ Legrange.	

and the Deputy Secretary.

to conduct such defence, and to assist Mr. Alexander, who was to have the management of such defence, and who was, from time to time as there should be occasion, to take the Committee's directions. It was resolved that at a meeting of the said Committee, any three may constitute a Committee and proceed to business. It was also ordered that if any other action were brought before the next General Meeting, against any other Member at the instigation of the Scriveners' Company, the same Committee should have power to direct the defence (if desired), at the expense of the Society.

At a meeting of the Committee appointed to consider the prosecution of Mr. Alexander, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, held at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavern in Chancery Lane, on the 3rd Novr., 1749. Present :—

Mr. Howell.	Mr. Atwood.	Mr. Hunt.	Mr. Whishaw, and
„ Hopkins.	„ Mason.	„ ffothergill.	the Deputy
„ Pardoe.	„ Waddilove.	„ Skinner.	Secretary.
„ Powell.	„ Wade.		

Mr. Alexander attended, and produced the notice given to quash his writ of privilege, and for a Procedendo to proceed in the action against him brought in the Mayor's Court, and also some instructions he proposed giving to Counsel in opposition to the Motion; and after consideration the Committee ordered that Mr. Alexander give instructions to Sir Richd. Lloyd and Mr. Hume Campbell to take notes on the said intended motion. At the next meeting of the same Committee on the 13th Novr., 1749. Present :—

Mr. Johnson.	Mr. Mason.	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Waddilove, and
„ Powell.	„ Atwood.	„ Legrange.	the Deputy
„ Hunt.	„ Hopkins.	„ R. Whishaw.	Secretary.
„ Pardoe.			

Mr. Alexander again attended, and the several cases cited on the motion, and proposed to be cited, were considered, and observations made thereon, and several matters were proposed to be added to the instructions to Counsel on showing cause against the Rule obtained by the Scriveners' Company. Mr. Alexander was desired to settle the briefs to be delivered to counsel in accordance with the directions given to him, and it was resolved to give "briefs to all the Councill retained, and with proper fees."

At a meeting of the standing Committee of the Society on the 13th Feby., 1749. Present:—

Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Joseph Letch.
„ Pardoe.	„ Chas. Browne.	

The accounts of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary were audited, and it was found that the balance in the Secretary's hands after deducting disbursements and allowances (£12 5s. 4d.) amounted to the "neat ballance" of £26 13s. 7d.

At the General Meeting of the Society held on the 16th Feby., 1749, at the Devil Tavern. Present:—

	Mr. James Barnard.	
	„ Charles Brown.	
	„ Joseph Letch.	
	„ Robert Pardoe.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Petre.
„ Atwood.	„ Deeves.	„ Palmer, Wm.
„ Ayton.	„ ffothergill.	„ Praed.
„ Altham.	„ Green.	„ Penfold.
„ Bannister.	„ Grubb.	„ Partridge.
„ Bowman.	„ Godwin.	„ Poole.
„ Burton.	„ Hunt.	„ Ryder.
„ Benton.	„ Harrison.	„ Robinson,
„ Booth.	„ Howard.	Post Office.
„ Barber, Junr.	„ Hurst.	„ Skinner.
„ Byfield.	„ Johnson.	„ Smith, Wm.
„ Ballard.	„ Jackson.	„ Saunderson.
„ Bridge.	„ Innes.	„ Swaile.
„ Cooper, ffra.	„ Jackman.	„ Southhouse.
„ Cromwell.	„ Kirby.	„ Scott.
„ Craddock.	„ Lloyd.	„ Thomas.
„ Crawford.	„ Layton.	„ Taylor.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Lewis.	„ Timms.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Langmore.	„ Tovey.
„ Cooke.	„ Letchmore.	„ Usticke.
„ Cox, Hatton	„ Matthews.	„ Watson.
Garden.	„ Nuthall.	„ Whishaw, Rd.

Mr. Chatfield.	Mr. New.	Mr. Waddilove.
„ Cooper, John.	„ Nicholson.	„ Wynne.
„ Callamy.	„ Owen.	„ Wylde.
„ Crewys, Thos.	„ Powell.	

After the usual business had been gone through, the report of the Committee was read, and was to the following effect:—That since the last General Meeting Mr. Alexander, against whom the Pleint was lodged in the Mayor's Court, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, brought his Writ of Privilege as an Attorney of the King's Bench, and that a Motion was made and a Rule granted, unless cause shown in the said Court for quashing the said Writ of Privilege, and for a Procedendo in the Mayor's Court. That the Select Committee appointed at the last General Meeting had since then twice met, and in consequence of their resolutions, briefs had been given to Counsel to show cause against the said Rule, and that in the preceding November cause was shown, and the Court adjourned the consideration of the matter until Hilary Term, when the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company were to reply in respect of the Rule, which was enlarged for that purpose; but they, instead of replying, had only enlarged the Rule to the following Easter Term.

It was ordered that the thanks of the Society be given to Sir Richd. Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Williams for their assistance and obliging behaviour in Mr. Alexander's affair, and that the Deputy Secretary send letters to the Select Committee to meet and wait on these gentlemen for that purpose.

At a meeting of the Committee appointed to consider the prosecution of Mr. Alexander, held on 16th May, 1750. Present:—

Mr. Benton.	Mr. Waddilove.
„ New.	„ Atwood.
„ Powell.	„ Pardoe, and the Deputy Secretary.

The intent of the meeting being to attend Sir Richd. Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Williams, to return the Society's thanks for their assistance, and it being intimated by Mr. Alexander that it was expected that the affair would be again mentioned in Court on the Wednesday following, the meeting was adjourned to the 24th inst. On the 24th of May, accordingly, the Committee met again. Present:—

Mr. Hopkins.	Mr. Benton.
„ Richd. Wishaw.	„ Alexander likewise was present.

The Committee attended at the Chambers of the Gentlemen referred to, but did not find them in, and they then left with their respective clerks "a paper writing in the words or to the effect following, addressed to the said several gentlemen in order to prevent mistake:—

“The Committee appointed by the Society of Practisers in the several Courts of Law and Equity, in consequence of a resolution of that Society, came to wait on Sir Riehd. Lloyd to return the Society’s thanks to him for his assistance and obliging behaviour in the defence of Mr. Alexander against the Motion on behalf of the Scriveners’ Company.”

At a meeting of the Committee on the 6th July, 1750. Present :—

Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. R. Wishaw.
„ ffothergill.	„ Thomas.	

The accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary were audited, and it was found that there remained in the hands of the Secretary £25 5s. 6d., balance of the last account presented by him ; that the Deputy Secretary’s receipts, together with the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, came to £25 9s. 1d., and his disbursements to £10 16s. 6d., leaving a balance due to the Society of £39 18s. 1d.

At the General Meeting of the Society held on the 11th July, 1750. Present :—

	Mr. Thos. Nuthall.	} Stewards.
	„ Archibald Wynne.	
	„ Robert New.	
	„ John Sanderson.	
Mr. Adams.	Mr. Chatfield.	Mr. Mathews.
„ Alexander.	„ Cooke.	„ Powell.
„ Atwood.	„ Cooper, John.	„ Perkins, Wm.
„ Altham.	„ Cobb.	„ Petre.
„ Briggs.	„ Denton.	„ Paterson.
„ Biscoe.	„ Dobbins.	„ Pardoe.
„ Baker.	„ ffothergill.	„ Praed.
„ Bowman.	„ Geekie.	„ Plumtree.
„ Barnard.	„ Green.	„ Smith, Wm.
„ Burton.	„ Grubb.	„ Stanninought.
„ Benton.	„ Goodwin.	„ Sloper, Thos.
„ Brown, Edmd.	„ Haywood.	„ Southouse.
„ Botham.	„ Hopkins.	„ Taylor.
„ Buckle.	„ Hammersley.	„ Tyley.
„ Boyfield.	„ Jackson.	„ Thomas.
„ Bridge.	„ Inge.	„ Taylor, Wm.
„ Cooper, ffrancis.	„ Jackmar.	„ Tovey.
„ Cromwell.	„ Jessor.	„ Wells.
„ Comeline.	„ Kirkby.	„ Webb.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Lewis.	„ Waddilove.
„ Callamy.	„ Langmore.	„ Wharton.

Mr. Crewys, Thos.	Mr. Lacon.	Mr. Wallis.
„ Crofts.	„ Letchmore.	„ Watson.
„ Chambre.	„ Mason.	„ Wylde.
„ Cox, Joshua.	„ Marriot.	

After the usual business had been gone through, and the Reports of the Committee read, the Prolocutor reported that the affair of Mr. Alexander stood in the same situation as it did at the last General Meeting, the Scriveners' Company not having replied, but only from time to time enlarged the Rule.

The Society having been informed that one of the Six Clerks of the Chancery Office had refused to sign a certificate of a Replication filed in order that a defendant may dismiss an appeal for want of prosecution, on the ground that the Sworn Clerk who had appeared to the amended Bill in that case had not paid the said Six Clerk his fees for the copy of the said amended Bill, although it appeared that the said Sworn Clerk had been paid by his client so long before as August, 1744; and the Society being likewise informed that the said Six Clerks often insist on being paid by the parties in the cause or their Solicitors for their fees in respect of copies of pleadings which the Sworn Clerk employed as Clerk in Court, had refused or neglected to pay; and the opinion of the Society being desired in relation thereto, it was resolved that in the opinion of the Society such demands so made by the Six Clerks were unfounded and unreasonable. It was referred to the Committee to examine into the fact with regard to the Six Clerk's refusing to sign the certificate aforesaid, and to take such steps as they should think proper and necessary at the Society's expense; and that the Committee take into consideration the other matters complained of, and any other complaints or grievances of the like kind against the Six Clerks, and report the same at the next General Meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 23rd July, 1750. Present:—

Mr. David Thomas in the chair.

Mr. Whishaw. Mr. Edwd. Brown. Mr. ffothergill. Mr. Benton.

The Committee took into consideration the refusal of the Six Clerk to sign a certificate, and being informed that Samuel Raynardson, Esquire, was the Six Clerk so refusing, and that Mr. Charles Bicknell was the Sworn Clerk in the cause, and after certain documents in the cause were read, the Committee were of opinion that there was sufficient ground for the complaint, and directed the Deputy Secretary, together with Mr. Ivat, the Defendant's present Clerk in Court, to apply to Mr. Raynardson to know whether he persisted in his refusal to sign such certificate; and in case he did, it was ordered that an application be made in the name of the Defendant to the Court by Petition to the Lord Chancellor, praying that Mr. Raynardson may be obliged to sign such certificate; and the Deputy Secretary was ordered to prepare and present such

Petition and take such other proper steps as should be necessary, and that he forthwith retain Mr. Attorney and Mr. Solicitor-General on behalf of the Solicitors and Suitors of the Court, and give briefs to such Counsel as he should think proper.

At a meeting of the Committee appointed to consider the prosecution at the instance of the Scriveners' Company of Mr. Alexander, held on the 14th Novr., 1750. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill, in the	Mr. Attwood.	Mr. Pardoe.
Chair.	„ Powell.	„ R. Whishaw, and
„ New.	„ Benton.	the Deputy Secretary.
„ Wade.		

Mr. Alexander attended, and informed the Committee, that on the previous Saturday the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company had replied to the arguments of the Counsel acting on his behalf, and that the Court had adjourned the giving a determinate opinion on the Motion, but that the Chief Justice had declared his private opinion in favour of a *Procedendo*, and to quash Mr. Alexander's Writ of Privilege, and the Committee's opinion as to Mr. Alexander's future conduct was desired. It was resolved that Counsel on behalf of Mr. Alexander be desired to have a consultation, and to advise (1) whether it was not proper to apply to the Court of King's Bench for leave to reply to the new cases cited by the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company; (2) whether it would not be proper to make a proposal, and to have a trial in Middlesex on a feigned or any other issue so as to bring the merits of the case in question; and (3) if by the determination of the Court a *Procedendo* were directed, whether it would be advisable for Mr. Alexander to plead his privilege in the action brought against him in the Mayor's Court. Mr. Benton, Mr. New, Mr. Wade, Mr. Atwood, and the Deputy Secretary were requested to wait on Counsel for Mr. Alexander, and inform them of the above resolution and to fix a time for a consultation, and they were to be at liberty to propose to Counsel any other questions they should think necessary. In consequence of the above-mentioned resolution, the members of the Committee referred to waited on each of the Counsel concerned, and the consultation was fixed for Monday the 19th Novr., at 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Three members of the Committee, viz. Mr. Wade, Mr. Pardoe, Mr. Attwood, and the Deputy Secretary and Mr. Alexander, accordingly attended at Sir Richd. Lloyd's chambers, and Sir R. Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, and Counsellor Williams, on consultation, were of opinion on the first question, that when the Scriveners' Company moved for the judgment of the Court on their rule, time should be asked for to reply to the new cases cited by the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company; and on the second question it was adjudged needless to propose a trial on a feigned issue in regard to Mr. Bentham, Attorney for the Scriveners' Company, had absolutely declared he

would not consent thereto; and on the third question Counsel were of opinion, in case the Court determined against Mr. Alexander's privilege, that they would advise pleading that privilege in the Court below, and endeavour to get a special case made to be argued before all the Judges.

At a meeting of this Committee held on the 15th Feb., 1750. Present:—

Mr. R. Whishaw.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Barnes.
„ Johnson.	„ Brown.	

The accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary were audited, and it was found that his disbursements and allowances amounted to £19 5s., and that the balance in his hands amounted to £24 7s. 6d.

At the General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, on Monday the 18th Feby., 1750. Present:—

	Mr. Adam Callamy.	}	Stewards.																																																																										
	„ Edwd. Grubb.																																																																												
	„ Wm. Mason.																																																																												
	„ John Jackson.																																																																												
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Mr. Alexander.</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Mr. Dax.</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Mr. Palmer, Wm.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Atwood.</td> <td>„ Dodd.</td> <td>„ Pardoe.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Ayton.</td> <td>„ Edgar.</td> <td>„ Praed.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Atham.</td> <td>„ Geekie.</td> <td>„ Penfold.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Athawes.</td> <td>„ Green.</td> <td>„ Palmer, Charlton.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Briggs.</td> <td>„ Goodwin.</td> <td>„ Peal.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Baskerville.</td> <td>„ Gwatkin.</td> <td>„ Randolph.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Baker.</td> <td>„ Gale.</td> <td>„ Roberts, Petre.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Bowman.</td> <td>„ Howard.</td> <td>„ Rosewell.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Barnes.</td> <td>„ Heron.</td> <td>„ Roper.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Brown, Chas.</td> <td>„ Hoar.</td> <td>„ Smith, Wm.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Brown, Edmd.</td> <td>„ Johnson.</td> <td>„ Saunderson.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Barber, John.</td> <td>„ Inge.</td> <td>„ Staninought.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Byfield.</td> <td>„ Jackmar.</td> <td>„ Sparrow.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Ballard.</td> <td>„ Joynes.</td> <td>„ Sloper, Mathew.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Bargrave.</td> <td>„ J'Anson.</td> <td>„ Southouse.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Brigstock.</td> <td>„ Kirkly.</td> <td>„ Sayer.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Cooper, Francis.</td> <td>„ Lucas.</td> <td>„ Thomas.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Cromwell.</td> <td>„ Lewis.</td> <td>„ Taylor, Wm.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Coppinger.</td> <td>„ Lockmore.</td> <td>„ Tims.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Craddock.</td> <td>„ Marriot.</td> <td>„ Tovey.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Comeline.</td> <td>„ Morse.</td> <td>„ Tristram.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Cruttenden.</td> <td>„ Monk.</td> <td>„ Watson.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Cowper, Thos.</td> <td>„ Martin.</td> <td>„ Whishaw, Richd.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>„ Cooper, John.</td> <td>„ Neale.</td> <td>„ Wharton.</td> </tr> </table>	Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Dax.	Mr. Palmer, Wm.	„ Atwood.	„ Dodd.	„ Pardoe.	„ Ayton.	„ Edgar.	„ Praed.	„ Atham.	„ Geekie.	„ Penfold.	„ Athawes.	„ Green.	„ Palmer, Charlton.	„ Briggs.	„ Goodwin.	„ Peal.	„ Baskerville.	„ Gwatkin.	„ Randolph.	„ Baker.	„ Gale.	„ Roberts, Petre.	„ Bowman.	„ Howard.	„ Rosewell.	„ Barnes.	„ Heron.	„ Roper.	„ Brown, Chas.	„ Hoar.	„ Smith, Wm.	„ Brown, Edmd.	„ Johnson.	„ Saunderson.	„ Barber, John.	„ Inge.	„ Staninought.	„ Byfield.	„ Jackmar.	„ Sparrow.	„ Ballard.	„ Joynes.	„ Sloper, Mathew.	„ Bargrave.	„ J'Anson.	„ Southouse.	„ Brigstock.	„ Kirkly.	„ Sayer.	„ Cooper, Francis.	„ Lucas.	„ Thomas.	„ Cromwell.	„ Lewis.	„ Taylor, Wm.	„ Coppinger.	„ Lockmore.	„ Tims.	„ Craddock.	„ Marriot.	„ Tovey.	„ Comeline.	„ Morse.	„ Tristram.	„ Cruttenden.	„ Monk.	„ Watson.	„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Martin.	„ Whishaw, Richd.	„ Cooper, John.	„ Neale.	„ Wharton.		
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Dax.	Mr. Palmer, Wm.																																																																											
„ Atwood.	„ Dodd.	„ Pardoe.																																																																											
„ Ayton.	„ Edgar.	„ Praed.																																																																											
„ Atham.	„ Geekie.	„ Penfold.																																																																											
„ Athawes.	„ Green.	„ Palmer, Charlton.																																																																											
„ Briggs.	„ Goodwin.	„ Peal.																																																																											
„ Baskerville.	„ Gwatkin.	„ Randolph.																																																																											
„ Baker.	„ Gale.	„ Roberts, Petre.																																																																											
„ Bowman.	„ Howard.	„ Rosewell.																																																																											
„ Barnes.	„ Heron.	„ Roper.																																																																											
„ Brown, Chas.	„ Hoar.	„ Smith, Wm.																																																																											
„ Brown, Edmd.	„ Johnson.	„ Saunderson.																																																																											
„ Barber, John.	„ Inge.	„ Staninought.																																																																											
„ Byfield.	„ Jackmar.	„ Sparrow.																																																																											
„ Ballard.	„ Joynes.	„ Sloper, Mathew.																																																																											
„ Bargrave.	„ J'Anson.	„ Southouse.																																																																											
„ Brigstock.	„ Kirkly.	„ Sayer.																																																																											
„ Cooper, Francis.	„ Lucas.	„ Thomas.																																																																											
„ Cromwell.	„ Lewis.	„ Taylor, Wm.																																																																											
„ Coppinger.	„ Lockmore.	„ Tims.																																																																											
„ Craddock.	„ Marriot.	„ Tovey.																																																																											
„ Comeline.	„ Morse.	„ Tristram.																																																																											
„ Cruttenden.	„ Monk.	„ Watson.																																																																											
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Martin.	„ Whishaw, Richd.																																																																											
„ Cooper, John.	„ Neale.	„ Wharton.																																																																											

Mr. Cobb.	Mr. New.	Mr. Wallis.
„ Coulson.	„ Nicholson.	„ Worledge.
„ Denton.	„ Powell.	„ Yeo.

After the usual business had been attended to, the Prolocutor reported, that in consequence of the resolution of the Committee of the 23rd July, in relation to the complaint against one of the Six Clerks, an application, by Petition to the Lord Chancellor, had been made in the names of the Defendants in that cause against Mr. Raynardson, the Six Clerk who refused to sign such certificate, that the Solicitor-Genl., Mr. Noel, and Mr. Clerke were Counsel for the Petitioners, and had not taken any fees, as the application was at the instance of the Society; that the Petition was in part heard by the Lord Chancellor on the 19th and 20th Decr., and the further hearing then adjourned to the 21st Jany., the Lord Chancellor directing some enquiries to be made. When the case came up on the 21st Jany., Mr. Raynardson informed the Court, that since the previous hearing he had been satisfied for the copy of the amended Bill by Mr. Bicknell, and offered the Petitioners to sign the certificate as required, and the Court accordingly adjourned the Petition sine die. The Prolocutor stated that no other complaint against the Six Clerks had up to that time been laid before the Committee.

At the same meeting the Select Committee were ordered to enquire into the proceedings of the Scriveners' Company, to obtain a Bye Law, which was then under consideration by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City, and if they should find the same to be prejudicial to the interests of the Society, the said Committee were enabled to take such methods as they should be advised to prevent the same passing.

At a meeting of the Committee appointed to consider the prosecution at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, held on the 25th February, 1750. Present :—

Mr. Wade in the Chair.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Brigstock.
„ Comeline.	„ R. Whishaw.	„ Altham.
„ Hopkins.	„ Marriot.	„ Mason, and the
„ Coulson.	„ Lucas.	Deputy Secretary.

Mr. Alexander also attended. The Deputy Secretary having obtained a copy of the Petition of the Scriveners' Company, the same was read, and the Deputy Secretary informed the Committee that he had applied for a copy of the Bill for the intended Bye Law, but had not been able to procure same. The Secretary was ordered to get a copy of this Bill as soon as he could, and summon the Committee to meet thereon. At the meeting of the same Committee on the 25th March, 1751. Present :—

Mr. Altham, in the Chair.	Mr. Marriot.	Mr. Powell.
„ Monk.	„ Mason.	„ Brigstock, and
	the Deputy, Mr. Alexander, also attended.	

The Deputy Secretary having obtained a copy of the Bill, it was resolved that such Bill be laid before Mr. Williams for his opinion as to how far it may affect the members of the Society, and whether it was proper for the Society to oppose the said Bill, and in what manner.

The same Committee met again on the 17th April, 1751. Present :—

Mr. Barnes, Chairman.	Mr. Marriot.	Mr. Lewis.
„ Benton.	„ Waddilove.	„ Monk, and
„ Denton.	„ Hopkins	the Deputy
„ Martin.	„ Wade.	Secretary.
„ Powell.	„ Mason.	„ Cromwell attended.
„ Whishaw.	„ Baker.	

The Deputy Secretary informed the Committee that he had, in accordance with their instructions, laid the Bill before Mr. Williams, and had received from that gentleman a letter to the following effect : that he had read over the Bye Law, and believed it was in the common form, except as to the penalty, which was larger than usual ; that it seemed to him advisable to oppose the passing of this Bye Law into an Act of Common Council ; for supposing that the merits of the question between the Scriveners and Attornies should be determined in favour of the Scriveners, and the Attornies be obliged to become Freemen of the City, it may be more eligible for them, for many reasons, to take up their freedom in other Companies than the Scriveners ; that the most proper method to oppose the Bill may be by the Gentlemen of the Society applying to their particular friends on the Common Council to postpone the consideration of it until such time as the merits of the case then depending had been determined ; if this method should not be thought proper, or should not prove effectual, it would be very material to have a clause added to the Bye Law, enabling every Attorney who should act as a Scrivener to employ in his office any articed clerk, notwithstanding that such clerk shou'd not be articed for seven years, or bound according to the custom of the City, and also to employ any writer, although such writer should not be free of the City. Unless some clause of this sort were added, he doubted all the Attorneys in the City should article their clerks for seven years, and should employ such writers only as were freemen.

After considering the foregoing letter from Mr. Williams, it was resolved that the members of the Society, in their private capacity, should apply to their particular friends of the Common Council to postpone the passing of the Bye Law into an Act of Common Council, until the judgment of the Court of King's Bench had been given in the cause depending between the Chamberlain of the City of London and Mr. Alexander.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday, the 5th July, 1751. Present :—

Mr. Paterson.	Mr. F. Brown.	Mr. Geekie.
„ Denton.	„ Thomas.	

The Accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary were audited, and it was found that the disbursements and allowances amounted to £10 9s. 0d., and that there remained due to the Society a balance of £43 12s. 3d.

At a General Meeting of the Society, on Wednesday the 10th July, 1751.
Present :—

	Mr. George Baskerville.	} Stewards.
	„ Joseph Cruttenden.	
	„ Thomas Cowper.	
	„ John Lewis.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Penfold.
„ Atwood.	„ Dax.	„ Poole.
„ Adams.	„ Dodd.	„ Peal.
„ Altham.	„ Edgar.	„ Pembroke, Joseph.
„ Briggs.	„ Edison.	„ Randolph.
„ Biscoe.	„ Fothergill.	„ Robinson,
„ Baker.	„ Ford.	Borret's Office.
„ Bowman.	„ Green.	„ Smith, Wm.
„ Bernard.	„ Grubb.	„ Raper.
„ Burton.	„ Goodwin.	„ Saunderson.
„ Butler.	„ Gason.	„ Stubbs.
„ Benton.	„ Gassett.	„ Southouse.
„ Beech.	„ Hood.	„ Sayer, James.
„ Benn.	„ Hopkins.	„ Smith, Henry.
„ Brown, Edmd.	„ Harrison.	„ Thomas.
„ Barber, John.	„ Heron.	„ Taylor, Wm.
„ Buckle.	„ Johnson.	„ Tovey.
„ Bridge.	„ Jackson.	„ Wells.
„ Brigstock.	„ Joynes.	„ Wishaw, John.
„ Backhouse.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Watson.
„ Cooper, Francis.	„ Letchmore.	„ Wakelyn.
„ Cromwell.	„ Mason.	„ Wishaw, Rd.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Marriott.	„ Waddilove.
„ Combes.	„ Monk.	„ Watkinson.
„ Crawford.	„ New.	„ Wharton, James.
„ Calamy.	„ Nicholson.	„ Wallis.
„ Chambre.	„ Owen.	„ Wilson.
„ Collier.	„ Powell.	„ Wharton,
„ Chatfield.	„ Palmer, Wm.	Lincoln's Inn.
„ Cooper, John.	„ Plumptree.	„ Yeo.

After the usual business had been disposed of, the Prolocutor reported, that since the last General Meeting the Scriveners' Company in Trinity Term moved for judgment in Mr. Alexander's affair, but that Mr. Alexander's counsel desiring leave to answer some new cases cited in the reply, the Court adjourned

the further hearing of the Motion, and giving judgment till the following Michaelmas Term; that in consequence of the order for that purpose made at the last General Meeting, the Select Committee had enquired into the proceedings of the Scriveners' Company in endeavouring to obtain a Bye Law; and having procured a copy of this Bye Law, they laid it before Mr. Williams for advice thereon, who refused to accept any fee, but having considered it sent to the Deputy Secretary a letter, entered in the Minutes of the Committee of the 17th April, 1751; and that the said Bye Law was not passed by the Committee of the Common Council, to whom it was referred to settle the same. The Committee appointed to consider Mr. Alexander's affair were ordered and desired still to use their endeavours for the service of the Society in that affair, and in connexion with the proceedings of the Scriveners' Company.

It being moved that a printed paper, entitled "Friendly Hints to Young Gentlemen who are, or intend to be, bound by Articles to Attornies or Solicitors," might be read, and the same being read, and the Society being acquainted that Mr. John Felton had written the said "Friendly Hints," and had at his own expense printed many thousand copies thereof, and caused the same to be dispersed throughout the several counties of England and Wales, it was resolved *nem. con.* that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Felton for his laudable zeal in writing, printing, and dispersing the said "Friendly Hints."

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 20th Jany., 1752.
Present:—

Mr. Thomas.	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Brown.	Mr. Wells.
„ Coppinger.	„ Whishaw.	„ Pardoe.	„ Barnes.
„ Denton.	„ Benton.		

They took into consideration the several Acts of the 1st of George I., and of the 2nd of George II., made with regard to Attorneys and Solicitors taking the oaths directed by the said Act of the 1st of George I., and being informed that a Bill had been that Session brought into Parliament for allowing further time for taking these oaths, the Deputy Secretary was ordered to procure a copy of the said Bill, and to compare it with the former indemnifying Acts, and if necessary to summon the Committee thereon.

The Committee also took into consideration the neglect or omission of several persons in making and filing affidavits of due execution of contracts in writing on articling persons to serve as clerks to Attorneys or Solicitors, in pursuance of an Act made in the twenty-second year of "his present Majesty;" and apprehending it was necessary to procure a clause to be inserted in the then Act, to indemnify persons who had omitted to qualify themselves for offices and employments, for gaining further time for filing such affidavits, they drew up a clause to the following effect:

First reciting the title of the said Act of the 22nd George II., and the several clauses therein relating to filing such affidavits :

And whereas divers persons, through mistake, absence, or some unavoidable accident, to the prejudice of infants and others, have omitted to cause affidavits to be made and filed in the proper offices of the actual execution of several contracts, in writing, to serve as clerks to Attornies and Solicitors within the time limited and expressed in the said Act, whereby many persons may be in danger of incurring the disabilities in the said Act mentioned. Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and every person who have omitted to cause such affidavits to be made and filed as aforesaid, and who shall on or before the 28th day of Novr., 1752, cause one or more affidavit or affidavits to be made and filed in such manner as directed in and by the said Act, shall be, and are hereby indemnified, freed, and discharged from and against all the incapacities and disabilities in the said Act mentioned incurred, or to be incurred, for or by reason of any neglect or omission in causing such affidavit or affidavits so to be made and filed as aforesaid, shall be as effectual to all intents and purposes as if the same had been made and filed within the time limited by the said Act.

It was resolved to present this clause to the House of Commons to be inserted in the said Act, and the Deputy Secretary was ordered to deliver copies of the same to Lord Duplin, the Solicitor-General, and other Members of the House of Commons.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday the 17th Febr., 1752.
Present :—

Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. ffothergill.
„ R. Whishaw.	„ Cromwell.	

The Accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary were audited. The disbursements and allowances were found to amount to £11 4s. 8d., and the balance due to the Society was £42 16s. 9d.

At the General Meeting of the Society on the 21st Feb., 1752. Present :—

	Mr. John Hood.	} Stewards.
	„ John Edgar.	
	„ Richd. Combes.	
	„ ffrancis Plumtree.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Palmer, Wm.
„ Attwood.	„ Dobbins.	„ Roberts, Philip.
„ Altham.	„ Dax.	„ Roberts, Peter.
„ Baskerville.	„ Dodd.	„ Robinson,
„ Baker.	„ Evans.	Borret's Office.
„ Bowman.	„ ffothergil.	„ Raper.
„ Barnes.	„ Geekie.	„ Rosewell.

E

Mr. Butler, Southwark.	Mr. Green.	Mr. Skynner.
„ Brown, Edmd.	„ Grubb.	„ Saunderson.
„ Botham.	„ Harrison.	„ Stanninought.
„ Barber, John.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Southouse.
„ Boyfield.	„ Jacombe.	„ Smart.
„ Bridge.	„ Kirby.	„ Thomas.
„ Bargrave.	„ Lucas.	„ Tristram.
„ Bromley.	„ Lewis.	„ Twynihoe.
„ Beardmore.	„ Letchmore.	„ Wells.
„ Cromwell.	„ Mason.	„ Watson.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Morse.	„ Waddilove.
„ Cowper, Thomas.	„ Matthews.	„ Wade.
„ Callamy.	„ Mitchell, Thos.	„ Wallis.
„ Cox, Joshua.	„ New.	„ Wilson.
„ Cobbe.	„ Nicholson.	„ Wharton,
„ Comeline.	„ Owen.	Lincoln's Inn.
„ Colston.	„ Powell.	„ Yeo.

After the usual report had been made, the Prolocutor stated, that since the last General Meeting nothing material had been done relating to the prosecution of Mr. Alexander at the instance of the Scriveners' Company; and reported that in pursuance of the resolution of the 20th Jany., a clause for indemnifying persons who had omitted to make and file affidavits of due execution of articles, and allowing further time for that purpose, had been given to several members of the House of Commons in order to be inserted in the Act for indemnifying persons who had omitted to qualify themselves for offices and employments, and that the said clause had been inserted in the Bill which was then depending in the House of Commons. It was ordered that in case the clause passed into law, the Committee should have power forthwith to publish the contents thereof in the public papers, or in such other manner as they should think proper, at the expense of the Society.

The Deputy Secretary having laid before the Society a printed copy of the Bill then depending before the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of London, for regulating the Company of Scriveners, and the same being read and several members declaring their sentiments and opinions thereon, it was resolved that every member in his private capacity should apply to his particular friends of the Common Council to postpone the passing of that Bill until the judgment of the Court of King's Bench had been given in the case depending between the Chamberlain of the City of London and Mr. Alexander, touching his Writ of Privilege; and it was that the special Committee be summoned forthwith to consider the said Bill, and to consider whether it was proper to oppose the passing of the said Bill, and if so, to oppose the same in such manner as they should think fit. The thanks of the Society were given to Mr. Alexander for his prudent conduct and steady

behaviour in opposition to the prosecution against him at the instance of the Scriveners' Company.

The Deputy Secretary having informed the Society of some instances which had come to his knowledge of persons who, since the Act of the 22nd George II., had been articulated to serve as clerks to Attornies, and had filed affidavits of due execution of their articles, yet continued to follow trades and other professions, it was ordered that the Deputy Secretary enter in a book to be kept for that purpose all such instances as should come to his knowledge, and from time to time communicate the same to the General Committee, who were empowered to give such directions for prosecution thereon against the Masters articling such clerks, or preventing such clerks, if admitted, as they should think proper, and that the charges and expenses on these occasions should be paid out of the Society's cash.

It was also ordered, that the Committee take notice of and prosecute, at the Society's expense, any Attornies guilty of illegal practices, and every Member of the Society was desired to give notice to the Deputy Secretary of all such illegal practices as should come to their knowledge.

The Deputy Secretary was also ordered to enquire of what Courts Daniel Alexander, who lately stood in the pillory, on a conviction of being concerned in a conspiracy against the Right Honourable Mr. Edward Walpole, was admitted, and that the General Committee give directions for procuring him to be struck off the Roll.

At the meeting of the Select Committee to consider the prosecution of Mr Alexander, on the 30th April, 1750. Present :—

Mr. John Howell,	Mr. Colston.	Mr. Skynner.
in the Chair.	„ Brigstock.	„ Lucas.
„ Marriot.	„ Baskerville.	The Deputy Secretary.
„ Wade.	„ Altham.	

Mr. Alexander attended. The Minutes of the Society relating to the Bill before the Lord Mayor and Common Council, together with the Bill, were considered, and it was resolved that it was improper for the Society as a body to oppose or pray to be heard against the said Bill by Counsel, but agreed to the former resolutions of the Society in Committees, and at the last General Meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 4th May, 1752. Present :—

Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Cooper.	Mr. Howell.
„ Webb.	„ Edmd. Browne.	„ ffothergill.

The Deputy Secretary was ordered to cause the clause inserted in the Bill, passed in the preceding Session of Parliament, indemnifying persons who had omitted to make and file affidavits of execution of articles of clerkship within the time limited, to be published in the *London Gazette* once, and three times

in the *London Evening*, and the *Whitehall and General Evening Posts* on three successive days.

A meeting of the Select Committee to consider the prosecution at the instance of the Scriveners' Company was held on the 13th May, 1752. Present :—

Mr. Hopkins, in the Chair.	Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. Webb.
„ Mason.	„ Lucas.	„ Atwood.
„ Powell.	„ Skynner.	„ Monk.
„ Marriot.	„ Baskerville.	„ Pardoe.
„ Wadilove.	„ Wade.	„ Howell.
„ ffothergill.	„ Cooper.	The Deputy Secretary.

Mr. Alexander also was present. Upon reading the Act of Common Council for regulating the Scriveners' Company, it was unanimously resolved that the said Act, so far as it may be intended to affect sworn Solicitors or Attornies of the Courts of Law or Equity in the conveyancing branch of their business, was contrary to law, and that no Attorney or Solicitor should submit thereto until the validity thereof had been properly determined ; and that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the above mentioned Act of Common Council, the Society should defend such action at the general expense ; and it was resolved to lay such resolution before a Special General Meeting of the Society, to be summoned by the Deputy Secretary, and to be held on the 29th of the same month at the Devil Tavern, at six o'clock in the evening. At a meeting of the same Committee, on the 27th May, 1752. Present :—

Philip Cateret Webb, Esq., in the Chair.	Mr. Monk.	Mr. Marriot
Mr. Powell.	„ Brigstock.	„ Attwood.
„ Waddilove.	„ Mason.	„ Altham.
	„ Baskerville.	The Deputy Secretary.

It was resolved unanimously, that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the General Bye Law of the City of London, whereon the action pending against Mr. Alexander was founded, that such action should be defended at the expense of the Society ; and it was resolved to lay this resolution before the Members at the Special General Meeting on the following Friday.

At the General Meeting of the Society on the 29th May, 1752. Present :—

Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Cobb.	Mr. Powell.
„ Atwood.	„ Comeline.	„ Pardoe.
„ Altham.	„ Colston.	„ Plumtree.
„ Baskerville.	„ Dodd.	„ Pembroke.
„ Baker.	„ ffothergil.	„ Raper.
„ Bowman.	„ Green.	„ Skinner.

Mr. Bernard.	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Sanderson.
„ Burton.	„ Hood.	„ Stanninought.
„ Benton.	„ Highmore.	„ Sparrow.
„ Butler, Saml.	„ Hurst.	„ Smart.
„ Beech.	„ Jackson.	„ Sheffield.
„ Boyfield.	„ Jesser.	„ Southouse.
„ Brigstock.	„ Joynes.	„ Tyley.
„ Beardmore.	„ Lucas.	„ Thomas.
„ Cromwell.	„ Letch.	„ Tilly.
„ Coppinger.	„ Langmore.	„ Webb.
„ Cranston.	„ Mason.	„ Waldoe.
„ Combes.	„ Marriot.	„ Waddilove.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Martin.	„ Wade.
„ Cowper.	„ New.	„ Wharton, Symond's Inn.
„ Callamy.	„ Nicoll.	„ Wilson.

After reading the resolution of the last General Meeting, the Scriveners' Company's Bill, and the resolutions of the Select Committee relating to the Act of Common Council, as also the said Act and the Bye Law of the City of London, whereon the action against Mr. Alexander was pending, it was unanimously resolved that, in the opinion of the Society, the said Act, so far as it was intended to affect the Sworn Attornies and Solicitors of the respective Courts of Law and Equity, in the conveyancing branch of their business, was contrary to law, and that no Attorney or Solicitor should submit thereto, and that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the said Act, the Society would defend such action at the general expense. It was also unanimously resolved, that if any action should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor on the General Bye Law of the City of London, on which the action against Mr. Alexander was founded, such action should also be defended at the general expense of the Society. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to have the foregoing resolutions inserted in the following public papers: *The Daily Advertiser*, *The General Advertiser*, *The Gazetteer*, and *The London Advertiser*. At the same meeting the Select Committee were fully empowered to give directions from time to time for defending all actions which should be brought on the said Act of Common Council or Bye Law against any Attorney or Solicitor, and to employ such persons as they thought proper in the defence of such actions, reporting their proceedings from time to time to the Society at the General Meetings as occasion should require.

At a meeting of the Select Committee, on the 15th June, 1752. Present:—

Mr. Denton, in the Chair.	Mr. Wade.	Mr. Altham.
„ Baskerville.	„ Colstone.	„ Lucas.
„ Powell.	„ Brigstock.	The Deputy Secretary.
„ Monk.	„ Waddilove.	

It was resolved that Mr. Wm. Mason, one of the members of the Committee, be desired to undertake the defence of all actions which should be brought against any Attorney or Solicitor under the Act of the Common Council for regulating the Scriveners' Company, or upon the General Bye Law of the City of London, the said Mr. Wm. Mason taking the direction of the Committee, touching such defence from time to time as he should judge necessary.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 22nd June, 1752. Present :—

Mr. Skynner.	Mr. R. Wishaw.	Mr. Pardoe.
„ Thomas.	„ Cromwell.	

The Accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary were audited, and the disbursements and allowances were found to amount to £31 3s. 2d., and the balance due to the Society to £30 19s. 11d.

At the same meeting the Committee proposed to retain the following Sergeants and Counsel to defend any action that should be brought against any member of the Society by the Chamberlain of the City of London, on the Bye Law of the said City, or on the Act of Common Council lately passed :—

Mr. Sergeant Prime.	Mr. Bathurst.	Mr. Pratt.
„ „ Willes.	„ Gould.	„ Huett.
„ „ Poole.		

This proposal was ordered to be laid before the Society at the following General Meeting.

At the General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern on Friday, the 26th Febr., 1752. Present :—

	Mr. Saml. Comeline.	} Stewards.
	„ Peter Roberts.	
	„ Edmund Browne.	
	„ Joseph Mathews.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Dax.	Mr. Palmer, Robert.
„ Atwood.	„ Dodd.	„ Petre.
„ Adams.	„ D'Yough.	„ Plumtree, Francis.
„ Altham.	„ Durore.	„ Penfold.
„ Athawes.	„ Evans.	„ Poole.
„ Biscoe.	„ Fothergill.	„ Peale.
„ Baskerville.	„ French.	„ Palmer, Charlton.
„ Baker.	„ Francis.	„ Pembroke.
„ Bowman.	„ Green.	„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Bernard.	„ Grubb.	„ Plumtree, Polydore.
„ Barnes.	„ Goodwin.	„ Ryder.
„ Burton.	„ Gwatkin.	„ Rosewell.
„ Bourgh.	„ Gason.	„ Raper.

Mr. Butler, Saml.	Mr. Gassett.	Mr. Russell.
„ Beech.	„ Hunt.	„ Skynner.
„ Boyfield.	„ Howell.	„ Stanninought, Senr.
„ Bridge.	„ Hood.	„ Strickland.
„ Bargrave.	„ Harrison.	„ Sloper.
„ Brigstock.	„ Hippesley.	„ Smart.
„ Backhouse.	„ Highmore.	„ Sayer, James.
„ Beardmore.	„ Hindley.	„ Smith, Henry.
„ Benn, Thomas.	„ Inge.	„ Stanninought, Junr.
„ Burr.	„ Jesser.	„ Seawell.
„ Cooper, Francis.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Stoneham.
„ Cromwell.	„ Kirkby.	„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Lloyd.	„ Thomas.
„ Crewys, Henry.	„ Lucas.	„ Tayler, Wm.
„ Coppinger.	„ Letch.	„ Tovey.
„ Cranstone.	„ Langmore.	„ Vaughan.
„ Combes.	„ Letchmore.	„ Upton.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Lesure.	„ Wells.
„ Cowper, Thomas.	„ Lane.	„ Watson.
„ Callamy.	„ Lough.	„ Wakelin.
„ Crewys, Thomas.	„ Mason.	„ Whishaw, Rd.
„ Crofts.	„ Marriott.	„ Woodhouse.
„ Chambre.	„ Mitchell, Thomas.	„ Watkinson.
„ Collier.	„ Monk.	„ Whitchurch.
„ Chatfield.	„ Moreland.	„ Wylde.
„ Cobb.	„ Nicholson.	„ Wilson.
„ Colstone.	„ Nix.	„ Wharton, Joseph.
„ Cecill.	„ Owen, Thomas.	„ White.
„ Coats.	„ Owen, Charles.	„ Yeo.
„ Dobbins.	„ Powell.	

It was unanimously requested that Mr. ffotherby Baker should take upon himself the office of Prolocutor pro hac vice, and he took his place accordingly.

The Deputy Secretary received from Messrs. Thos. Benn, Burr, Cecil, Coates, D'Youngh, Durore, french, Francis, Lesure, Lane, Lough, Moreland, Nix, Charles Owen, Evan Paterson, Polidore Plumtree, Russell, Staninought Junr., Seawell, Stoneham, Sayer, Upton, and White, 10s. 6d. each for the use of the Society as their contributions.

The Prolocutor reported that the Committee had audited the accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary, and

That there remd in ye Secretary's hands at the last General Meeting, and still remains	l s d 14 : 15 : 6
That the Deputy Secretary's Rects, including the Ballance in his hands at the last General Meet- ing, amounts to	47 : 7 : 7
and his disbursemts and allowances to	31 : 3 : 2
and that there rems in the Deputy Secretary's hands—	16 : 4 : 5
Neat Ballance of cash due to ye Society	30 : 19 : 11

After the minutes of the last General Meeting and subsequent Committees were read, the Prolocutor reported, that since the last General Meeting there had not been anything material done relating to the prosecution against Mr. Alexander, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company; that the clause mentioned in the Minutes of the Meeting of the 21st Febr. had been passed into a law, and that the Committee had caused the same to be published in the *Gazette*, and three of the evening papers; that no complaint had been laid before the Committee since the said meeting of any Attornies being guilty of illegal practices, and that the Committee had caused the Rolls of Attornies admitted in the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas to be searched, and had not found that Daniel Alexander, mentioned in the Minutes of the meeting of the 21st Febr., had been admitted an Attorney of those Courts. The Minutes of the Select Committee were read and confirmed, and the Society unanimously agreed to employ Mr. Wm. Mason as therein mentioned, and Mr. Mason was directed to take the directions of the Select Committee touching such defence from time to time. The proposal of the Select Committee of the 15th June, with regard to retaining Sergeants and Counsel, being read, and the members of that Committee having withdrawn to consider thereof, and being returned, proposed that the following Sergeants and Counsel be retained :

Mr. Sergt. Prime.	Mr. Sergt. Poole.	Mr. Bathurst.
„ Sergt. Draper.	Sir Richard Lloyd.	„ Evans.
„ Sergt. Willes.	Mr. Hume Campbell.	„ Williams.

It was ordered that the said Sergts and Councill be forthwith retained for the Society to defend all actions wch shall be brought agt any Attorney or Solicitor by the Chamberlain of the City of London, now and for the time being; ordered that if any of the said Sergts. or Councill should be retained by the Scriveners' Company, or by the Chamberlain of the City of London, that then the Select Committee be empowered to retain such other Councill as they shall think proper.

At a meeting of the Select Committee on the 7th July, 1752. Present :—

Mr. Brigstock, in the	Mr. Comeline.	Mr. Attwood.
Chair.	„ Altham.	„ T. Cowper.
„ Baskerville.	„ Mason.	„ Powell.
„ Wade.	„ Marriot.	„ Deputy Secretary.

Mr. Thomas Constable attended. Several summonses served by the Scriveners' Company on Mr. Thos. Constable, Mr. John Dowding, Mr. Thos. Moye, & Mr. Nathaniell Andrews, requiring them personally to appear before the Ma. & Wardens of that Company on the 8th of July, then and there to take upon themselves the freedom, and to be made freemen of the said Company, as they should answer the contrary at their peril, were read, and it was unanimously resolved to totally disregard the aforesaid summonses. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to give notice of this resolution to Mr. Dowding, Mr. Moye, & Mr. Andrews.

It was ordered at the same meeting that the general resolutions of the Society, of the 29th of May last, be reprinted three times in the *Daily Advertiser* and *Gazetteer*, with the following addition thereto :

“The Attornies or Sollrs. who have been or shall be summoned to take upon them the freedom of the Scriveners' Company, are desired to apply to Mr. Edward Bowman at his house in Chancery Lane.”

At a meeting of the Select Committee on the 19th Aug., 1752. Present :—

Mr. Benton, in the	Mr. Altham.	Mr. Baskerville.
Chair.	„ Colston.	„ Atwood.
„ ffothergill.	„ Hopkins.	„ Richard Wishaw,
„ Mason.	„ Marriot.	Secretary.
„ Waddilove.		

Mr. John Bridgwater attended. It was reported by Mr. Mason that several actions had been entered in the Mayor's Court at the suit of the Chamberlain of London, against Mr. Cornelius Dutch, an Attorney of the Court of Common Pleas, and against Mr. Fotherby Baker, Mr. Saml. Butler, and Mr. Wm. Skimpshire, Mr. Samuel Comeline, Mr. Edwd. Wade, Mr. Ralph Carr, Mr. Charles Brown, and Mr. James Green, all Attornies of the Court of King's Bench, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, and that Mr. Mason had sued out Writs of Priviledge for all the said 9 gentlemen, which had been allowed. Mr. Mason further reported that a like action at the suit of the Chamberlain had been brought in the same Court against Mr. John Bridgwater, a Sollr. in the Court of Chancery, and Mr. Bridgwater attending, was called in, and having produced his admission to act as a Sollr. in the Court of Chancery, and having given satisfactory answers to the several questions proposed to him by the Committee, with regard to the business of conveyancing by him, transacted in the City of London and the libertys thereof, and having informed the Comittee that he had been admitted a Sollr. of the Court of the Dutchy of Lancaster for upwards of three years, he was then

desired to withdraw, and the Committee took into consideration the circumstances of the case of the said Mr. Bridgwater, and resolved to defend the same at the expense of the Society. The Committee, after debate and due consideration, unanimously resolved that an habeus corpus be obtained for removing the said action against Mr. Bridgwater into the Court of Common Pleas, and Mr. Mason was desired to sue forth such Writ at such time as he should think proper.

The Select Committee met again on the 20th Novr., 1752. Present :

	Philip Carteret Webb, Esq., in the Chair.	
Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Marriot.	Mr. R. Whishaw, &
„ Wade.	„ Mason.	The Deputy
„ Altham.	„ Pardoe.	Secretary.
„ Powell.	„ Brigstock.	

Mr. Mason reported that since the preceding meeting anor action had been brought agt Mr. Alexander, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, at the suit of the Chamberlain of the City of London, on the same Bye Law the former action agt him was brought, and that a Writ of Priviledge had been sued out for him ; and further informed the Committee that Motions had been made in the King's Bench to quash the Writs of Privilege brought by Mr. Alexander and Mr. ffotherby Baker, and that rules had been obtained to show cause, and that he had prepared and delivered briefs and instructions to the Councill retained by the Society to show cause on that occasion. The Committee passed a resolution entirely approving of Mr. Mason's conduct. It was resolved that, in the opinion of the Committee, the sume of one Guinea should be paid by each member of the Society into the hands of the Deputy Secretary towards defraying the expense of defending the several suits already brought or to be brought against Attornies or Sollicitors upon the Bye Laws of the City of London. Each of the members present at the Committee paid the same accordingly.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 19th Febry., 1753. Present :

Mr. D. Thomas.	Mr. Edmund Brown.	Mr. Robert Pardoe.
„ R. Cromwell.	„ Christopher Denton.	„ John Skeyner.
„ Edward Benton.		

The Accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary were audited, and it was found that there remained in the Secretary's hands at the last General Meeting, and that there still remained in his hands a sum of £14 15s. 6d. ; that the receipts of the Deputy Secretary, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, and including a sum of £199 10s. collected from the members, in consequence of the Select Committee's resolution of the 20th Novr., amounted to £232 17s. 5d., and his disbursements and allowances to £23 9s., and that there remained in the Deputy Secretary's

hands £209 8s. 5d., the "neat ballance" of cash due to the Society being £224 3s. 11d.

Mr. John Alexander having been desired to send in his Bill of Costs in the suit agt him by the Scriveners' Company, in the name of the late Sir John Bosworth, the late Chamberlain of the City of London, By a letter, acquainted the Committee that he had no demand on that account, except a sume of £6 3s. 10d., which he disbursed out of pocket, and that he felt himself greatly obliged to the Gentlemen of the society in general and to the Comitte, for their assistance in his defence, and should be always glad to contribute what lay in his power for the benefitt of the profession. The Deputy Secretary was ordered to pay out of the balance in his hands the aforesaid sum of £6 3s. 10d. to Mr. Alexander, and out of the same balance to pay Mr. Mason £40 on account of fees and disbursements in the Society's affairs.

At the General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern on Friday, the 23rd Febr., 1753. Present:—

	Mr. Alexr. Whitchurch.	
	„ Thomas Harrison.	} Stewards.
	„ Robert Palmer.	
	„ Thomas Ryder.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Constable.	
„ Atwood	„ Clare.	„ Mears.
„ Altham.	„ Cope.	„ Massey.
„ Athawes.	„ Denton.	„ New.
„ Baskerville.	„ Dobbins.	„ Nicholson.
„ Baker.	„ Dax.	„ Nix.
„ Bowman.	„ D'Yough.	„ Owen.
„ Barnes.	„ Dubuc.	„ Powell.
„ Burton.	„ Eddison.	„ Pardoe.
„ Benton.	„ Evans.	„ Partridge.
„ Butler, Saml.	„ ffothergil.	„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Brown, Edmd.	„ ffrancis.	„ Plumtree.
„ Barber, John.	„ ffraine.	„ Popham.
„ Buckle.	„ Grose.	„ Raper.
„ Boyfield.	„ Green.	„ Roberts, Peter.
„ Ballard.	„ Gardiner.	„ Spateman.
„ Bridge.	„ Grubb.	„ Sanderson.
„ Bargrave.	„ Goodwin.	„ Sparrow.
„ Burr.	„ Gason.	„ Strickland.
„ Bennet, John.	„ Grove.	„ Smart.
„ Bennet.	„ Heron.	„ Southouse.
„ Buxton.	„ Hindley.	„ Smith, Henry.
„ Cooper, ffrancis.	„ Holker.	„ Stanninought, Junr.
„ Cromwell.	„ Hamilton.	„ Sayer.

Mr. Coppinger.	Mr. Hamersley.	Mr. Thomas.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Jesser.	„ Tims.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Upton.
„ Callamy.	„ Jacombe.	„ Watson.
„ Crofts.	„ Letchmore.	„ Webb.
„ Chambre.	„ Mason.	„ Wallis.
„ Cox, Joshua.	„ Marriott.	„ Wilson.
„ Chatfield.	„ Mitchell, Thos.	„ White.
„ Cobb.	„ Monk.	„ Waters.
„ Comeline.	„ Martin.	„ Yeo.
„ Colston.		

The Deputy Secretary received from Messrs. Jno. Bennet, Bennet, Buxton, Costable, Clare, Cope, Grove, Hindley, Holker, Hamilton, Mears, Massey, Popham, and Mr. ffraine 10s. 6*d.* each for the use of the Society as their contributions.

The Prolocutor reported that ye Comittee had auditted the accots of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary, and stated the result as shown in the minutes of the Comittee of the 19th of Febry., 1753.

Ordered that the prolocutor, Mr. Fotherby Baker, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Baskerville, Mr. Benton, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Mason, Mr. Pardoe, and Mr. Secretary Whishaw, members of the Select Committee, or any five of them, and as many more of that Committee as think proper to attend, doe waite on Sr. Richard Lloyd, Mr. Hume Campbell, Mr. Bathurst, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Williams, the Council retained by the Society, to return them the Society's thanks for their services in the Society's behalf, and that they meet for that purpose next Thursday at 6 o'clock in the evening, at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavr. in Chancery Lane, and that the Deputy Secretary give notice to them accordingly.

After the usual business had been disposed of, the Prolocutor (Mr. ffotherby Baker) reported on behalf of the Committee, that since the last General Meetings several actions having been entered in the Mayor's Court, at ye suit of the Chamberlain of the City of London, agt several members of the Society, and others at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, Writs of Priviledge had been sued out and allowed ;

That in Michaelmas Term motions were made in the Court of King's Bench to quash the Writs of Priviledge brought by Mr. Alexander and Mr. Ffotherby Baker, and rules obtaind to show cause, That the Councill retained by the Society had had briefs, and had been fully instructed ;

That no cause had as yet been shown, the Court of King's Bench not having been at leisure to hear the argumt, so that the rules to show cause had been from time to time enlarged, and then stood enlarged till next Easter Term.

It having been reported that Mr. George Wilson and Mr. Giles Taylor, members of the General Committee, were dead, and that Mr. Wm. Round, Mr. Theodore Johnson, and Mr. Henry Crewys had left off business and retired into the country, and that Mr. Wm. Cranstone, Mr. James Mead, and Mr. John Mitchell desired to be excused their attendance, it being inconvenient for them to attend,

Mr. James Bernard.	Mr. Wm. Mason.	Mr. John Alexander.
„ ffotherby Baker.	„ Joseph Dobbins.	„ George Baskerville.
„ Thomas Brigstock.	„ John Powell.	

were elected in their place.

Ordered that Mr. James Bernard. }
 Mr. Joseph Dobbins. } Be members of the
 Mr. John Alexander. } Select Committee.

In the places of

Mr. Lucas, Esqr. . . .	now called to ye Barr.
Mr. Theodore Johnson.	} Retired into the Country.
Mr. Wm. Round.	

It was referred to the Committee to consider and report to the next General Meeting their opinion on a letter received by Mr. Cromwell from Mr. John Ffelton, the author of the *Ffriendly Hints*, intreating the flavour of him to encourage a disposition in the Gentlemen of the Law Society to reward or make a kind return for his being at some trouble and expense in his endeavours to serve a great number of practicers, both by his *Ffriendly Hints*, and obtaining materials to show the necessity of applying to Parliamt for further time to fyle affidts, and informing Mr. Cromwell that he had shown to the Law Committee a vast number of defaulters in alphabetical order, and that the Committee, on receiving an application from him, immediately met, and drew up a clause for further time ; That he had been at considerable expense, and that if his endeavours had proved truly usefull, and the Society thought he deserved a reimbursemt or reward, he should think it his duty to accept it.

Which letter being read, ordered that the same and the matters therein contained be referred to the consideration of the General Comittee, and that they report their opinion thereon to ye next General Meeting.

At a meeting of the Select Comee on the 31st May, 1753. Present :—

Mr. Marriott, in the	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Powell.
Chair.	„ ffothergill.	The Deputy
„ Attwood.	„ Mason.	Secretary.
„ R. Wishaw.	„ Altham.	

Mr. Mason reported that ye Councill for the Society had shown cause agt the Rules obtained by the Chamberlain of the City of London for superceding the Writs of Priviledge sued out for Mr. Alexander and Mr. ffotherby

Baker, in the several actions brot agt them in the Mayor's Court, and had on that occasion greatly exerted themselves, and that the adverse Council had desired time till ye next Term to reply to ye cause shown wch the Court had granted, by further enlarging the Rules to the second day of the following Trinity Term.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 16th July, 1753. Present:—

Mr. Denton, in the	Mr. Bernard.	Mr. Cromwell.
Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Edmund Brown.
„ Mason.	„ Brigstock.	„ Thomas.
„ Baskerville.		

The Committee audited the Accounts of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary, and found that there remained in the Secretary's hands at the last General Meeting, and still remained, a balance of £14 15s. 6d.; that the receipts of the Deputy Secretary, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, and £25 4s. received by him from several members, in consequence of the Select Comttee's resolution of the 20th Nov. 1752, amounted to £272 19s. 1d., that his disbursements and allowances amounted to £58 14s. 0d., and that there remained in his hands £214 5s. 1d., the "net ballance" due to the Society being £229 0s. 7d.

The Committee, pursuant to the order of the last General Meeting, took into consideration the subject of Mr. Felton's letter mentioned in the Minutes of that meeting, and were unanimously of opinion that fifteen guineas would be a reasonable gratuity for Mr. Felton's services.

At a General Meeting of the Society on the 20th July, 1753. Present:—

	Mr. Alexr. Hamilton.	} Stewards.
	„ Wm. Southouse.	
	„ Thos. Athawes.	
	„ Henry Smith.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Barnard.	Mr. Mitchell, Thos.
„ Atwood.	„ Barnes.	„ Martin.
„ Adams.	„ Burton.	„ Mears.
„ Altham.	„ Butler, John.	„ Mason.
„ Baskerville.	„ Benton.	„ Nichol.
„ Baker.	„ Butler, Saml.	„ Nicholson.
„ Bennet, John.	„ Barber, John.	„ Nix.
„ Bennet, Thos.	„ Bridge.	„ Poole.
„ Cromwell.	„ Bargrave.	„ Paterson.
„ Craddock.	„ Bromley.	„ Evan.
„ Crawford.	„ Beardmore.	„ Randolph.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Ben, Thos.	„ Ryder.
„ Goodwin.	„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Rosewell.
„ Gason.	„ Calamy.	„ Raper.

Mr. Hunt.	Mr. Cobb.	Mr. Skinner.
„ Hood.	„ Comeline.	„ Sanderson.
„ Haywood.	„ Colston.	„ Strickland.
„ Hindley.	„ Cecil.	„ Stubbs.
„ Owen, Thos.	„ Denton.	„ Sayer, James.
„ Owen, Chas.	„ Dax.	„ Stanninought, Junr.
„ Powel.	„ Dubuc.	„ Upton.
„ Palmer, Wm.	„ ffothergil.	„ Wells.
„ Pardoe.	„ ffrench.	„ Webb.
„ Plumtree, ffr.	„ Green.	„ Whishaw.
„ Seawel.	„ Grubb.	„ Waddilove.
„ Sayer, Henry.	„ Holker.	„ Watkinson.
„ Short.	„ Jackson.	„ Wallis.
„ Tily.	„ Jackmar.	„ Wharton, Jonathan.
„ Thomas.	„ Jenkinson.	„ White.
„ Tovey.	„ Kirkby.	„ Yeo.
„ Bowman.	„ Mason.	

Mr. ffotherby Baker was unanimously chosen Prolocutor in the place of the late Prolocutor, Mr. John Whishaw, deced., and he took his seat accordingly.

The Prolocutor reported, on behalf of the Committee, that since the preceding General Meeting the Council for ye Society had shown cause agt the Rules obtained by the Chamberlain for the City of London, for superceeding the Writs of Priviledge sued out for Mr. Alexander and Mr. ffotherby Baker, and on that occasion greatly exerted themselves; that the Councell for the Scriveners' Company did not think proper to reply, but desired time till the preceding Trinity Term for that purpose, and that therefore at their instance the Rules were enlarged till ye second day in Trinity Term, but that the Scriveners' Company had not thought proper to reply, nor had the Rules been further enlarged.

The Prolocutor also reported the opinion of the Committee as to the gratuity proposed to be made to Mr. ffelton, and the Deputy Secretary was ordered to pay to Mr. ffelton the sum of fifteen guineas, as a gratuity for his services.

At the same meeting a similar resolution to that adopted on the 23rd of Feby, 1753, was passed as to the same deputation waiting on the Counsel for the Society, and returning to them the Society's thanks for their services.

It appearing that the balance due to the Society amounted to £229 10s. 7d., and the Deputy Secretary, at the preceding General Meeting, having declared his readiness to invest the balance then in his hands, or any part thereof, in such publick ffunds as the Society thought proper, it was ordered that so much of the said sum as would purchase £150 stock in the Three Per Cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities be laid out and invested in such Annuities, in the names of the Prolocutor, Mr. ffotherby Baker, Mr. Alexander Hamilton,

and Mr. Wm. Southouse, and that they accept the same, and execute a declaration of trust, that such Annuities so standing in their names are for the use of the Society, and it was ordered that such annuities when purchased, and the dividends to arise therefrom, should be from time to time subject to the orders and resolutions of the Society at their General Meetings; and that the said Trustees shd execute to the Deputy Secretary a letter of Attorney to empower him from time to time to receive the dividends payable on account of such Annuities. The Secretary, Mr. Richard Whishaw, was ordered to pay over to the Deputy Secretary £14 15s. 6d., the balance in his hands.

Ordered that Mr. John Jackson be added a member of the General and Select Committees, in the place of Mr. Joseph Dobbins, deced.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 26th July, 1753. Present:—

The Prolocutor.	Mr. Barnes.	Mr. Baskerville.
Mr. Whishaw.	„ Mason.	

The Order made at the General Meeting for several members to wait on the Society's Councill was read, and the five members then present accordingly waited on the Councill. But were not so fortunate as to meet with Sir Richd. Lloyd, Mr. Bathurst, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Williams at their respective chambers and houses, they left cyps of the order with their respective clerks, with a memorandum at the bottom of ye names of the members who attended on that occasion, and the purposes for which they came.

And the members waited upon Mr. Hume Campbell, and the Prolocutor returned him the Society's thanks, agreeable to the sd order, which he reced in a very obliging manner, and declared himself at all times ready and willing to do everything in his power for their service.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 9th Augt., 1753. Present :

	The Prolocutor.	
Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Fothergil.	Mr. Thomas.
„ Powell.	„ Alexander.	„ Mason.
„ Brigstock.	„ Baskerville.	„ Whishaw.

It being represented to the Committee that Mr. John Sparry, an Attorney of the King's Bench, and then a prisoner in the fleet, had commenced and prosecuted an action in the sd Court agst one Charles Huddy, for the recovery of fees and disbursemts, pretended to be due to Mr. Jones; whilst he, Sparry, was a prisoner, contrary to the Statute of the 12th of George II., and that on a motion made in the King's Bench, a Rule had been obtained, that Sparry should show cause why he should not be struck off the Roll, and incapacitated from acting as an Attorney or Sollr. for ye ffuture. It was ordered that the Deputy Secretary should attend Mr. Basil Herne, the Attorney concerned for the Defendant in the said action, and enquire into the state of the above ffacts, and as to what affidavits and proofs

he had to support the said Rule, and to inform Mr. Herne that the Society were ready at their own expense to assist in prosecuting Sparry for the "misdemeanor," and to desire Mr. Herne to accept their advice and assistance. Mr. Mason and Mr. Alexander were desired to go with the Deputy Secretary when he attended Mr. Herne for the purpose aforesaid. It was also resolved to instruct the Council employed to support the said Rule, that they may inform the Court that the Society would at all times be ready, at their own expense, to prosecute Attornies for any unfair practices, and would use their utmost endeavours to detect all illegal practices, and to prosecute Attorneys or Solicitors who should be surreptitiously admitted.

In consideration of the fact that several unfortunate Attorneys and Solicitors confined in prisons took upon them to defend suits at law and equity, and the Committee being of opinion that such practice was contrary to the intent of the Act 12th of George II., it was resolved to refer to the consideration of the Society at the following General Meeting, whether it may not be proper to apply to Parliament at a convenient time for an amendment of the said Act, in order to prevent Attornies and Solicitors whilst prisoners from defending any actions or suits.

At a meeting of the Comee on the 18th Febr'y, 1754. Present :

Mr. Cromwell,	Mr. Bernard.	Mr. Mason.	Mr. ffothergill.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Denton.	„ Baskerville.

The Accounts of the Deputy Secrey were audited, and his receipts, including the balance in his hands at the General Meeting (the £14 15s. 6d. handed over by the Secretary, and £10 10s. received by him from several members, in consequence of the Select Committee's resolution of the 20th Novr., 1752, and £2 5s. received since the General Meeting for half a year's dividend on the £150 Three Per Cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities), amounted to £244 8s. 1d., and his disbursements (including £156 7s. 6d. paid for the purchase of the said Bank Annuities), together with his allowances, £189 8s. 2d., and there remained in his hands £54 19s. 11d.

At a General Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 22nd Febr'y., 1754. Present :—

	Mr. Jonathan Colston.	} Stewards.	
	„ Michael Tovey.		
	„ Thos. Haywood.		
	„ Rich. Whishaw.		
Mr. Atwood.	Mr. Denton.		Mr. Partridge.
„ Ayton.	„ Dax.		„ Poole.
„ Altham.	„ Dodd.		„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Athawes.	„ Durore.		„ Popham.
„ Briggs.	„ Dubuc.		„ Praed.
„ Biscoe.	„ Davies.		„ Ryder.

F

Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Eyre.	Mr. Rosewell.
„ Baker.	„ Eddison.	„ Spateman.
„ Bowman.	„ ffothergil.	„ Sanderson.
„ Bernard.	„ ffraine.	„ Sparrow.
„ Barnes.	„ Greene.	„ Strickland.
„ Burton.	„ Grubb.	„ Southouse.
„ Butler, John.	„ Gwatkin.	„ Sayer, James.
„ Benton.	„ Goostry.	„ Smith, Henry.
„ Butler, Saml.	„ Hood.	„ Stanninought, Junr.
„ Barber, John.	„ Harrison.	„ Seawell.
„ Bromley.	„ Hamilton.	„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Barnardiston.	„ Holker.	„ Short.
„ Baines.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Simpson.
„ Baron.	„ Jones.	„ Thomas.
„ Cooper, ffrancis.	„ Letch.	„ Taylor.
„ Cromwell.	„ Lewis.	„ Upton.
„ Cornthwaite.	„ Letchmore.	„ Watson.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Mason.	„ Waddilove.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Marriot.	„ Wade.
„ Calamy.	„ Morse.	„ Wallis.
„ Crofts.	„ Massey.	„ Wharton, Jonathan.
„ Chambre.	„ Powell.	„ White.
„ Chatfield.	„ Petre.	„ Wall.
„ Cobb.	„ Palmer, Wm.	„ Webb.
„ Comeline.	„ Penfold.	„ Yeo.
„ Cecil.		

The Deputy Secretary received from Messrs. Barnardiston, Baines, Baron, Goostry, Jones, Simpson, Walland, Webb, 10s. 6*d.* each, for the use of the Society, for their respective contributions towards the fund for discharging the expences of the Society.

And the Deputy Secretary received from Messrs. Ayton, Biscoe, Barnardiston, Baines, Baron, Davies, Goostry, Jones, Pread, Simpson, Wall, and Webb, one guinea each, in consequence of the Committee's resolution of the 20th of Novr., 1752, and order made at the General Meeting the 23rd february, 1753.

The Prolocutor reported from the General Committee, that the Counsel for the Scriveners' Company had not, since the last General Meeting, thought proper to reply to the arguments of the Society's Councill, on showing cause against the Rules obtained by the Chamberlain of the City of London for superceeding the Writs of Privilege sued out for Mr. Alexander and Mr. Fotherby Baker in the several actions brought against them in the Mayor's Court, at the instance of the Scriveners' Company, nor had the Rules been since enlarged.

It was referred to the Committee to consider a proper application to be made, either to the Judges of the respective Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, and the Barons of the Court of Exchequer, or to Parliament, to prevent a bail put in in any action, from being fixed with the payment of the debts recovered in such actions, without express notice in writing being first given to such bail respectively, of the Scire facias sued out against them, and the Committee were likewise to consider the properest method to be taken to prevent sham or hired bail being given in any action at law.

It was also referred to the General Committee to consider the most proper method of applying to the Courts of King's Bench, or Exchequer Chamber, or to Parliament, or otherwise to obtain some general directions to the officers appointed to tax costs on the affirmance of any judgments, that they not only should have regard to the costs which the Defendants in error had been put to in the defence of such Writs of Error, but also compute and allow to the Complainants in the original judgments interest on the sums recovered in the original judgments, from the time of such judgments being recovered to the time of affirming the same, agreeable to the then existing practice on the affirmance of judgments obtained on the plea side of the Court of Exchequer, by the special judicature before whom Writs of Error on such judgments were brought and made returnable. It was also referred to the General Committee to consider some proper application to be made, that bail may be put in on every Writ of Error brought where no bail was then required; and also some proper application to be made, that where Writs of Error were brought by Executors in judgments recovered against them, that such Plaintiffs in Error should pay costs upon all such Writs in like manner as other Plaintiffs in Error are liable to pay.

At a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday the 15th of May, 1754.
Present:—

Mr. Christopher Denton in the Chair.

Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Cromwell.
„ Mason.	„ White.	„ ffothergill.
„ Baskerville.	„ Pardoe.	„ Letch.

The Committee took into consideration the several matters contained in the order of reference made at the General Meeting, and with regard to so much of the first order as directed the Committee to consider the properest method to be taken to prevent sham or hired bail being given in any action at law. The Committee were of opinion that it would be very improper for them or the Society, as a collective body, to propose or dictate any method, to remedy that evil, to any of the Courts of law, in regard the Courts of Law had it already in their power to discountenance and prevent sham or hired bail being put in. The consideration of the remainder of the first order was postponed, Mr. Wade, on whose motion that order was made, being absent.

The Committee then took into consideration the second order of reference,

and many reasons were offered in support of the subject matter of the motion, on wch that order was founded, and the Committee were reminded of an Act of Parliament of the 3rd of Henry VII. chap. 10, which recites, that oftentimes Plts or demandts that had judgment to recover, were delayed of execution by the Deft or Tent agt whom judgment had been given, suing a Writ of Error to annul or reverse the sd judgment to the intent only to delay execution of the sd judgment: and enacts, that if any such Deft or Tent sued (afore execution had) any Writ of Error, to reverse any such judgment in delaying of execution, yt then if the same judgment be affirmed good in the Writ of Error, and not erroneous, or if the Writ of Error be discontinued in the default of the party, or if the person that sueth be nonsuited in the same, then the said person against whom the Writ of Error is sued shall recover his costs and damages for his delay and wrongfull vexation in the same, by the discretion of the Justice afore whom the Writ of Error is sued: and recites that by an Act of the 19th of Henry VII. chap. 20, reciting the former Act, and that the same had not been duly put into execution, by reason whereof as well Plaintiffs as demandts in divers actions by them sued sith the making of the said Statute have been oftentimes delayed of their execution, to their great and insupportable hurt, loss, and charges: and enacts that the sd former Act, the third of the reign, concerning the premises be good and effectual, and that from thenceforth it be duly put in execution.

The Committee were of opinion that it would be proper in some action, then depending on a Writ of Error, whercon judgment may be affirmed or Plt in Error, nonsuited, to try the event on application to the Court on the above Acts of Parliament that the proper officer, on taxing the costs, should consider and allow to the Plaintiff in the original action damages for the detention of the debt over and above the costs taxed, regard being had to interest on Plaintiff's debt on his judgment.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 29th May, 1754. Present:—

Mr. Barnes in the Chair.

Mr. Wade.	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Denton.	Mr. Jackson.
„ White.	„ Alexander.	„ Whishaw.	„ Atwood.
„ Powell.	„ Benton.		

The further consideration of the several references was proceeded with, some of the matters referred to being adjourned to another day. The second order of reference was again read, together with a case in Lord Macclesfield's time, when he was Chief Justice of the King's Bench, "Hill 1 Geo: 1 between Holroi and Ebizoon," reported in *Cases in Law and Equity*, fo. 274, was produced and read, wherein a matter of interest being allowed by way of costs and damages on a non pros. of the Writ of Error was argued, and it was resolved by the whole Court that the Deft upon a Writ of Error brot in B: R, shd not have interest allowed him by way of damages for the same

adjudged due to him from the time of the first judgment pending a Writ of Error.

At the next meeting of the Committee, on the 20th June, 1754. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Powell.	Mr. White.	Mr. Letch.
in the Chair.	„ Whishaw.	„ Atwood.	„ Mason.

Several of the orders of reference were adjourned to the following meeting, and it is stated in the Minutes that “the Committee made a further progress in considering the several other orders of reference,” but no particulars are given of the work done. At the meeting of the Committee on the 24th June, 1754. Present :—

Mr. Barnes,	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. ffothergill.
in the Chair.	„ Atwood.	„ White.	„ Letch.
„ Alexander.	„ Whishaw.		

The first order of reference was again considered, & the Committe were of opinion that the inconvenience arising from the method of proceeding against bail by Scire facias without notice given them thereof would be effectually prevented if in all cases where a Capias ad Satisfaciendum should be sued out as a foundation for proceeding against bail, notice thereof in writing were required to be given to each of the bail four days at least before the return of such Ca. Sa., in which notice should be expressed that the Ca. Sa. was sued out with the intent to proceed against the bail, and that such notice be either given to each of the bail personally or left at their respective last or most usual place of abode, and that no Ca. Sa. returned that the Principal was not found should be deemed sufficient to warrant any proceeding against bail without such notice as aforesaid to them previously given.

The Committee proceeded further on the three other orders of reference, but not being able to come to any further resolutions thereon, and apprehending it to be impracticable for them so to do before the next General Meeting, the further consideration of the said orders was adjourned until after the next General Meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 15th July, 1754. Present :—

Mr. Barnes.	Mr. Cromwell.	Mr. Atwood.
„ Powell.	„ White.	„ Brigstock.
„ Alexander.	„ Mason.	„ Browne.

The accounts of the Deputy Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £96 7s. 0d., his disbursements and allowances to £18 13s. 8d., there remaining in his hands £77 13s. 4d.

At the General Meeting of the Society on the 19th July, 1754. Present :—

	Mr. Benjamin Rosewell.	} Stewards.
	„ Joseph Eyre.	
	„ George Petre.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Eddison.	Mr. Palmer, Charlton.
„ Atwood.	„ ffothergil.	„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Adams.	„ Green.	„ Popham.
„ Athawes.	„ Grubb.	„ Praed.
„ Bowman.	„ Goodwin.	„ Petre, Nathaniel.
„ Barnes.	„ Goostry.	„ Ryder.
„ Brown, Edmd.	„ Hood.	„ Roberts, Philip.
„ Barber, John.	„ Harrison.	„ Swale.
„ Bargrave.	„ Hindley.	„ Smart.
„ Brigstock.	„ Holker.	„ Southouse.
„ Bennett, Thos.	„ Jackson.	„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Buxton.	„ Inge.	„ Smith, Henry.
„ Bristowe, George.	„ Jackmer.	„ Stanninought, Junr.
„ Cromwell.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Seawell.
„ Coppinger.	„ Letch.	„ Sayer, James.
„ Cranstone.	„ Lewis.	„ Short.
„ Craddock.	„ Letchmore.	„ Seagrove.
„ Crawford.	„ Lesure.	„ Tily.
„ Cobb.	„ Lane.	„ Thomas.
„ Comeline.	„ Mason.	„ Taylor.
„ Colston.	„ Morse.	„ Upton.
„ Cecil.	„ Mears.	„ Wells.
„ Cooper, ffrancis.	„ Massey.	„ Waddilove.
„ Denton.	„ Nicholson.	„ Wade.
„ Dax.	„ Nix.	„ Whitchurch.
„ Dodd.	„ Owen, Charles.	„ Wilson.
„ Dubuc.	„ Powell.	„ Wharton, Jonathan.
„ Davies.	„ Palmer, Wm.	„ White.
„ Davison.	„ Plumtree, ffrancis.	„ Wallis.
„ Elers.	„ Peal.	

The Prolocutor on behalf of the General Committee reported that since the last General Meeting the Court of King's Bench, pressed by the Councill for the Scriveners' Compy to appoint a day for the further hearing of the Motion depending before them concerning Mr. Alexander's Writ of Priviledge, were pleased to declare that they thought it a question of too great weight and importance to be determined on a Motion in a summary way, & that it ought to receive a judicial determination; they therefore determined that so much of the Rule as required Mr. Alexander to show cause why his Writ of Privilege should not be superceeded should be discharged, but that the Chamberlain of London should, notwithstanding the Writ of Priviledge, be

at liberty to declare in the Mayor's Court, so that Mr. Alexander may there plead the privilege by him claimed, and the merits of the question respecting the privilege may receive a judicial determination.

Mr. Thomas Athawes, Mr. Jonathan Colston, Mr. Thos. Cowper, Mr. Saml. Comeline, and Mr. Robert Waddilove were added to ye General Committee.

Mr. Atwood acquainting the Society that Mr. Wishaw desired to resign the office of Secretary, his resignation was accepted, and Mr. Edward Bowman, the Deputy Secry., unanimously ordered to succeed him in the said office; and the thanks of the Society were unanimously ordered to be returned to Mr. Whishaw for "his care in the faithful discharge of the execution of the said office."

Mr. Southouse acquainting the Society that he apprehended it would be proper to appoint a new Trustee with himself and Mr. Hamilton in the room of Mr. Fotherby Baker, deceased, the Prolocutor, Mr. David Thomas, was ordered to be added as a Trustee in the place of Mr. Fotherby Baker.

It was ordered that so much of the Society's cash as remained in the hands of Mr. Edward Bowman as would purchase £50 Stock in the Three Per Cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities be laid out and invested by him in such Consolidated Bank Annuities in the names of the Prolocutor, Mr. David Thomas, and of Mr. Alexander Hamilton and Mr. Wm. Southouse, and that they accept the same & execute a deed of trust that such Annuities so standing in their names are for the use of the Society.

It was ordered that the said £150 and £50 Three Per Cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities, & the dividends to arise on same from time to time, be subject to the orders & resolutions of the Society at their General Meetings, and the Trustees were ordered to execute to the Secretary, Mr. Bowman, a letter of attorney to empower him from time to time to receive the dividends payable on account of the said £150 and £50 Consolidated Bank Annuities. It was also ordered that whenever one or more of the nominees in whose names the said annuities stood should die, another nominee or nominees should be named at the next General Meeting instead of the person so dying, and that such bank annuities should be transferred to such new nominee or nominees.

The thanks of the Society were ordered to be given to Mr. Wm. Mason for his great care and services in the business of the Society, and the Prolocutor at the same time returned thanks to Mr. Mason accordingly.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 17th Febr'y, 1755. Present:—

Mr. Cromwell,	Mr. Benton.	Mr. Mason.	Mr. White.
in the Chair.	„ Brigstock	„ Wade.	„ Powell.
„ Baskerville.	„ ffothergill.	„ Wadilove.	„ Thomas.

The accounts of the Secretary were taken into consideration, and his receipts (including £77 13s. 4d., the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, and £6 6s. received from several members of the Society in

consequence of the resolution of the Select Committee of the 20th Novr., 1752, and £4 10s. for a year's dividend on £150 Three Per Cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities) were found to amount to £94 6s. 7d., and his disbursements (including £50 2s. 6d. paid for the purchase of £50 Three Per Cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities) and allowances to £65 9s. 8d., leaving in his hands £28 16s. 11d.

At a General Meeting of the Society held on the 21st Febr'y, 1755.
Present :—

	Mr. George Crawford.	} Stewards.
	„ Samuel Dod.	
	„ Thomas Brigstock.	
	„ Hugh White.	
Mr. Atwood.	Mr. Colston.	Mr. Peterson, John.
„ Ayton.	„ Clare.	„ Palmer, Wm.
„ Athaws.	„ Cecill.	„ Pardoe.
„ Baskerville.	„ Dax.	„ Penfold.
„ Barber, Robt.	„ Dodd.	„ Palmer, Charlton.
„ Bowman.	„ Dubuc.	„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Barnes.	„ Fothergill.	„ Rogers.
„ Burton.	„ Geekie.	„ Saunderson.
„ Benton.	„ Green.	„ Swale.
„ Butler, Saml.	„ Grubb.	„ Stubbs.
„ Brigstock.	„ Hood.	„ Sayer, James.
„ Beardmore.	„ Harrison.	„ Stanninought, Junr.
„ Benn, Thos.	„ Holker.	„ Seawell.
„ Brown, John.	„ Jackson.	„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Bushby.	„ Jesser.	„ Seagrave.
„ Cooper, Francis.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Thomas.
„ Cromwell.	„ Kirkby.	„ Taylor.
„ Coppinger.	„ Langmore.	„ Upton.
„ Combes.	„ Letchmore.	„ Wishaw.
„ Crawford.	„ Mason.	„ Wade.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Marriot.	„ Wallis.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Monk.	„ White.
„ Chambre.	„ New.	„ Webb.
„ Cobb.	„ Nicholson.	„ Yeo.
„ Comeline.	„ Powell.	

The Prolocutor reported that since the preceding General Meeting the Lord Chief Justice Ryder during the Trinity Vacation, on the application of Mr. Mason, and on hearing him and Mr. Bentham (the Attorney concerned on behalf of the Scriveners' Compy), being dissatisfied with the rule as pronounced on the last day of Trinity Term, was pleased to order the drawing up of the said rule to be stayed till the Court should be again moved in the matter in

Michaelmas Term. That on the 2nd day of Michaelmas Term the Court was moved again, and on hearing Councill on both sides, it was ordered that the Writ of Privilege issued out of that Court by Mr. Alexander should be superseded, but without prejudice to his pleading his privilege in the Court below, and that he should be at liberty to sue out anōr Writ of Privilege to verify his plea if he should think fit. That the first Writ of Privilege being thus superseded, Mr. Alexander appeared in the Court below, and a declaration being delivered against him, he pleaded his privilege in the Court below in abatement of the action, which plea was drawn by Mr. Altham, and perused and approved by Mr. Williams and Mr. Sergeant Poole, and also by Mr. Sergt. Martyn, who signed the same (being one of the City Councill); and there was annexed to the plea in support thereof a new Writ of Privilege uuder Seal, as also an affidavit that the substance of the Plea was true. That the Plaintiffs had demurred generally to the said Plea, and a joynder in demurrer was prepared, which had been approved by Mr. Sergeant Poole, and afterwards perused and signed by Mr. Sergt. Martyn, and was then ready to be delivered.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday the 23rd June, 1755. Present:—

Mr. Cromwell,	Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. White.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Letch.	„ Atwood.
„ Baskerville.	„ Mason.	„ ffothergil.	„ Waddilove.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts (including £28 16s. 11d., the balance in his hands, and £5 5s. received from members in conscqce of the resoltn of the Select Comee of the 20th Novr., 1752) amounted to £56 14s. 6d., and his disbursements and allowances to £11 11s. 2d., leaving due to the Society £45 3s. 4d.

Mr. Mason informed the Committee that since the last Genl Meeting Mr. Alexander having joined in demurrer, the demurrer to his plea of privilege was argued in the Mayor's Court on Tuesday the 27th May, before the Recorder, by Mr. Ungent on the part of the Scriveners' Compy, and Mr. Williams on the part of the Attorneys, and that Mr. Sergt. Poole attended on the part of the Attorneys, and took notes for a further argument, which the Court appointed for the 4th of Novr. following.

At the General Meeting of the Society on the 27th June, 1755. Present:—

	Mr. Wm. Roos.	} Stewards.	
	„ John Langmore.		
	„ William Monk.		
	„ John Swale.		
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Denton.		Mr. Poole.
„ Atwood.	„ Dubuc.		„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Adams.	„ ffothergil.		„ Petre, Nathl. Geo.
„ Athawes.	„ Grubb.		„ Ryder.
„ Baskerville.	„ Goodwin.		„ Rosewell.

Mr. Bowman.	Mr. Gason.	Mr. Spateman.
„ Bernard.	„ Goostry.	„ Saunderson.
„ Barnes.	„ Hood.	„ Southouse.
„ Butler, John.	„ Harrison.	„ Stanninought.
„ Benton.	„ Hindley.	„ Seawell.
„ Butler, Samuel.	„ Holker.	„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Boyfield	„ Jackson.	„ Smith, Joseph.
„ Bargrave.	„ Jackmar.	„ Skynner.
„ Brigstock.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Thomas.
„ Burr.	„ Letch.	„ Taylor.
„ Brown, John.	„ Letchmore.	„ Upton.
„ Cooper, Francis.	„ Lane.	„ Wells.
„ Cromwell.	„ Mason.	„ Whishaw.
„ Crawford.	„ Marriot.	„ Waddilove.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Mears.	„ Wade.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ New.	„ Watkinson.
„ Callamy.	„ Nicoll.	„ Wallis.
„ Chambre.	„ Nicholson.	„ Wharton.
„ Chatfield.	„ Nix.	„ White.
„ Cobb.	„ Powell.	„ Webb.
„ Comeline.	„ Pardoe.	„ Wynter.
„ Colston.	„ Penvold.	„ Yeo.
„ Cecil.		

The statement made by Mr. Mason at the last meeting of the Committee was communicated to the Society, and it was ordered that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Williams for his argument in Mr. Alexander's affair, and that Mr. Mason, with such other members as he should think proper, wait on Mr. Williams for that purpose.

The orders of reference to the Committee made on the 22nd Feby, 1744, and the minutes of the Committee's proceedings thereon, were read, and it was referred to the Committee to consider further the said orders of reference, and to report their opinion thereon at the next General Meeting.

It was also referred to the Committee to consider as to an application to Parliament to make fines complete and effectual, from the time of the acknowledgment thereof, provided the same were passed through the offices within a reasonable time, and that recoveries may be completed where acknowledged at the Bar or by Warrant of Attorney, though the party acknowledging should afterwards die before the recovery was completed.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 2nd Feb., 1756. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Thomas.	Mr. Powell.
in the Chair.	„ Woodhouse.	„ Letch, and
„ Baskerville.	„ White.	The Secretray.
„ Wade.	„ Mason.	

The referee in respect to notice in case of bail with the proceedings had thereupon been again taken into consideration and fully debated, and many difficulties arising, it was resolved that it was not proper to make any application relating thereto.

The consideration of the other orders was adjourned to the 13th Febr'y.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 13th Febr'y, 1756. Present:—

Mr. Wishaw,	Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. ffothergill.
in the Chair.	„ Mason.	„ Powell.
„ Baskerville.	„ Comeline.	„ J. Brown, and
„ Wade.	„ Marriot.	The Secretary.
„ White.		

The second order of reference was considered, and it was resolved that, when a convenient opportunity offered on the affirmance of any judgment upon any Writ of Error brought thereon, returnable in the Courts of King's Bench or Exchequer Chamber, or on the nonprossing of any Writ of Error, the proper officer appointed to tax the costs should be desired to allow not only the costs which the Defendant in Error had been put to, but also damages by reason of the delay of execution on the judgment obtained on the plea side of the Court of Exchequer; and that if the officer shou'd refuse to make such allowance as aforesaid, then application shd be made to the said Court of King's Bench or Exchequer Chamber to give proper directions for that purpose, and that such application be made with the privity and approbation of the Committee. It was resolved to postpone the consideration of the third and fourth orders of reference until the event of an application to be made in accordance with the foregoing resolution was known.

The Committee then considered the order of reference made to them at the last Genl Meeting with regard to fines and recoveries, and not being able to come to any determination, adjourned the further consideratn thereof to the 18th Febr'y. At the meeting of the Committee on the 18th Febr'y. Present:—

Mr. Wishaw,	Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. Mason.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Thomas, and
„ J. Brown.	„ Wade.	The Secretary.
„ ffothergill.	„ White.	

The Committee again considered the reference with regard to fines and recoveries, and were of opinion that it would not be proper for the Society to make any application to Parliament with reference to the matter.

At the same meeting the Committee audited the Secretary's accounts. His receipts (including £45 3s. 4d., the balance in his hands at the preceding audit, and £6 for a year's dividend on the £200 Bank Annuities) amounted to £55 17s. 10d., and his disbursements and allowances to £15 7s. 7d., there remaining due to the Society £40 10s. 3d.

At the General Meeting of the Society held on the 20th Febr'y, 1756.
Present :—

	Mr. Saml. Butler.	
	„ Jas. Penfold	} Stewards.
	„ John Chatfield.	
	„ Jas. Cecil.	
Mr. Athawes.	Mr. Edison.	
„ Baskerville.	„ Fothergill.	„ Morgan.
„ Bowman.	„ Grubb.	„ New.
„ Barnes.	„ Goodwin.	„ Powell.
„ Benton.	„ Goostry.	„ Partridge.
„ Bargrave.	„ Hood.	„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Brown.	„ Harrison.	„ Petre, Nathl. Geo.
„ Cromwell.	„ Highmore.	„ Roberts, Peter.
„ Crawford.	„ Holker.	„ Rogers.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Jackmar.	„ Sparrow.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Stubbs.
„ Callamy.	„ Kirby.	„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Comeline.	„ Letch.	„ Stratton.
„ Colston.	„ Langmore.	„ Thomas.
„ Constable.	„ Letchmore.	„ Upton.
„ Chapone.	„ Mason.	„ Wade.
„ Duroure.	„ Marriot.	„ White.
„ Dubuc.	„ Morse.	„ Yeo.

The Prolocutor reported on behalf of the General Committee, that since the preceding Genl. Meeting the demurrer on Mr. Alexander's plea of privilege in the Mayor's Court, was on the 4th Novr. argued by Mr. ffield on the part of the Plaintiff, and by Mr. Sergt. Poole on behalf of the Defendant, and that the Recorder declared there was no occasion for any further argument, but that he would consider the arguments used, and the several authorities cited on both sides, and form his judgment upon the whole as soon as he conveniently could, and when he had done so would give sufficient notice to the parties to attend to receive his judgment. Up to that time, however, no such notice had been received. The thanks of the Society were ordered to be returned to Mr. Sergt. Poole, and Mr. Mason was requested to wait on that gentleman with such other members as he should think proper for that purpose.

Mr. Mason informed the Society that on Mr. Hume Campbell's leaving the Bar he had waited on fletcher Norton Esqre. to retain him as Councill for them in their affairs, and that Mr. Norton had refused to take any retaining fee, and declared his readiness to be counsell for the Society, and thought it an honor so to be. The thanks of the Society were also ordered to be given to fletcher Norton Esqre.

Mr. Wade, a member of the Society, being called to the Barr as Councill

and being present, "in a very genteel and obliging manner" offered his services to attend the Society's affairs on all occasions in Court, and to give them his utmost assistance, and likewise declared his readiness to give his attendance on any Committee on receiving notice for that purpose. The Society accepted the favour, and the Prolocutor returned Mr. Wade their thanks on the occasion.

It being notorious that Mr. Wm. Wreathock was in the year 1735 condemned for a robbery on the highway, and was afterwards transported, and that he was then acting as an Attorney, the Secretary was ordered to make proper searches in the several Courts, and find of what Courts the said Wm. Wreathock then stood admitted as Attorney and Solicitor, and to make application to such Court or Courts as the said Wreathock should practise in, to have his name struck off the Roll. It was referred to the Standing Committee of the Society to carry this resolution into execution in such manner as they shd think fit, and that they should give directions to the Secretary accordingly.

At the Meeting of the Committee on the 29th June, 1756. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Benton.	Mr. Brigstock.
in the Chair.	„ New.	„ Whishaw.
„ Powell.	„ White.	„ Bowman.
„ Atwood.		

The Secretary was ordered to get a copy of the record of conviction of the said Wm. Wreathocke for a robbery on the highway, and that he search for and read the pardon alleged to have been granted to the said Wreathock by His Majesty, and take a copy thereof if he thought it necessary; that he get copies of the Order made in the Court of Exchequer for taking off the File a Bill exhibited in the said Court by one highwayman against another, in case he finds the said Wreathocke named in such orders as Solicitor concerned in filing that Bill; that he prepare a notice and brief for counsel to move to strike the name of the said Wreathocke out of the Roll of Attorneys of the Common Pleas; and that he pursue the like directions given for the motion against Landon Jones, for discharging the said Landon Jones from being a Solicitor of the Court of Chancery.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 12th July, 1756. Present :—

Mr. Mason,	Mr. Bakerville.	Mr. Powell, and
in the Chair.	„ White.	„ Thomas, the Secretary.

The accounts of the Secry were audited, and his receipts (including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting) were found to be £63 5s. 11d., and his disbursements and allowances £13 9s. 2d., leaving a balance of £49 16s. 9d.

At the General Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, on Friday the 16th July, 1756. Present :—

	Mr. John Partridge.	} Stewards.
	„ Charles Dubuc.	
	„ Thos. Goostry.	
	„ John Brown.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Coulthard.	Mr. New.
„ Atwood.	„ Currie.	„ Powell.
„ Briggs.	„ Dax.	„ Paterson.
„ Baskerville.	„ D'Yough.	„ Pardoe.
„ Bowman.	„ Emmonson.	„ Palmer.
„ Bernard.	„ Fothergill.	„ Petre.
„ Barnes.	„ Grubb.	„ Partington.
„ Burton.	„ Gregg.	„ Ryder.
„ Benton.	„ Hood.	„ Rogers.
„ Barber.	„ Hindly.	„ Saunderson.
„ Burr.	„ Howell.	„ Sayer.
„ Cooper.	„ Harrison.	„ Seagrave.
„ Cromwell.	„ Inge.	„ Skyrne.
„ Cranston.	„ Lloyd.	„ Stratton.
„ Crawford.	„ Langmore.	„ Thomas.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Letchmore.	„ Taylor.
„ Cowper.	„ Lesure.	„ Totten.
„ Callamy.	„ Lane.	„ Upton.
„ Chambre.	„ Mason.	„ Wells.
„ Cobb.	„ Marriot.	„ Wishaw.
„ Comeline.	„ Michell.	„ White.
„ Colston.	„ Massey.	„ Wynter.
„ Constable.		

The Committee were ordered to proceed with the case against Wreathocke with the utmost dispatch ; and Mr. Mason informed the Socy that up to that time no notice had been received when the Recorder of London would give judgment in Mr. Alexander's affair.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 26th Janry, 1757. Present :—

Mr. Whishaw. Mr. Bowman. Mr. White.

As only three members attended, no directions could be given as to the motion to be made against Mr. Wm. Wreathocke.

The Committee met again on Friday the 4th Feb., 1757. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas, Mr. Colston. Mr. Pardoe. Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair. „ Comeline. „ White.

Considered Wreathocke's case, and it appearing that Wreathocke was on the 1st of the preceding Novr. committed by the then Lord Chancellor for misbehaviour and contempt of the Court of Chancery, and that he still remained in custody in the Fleet, and the Committee being informed that the same term a complaint had been made against Wreathocke in the Court of Common

Pleas for malpractices, and that a Rule had been granted for him to answer the affidavits on which the complaint was grounded; and as there was a probability that Wreathocke might be struck off the Roll for the offences laid to his charge, the Committee thought it desirable to postpone the application directed by the Society till the following Term.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 21st Febr, 1757. Present:—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Robert Pardoe.	Mr. Richd. Marriot.
in the Chair.	„ John Powell.	„ Hugh White.
„ Wm. Mason.		

The Accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last audit, were £67 18s. 3d., and his disbursements and allowances £25 14s. 10d., leaving a balance due to the Society of £43 3s. 5d.

At a General Meeting of the Society on the 25th Feb., 1757. Present:—

	Mr. Thos. Life.	} Stewards.	
	„ Thos. Upton.		
	„ Thos. Lloyd, Esq.		
	„ Wm. Taylor.		
Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. ffothergill.		Mr. Rogers.
„ Bowman.	„ ffrancis.		„ Spateman.
„ Barnes.	„ Grubb.		„ Skinner.
„ Burton.	„ Gregg.		„ Sanderson.
„ Benton.	„ Haywood.		„ Stanninought.
„ Butler.	„ Holker.		„ Seawel.
„ Barber, John.	„ J'Anson, Bryan.		„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Bennet, Thos.	„ Jenkinson.		„ Seagrave.
„ Brown, John.	„ Jacombe.		„ Stratton.
„ Cromwell.	„ J'Anson, John.		„ Smith, John.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Kirkby.		„ Thomas.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Letchmore.		„ Totten.
„ Callamy.	„ Lucas.		„ Tyrrel.
„ Cobb.	„ Mason.		„ Wells.
„ Colston.	„ Marriott.		„ Whishaw.
„ Constable.	„ Morse.		„ Waddilove.
„ Coulthard.	„ Morgan.		„ White.
„ Denton.	„ Powell.		„ Winter.
„ Dax.	„ Pardoe.		„ Winckley.
„ Dubuc.	„ Partridge.		„ Worlidge, John.
„ Dowding.	„ Poole.		„ Wilmot.
„ Dagge.	„ Palmer, Charlton.		„ Wilson.
„ Eyre.	„ Petre.		„ Wellard.
„ Eddison.	„ Partington.		„ Walley.
„ Elers.	„ Philips.		

Mr. Mason reported that on the 16th of the preceding Novr. the Court gave judgment of Respondeas Ouster on the Demurrer joined in the cause depending in the Mayor's Court, between Harrison, Chamberlain of London, and Mr. John Alexander, and Mr. Mason also gave a very clear, distinct, and satisfactory account of the steps since then had and taken in that cause, and in obtaining and issuing forth a Commission of errors on the Judgment given in the said cause, and of the proceedings had in the said Commission of Errors. The thanks of the Society were returned to Mr. Mason for his great care and service in the business of the Society, and the Secretary was ordered to pay Mr. Mason £30 on account of his fees and disbursements in connection with the Society's affairs.

At the same meeting it was referred to the General Committee to consider some proper and respectful application to be made to the several Courts of Law and Equity, or to the respective Judges of those Courts, or, if necessary, to the Legislature, to prevent persons not duly qualified within the meaning of the several statutes in that behalf made, from being admitted attorneys or Solicitors, and they were ordered to take such measures in relation to the same as they should think proper.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday the 11th July, 1757. Present :—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Mason.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. White.
in the Chair.	„ Wlshaw.	„ ffothergill.	„ Bowman.

The Secretary's Accounts were audited. His receipts, including the balance from the preceding audit, were £84 18s. 9d., and his disbursements and allowances £43 8s. 2d., leaving due to the Society a balance of £41 10s. 7d.

The Secretary informed the Committee that on the 27th June a motion was made in the Court of King's Bench, at the instance of Mr. Saml. John of Lyon's Inn, to strike off the Roll Mr. John Greenwood and Mr. John Sliper, on the ground that Sliper had surreptitiously procured himself to be admitted an Attorney under articles to the said Greenwood at a time when Sliper was footman or common servant to Mr. John Greenwood, and was then Mr. John's agent or writer, and under an affidavit by Sliper of five years' service to the said Greenwood, and the said Greenwood's certificate of Sliper having served his clerkship to his satisfaction; and that a Rule had been made by the Court for the said Greenwood and Sliper's answering the matters contained in Mr. John's affidavit, and to attend the Court in person on the last day of the preceding term; and that the Rule was then enlarged to the second day in the next Term. The Secretary stated that he had assisted Mr. John, and drawn and delivered a brief to counsell on showing cause, and had attended on Henry Gould Esqre on that occasion, and that that gentleman freely attended as counsel on the Motion without taking any fee; and the Secretary submitted his conduct therein to the consideration of the Committee. The Secretary was ordered to lay the proceedings on the above motion before the Society at the next General Meeting for their directions therein.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday the 15th July, 1757.
Present :—

	Mr. Richd. Boyfield.	} Stewards.
	„ Branstone Seawell.	
	„ Henry Wilmot, Esq.	
	„ John Woodhouse.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Gregg.	Mr. Pardoe.
„ Bowman.	„ Haywood.	„ Penfold.
„ Barnes.	„ Harrison, Thomas.	„ Poole.
„ Benton.	„ Holker.	„ Paterson, Evan.
„ Butler.	„ Harrison, William.	„ Popham.
„ Bargrave.	„ Hull.	„ Saunderson.
„ Brown, John.	„ Harrison, John.	„ Stubbs.
„ Cromwell.	„ Inge.	„ Southouse.
„ Cowper, Thomas.	„ Jesser.	„ Stanninought.
„ Callamy.	„ Jenkinson.	„ Seagrave.
„ Crewys.	„ J'Anson, John.	„ Stratton
„ Chambre.	„ Kirkly.	„ Thomas.
„ Colstone.	„ Lloyd.	„ Taylor.
„ Coulthard.	„ Letchmore.	„ Tyrrel.
„ Crawley.	„ Lawrence.	„ Upton.
„ Denton.	„ Lucas.	„ Wells.
„ D'Yough.	„ Mason.	„ Wishaw.
„ Dubuc.	„ Marriot.	„ Whitchurch.
„ Dowding.	„ Marie.	„ Wallis.
„ Dagge, John.	„ Morgan.	„ White.
„ Edison.	„ New.	„ Winckley.
„ ffothergill.	„ Nix.	„ Wilson.
„ Green.	„ Powell.	„ Walley.
„ Grubb.	„ Paterson, John.	

After Mr. Mason informed the Society that since the last Genl Meeting the Recorder had certified the Record of the Judgment in the cause of *Harrison v. Alexander, ore tenus*, before the Judge's Delegate, that errors had been assigned by Mr. Alexander, and *in nullo est erratum* pleaded thereto, and that the cause stood for argument before the Judge's Delegate at the Guildhall on Wednesday, the 16th Novr.

The Secretary, in pursuance of the Committee's order of the 11th inst., laid before the Society a statement of the proceedings against Mr. John Greenwood and Mr. John Sliper mentioned in the Minutes of that day, and the Society approved of the Secretary's conduct in assisting Mr. Johns in that affair. It was ordered that the Secry continue his assistance to Mr. Johns on the motion against Greenwood and Sliper, and pay out of the Society's cash whatever expense should be necessary in that affair. The Secretary was also ordered

to wait on Henry Gould, Esqre., and return him the Society's thanks for his obliging behaviour in appearing as Councill on that motion without taking any fee; and to thank Mr. John for his laudable zeal in making the said Motion for the honour of the profession.

The Minutes of the Committee of the 4th february, with regard to Mr. Wm. Wreathock were read, and it not appearing that the Motion against him in the Court of Common Pleas mentioned in the said Minutes had come to any determination, and the Society being of opinion that they ought to endeavour, for the honor of the profession, to get the said Wreathock struck off the Rolls, and the Prolocutor, Mr. Mason, Mr. Pardoe, Mr. Powell, Mr. Nix, Mr. Kirkby, and Mr. John Harrison were appointed, a Select Committee to enquire into the conduct and behaviour of Wreathock with regard to his practice as an Attorney, and to make such application for striking him off the Roll as they should see necessary, and that such application be carried on by such person or persons, and in such manner as they should direct, at the Society's expense. The Secretary was ordered to assist the Select Committee and summon them to meet on the 2nd day in Michaelmas Term for the purposes of the preceding Order.

At the meeting of the Select Committee appointed with regard to the affair of Mr. Wm. Wreathocke at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavern in Chancery Lane, on Tuesday the 8th Novr., 1757. Present:—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Powell.	Mr. White.	Mr. Kirby.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ Harrison.	„ Nix.

The order of reference made at the last Genl Meeting was considered, and the Committee proceeded to make the enquiry thereby directed; and being of opinion that an application should be made to strike Wreathocke off the Roll of Attorneys of the Court of Common Pleas, and that the first step necessary to take was to procure a copy of the Record of his conviction in 1735 for a robbery on the highway, a draft of an affidavit to be made by all the Committee in order to obtain from the Attorney-General a fiat for having such copy of the record of conviction was drawn and settled, and Mr. Thomas and Mr. Pardoe immediately waited on the Attorney-General therewith for his approbation. The Attorney-General obligingly promised, on such affidavit being made, to issue out his fiat forthwith for such copy of the record of conviction to be made. The Committee resolved to meet on the following Thursday at the Crown and Rolls Tavern, Chancery Lane, at 7 o'clock in the evening precisely, to attend a judge of the King's Bench to swear to the said affidavit. The Secretary was ordered, when the said affidavit was made, and the Attorney-General's fiat obtained, to endeavour to procure from the Clerk of the Peace of the County of Middlesex a copy of the aforesaid conviction, and when obtained, that he again summon the Committee to meet and further to consider the said order of reference. On the 10th Novr., 1757, the Committee, in pursuance of the resolution of the 8th Novr., met at the Crown & Rolls

Tavern, and went to Judge Foster's Chambers in Serjeants' Inn, and swore the affidavit mentioned in the preceding Minutes.* The Select Committee met again on Friday the 18th Novr., 1757. Present:—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Powell.
in the Chair.	„ Kirkby.	„ White.

The Secy informed the Committee that he had obtained the Attorney-General's fiat, and a copy of the record of conviction of Wreathocke in Decr. 1735, which he produced, and that he had also obtained from the Clerk at the Warrant of Attorney Office of the Common Pleas a certificate when Wreathocke was admitted an Attorney of that Court, when he was left out of the Roll of Attorneys, and when again admitted therein, and produced such certificate; and also that as the Record of conviction was carried down no further than the sentence of death, he had made several enquiries at different places to find out when Wreathocke was discharged from the said sentence on condition of transportation, and that he had searched the books of the keeper of Newgate, and therein found the said sentence was respited, and Wreathocke continued in the Calendar to the month of May, 1736, but could not find his name mentioned in the subsequent Calendars, nor could he learn when or on what terms Wreathocke had been transported, or when he returned from such transportation. The Committee, being of opinion that they were in possession of sufficient information to lay a foundation for a motion to strike Wreathocke off the Roll of Attorneys of the Court of Common Pleas, prepared the draft of an affidavit to be made by them and used on such notion; but Mr. Harrison and Mr. Nix not being present, the further consideration of the affair, and the settling of the said Draft and preparing a proper notice and briefs for the intended motion was adjourned to the following Monday. On Monday the 21st Novr., 1757, the Committee met again. Present:—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Kirkby.
in the Chair.	„ White.	„ Harrison.	„ Nix.

The affidavit to be made by them was settled, and they also settled and signed the notice of motion to be served by Wreathocke. On the 24th Novr. the Committee met again. Present:—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Nix.
in the Chair.	„ White.	„ Harrison.	

The motion against Wreathocke was mentioned in Court, but, in the absence of the Lord Chief Justice, it was put off to the following day. The Committee met, and in a body waited on Mr. Sergeant Prime, and “desired him to enforce the motion, and were politely received by the Sergeant.”

At a meeting of the Committee on the 20th Febr'y, 1758. Present:—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Mason.	Mr. Powell.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ White.

* The names of those who were present are not given.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, were £53 16s. 7d., and his disbursements and allowances £34 19s. 6d., leaving due to the Society £18 17s. 1d.

At the General Meeting of the Society on Friday the 24th Feby, 1758.
Present:—

Mr. James Green.		} Stewards. and Messrs.
„ Evan Paterson.		
„ Thos. Augustus Crewys.		
„ Edward Inge.		
Bowman.	ffothergill.	Ryder.
Barnes.	Grubb.	Rees.
Burton.	Goostry.	Skinner.
Bargrave.	Gregg.	Sanderson.
Baynes.	Holker.	Southouse.
Brown, John.	Harrison, Wm.	Stanninought.
Cooper, ffrancis	Hull.	Sayer, Henry.
Cromwell.	Harrison, Jno.	Seagrave.
Cruttenden.	J'Anson, John.	Stratton.
Callamy.	Kirkby.	Smith, John.
Chambers.	Langmore.	Thomas.
Cobb.	Letchmore.	Taylor.
Cecil.	Mason.	Upton.
Chapone.	Morgan.	Wells.
Coulthard.	Masterman.	Whishaw.
Crawley.	New.	Wallis.
Clarkson.	Nicholson.	White.
Colston.	Powell.	Winter.
Denton.	Pardoe.	Winckly
Dax.	Palmer, Charlton.	Wilson.
Dubuc.	Partington.	Wellard.
Dowding.	Potts.	Welby.
Dagge.		

The Prolocutor informed the Society, that in pursuance of the order made at the last General Meeting with regard to the proceedings against John Greenwood and John Sliper, Attorneys of the Court of King's Bench, the Secretary had continued his assistance to Mr. Samuel John, and that on the 11th Novr. Greenwood and Sliper were by rule of the Court of King's Bench ordered to be struck off the Roll of Attorneys of that Court, and both committed into the custody of the Marshall for contempt, and that on their humble Petitions to the Court they were discharged from their comitt^{ms} on the 28th Novr.

The Prolocutor also reported that the Select Committee appointed at the last

Genl Meeting to enquire into the affair of Wm. Wreathocke, and to apply for striking him off the Roll of Attorneys of the Court of Common Pleas, had acted with great assiduity on that occasion, as in part appeared by the minutes already read to the Society. That on the 25th Novr. a rule was made by the said Court for Wreathocke answering the matters contained in the several affidavits in the said Rule mentioned, which Rule was afterwards three times enlarged; that on the 31st Jany the Court, on hearing counsell on behalf of the Committee and of the said Wm. Wreathocke were pleased to order that the name of the said Wreathocke be left out of the Roll of the Attorneys of the said Court for the future. That on this application Sergeants Prime, Poole, and Davy obligingly gave their assistance as counsell for the Society without taking any fees. It was ordered that the thanks of the Society be returned to Sergeants Prime, Poole, and Davy for their assistance, and that Mr. Prolocutor and the other members of the Select Committee wait on them for that purpose. The thanks of the Society were also given to the members of the Select Committee, and to Mr. Cowper, the clerk of the Rolls of the King's Bench, and to Mr. Barnes, one of the Secondaries of the Common Pleas, they having remitted their fees on the two aforesaid applications.

Mr. Mason informed the Society that on the 16th Novr. the cause on the Writ of Error in the matter of Harrison, Chamberlain of the City of London, against Alexander was argued by Councillor Williams before the Judges' Delegate, and was further argued on the Wednesday following by Mr. Field, Councillor for the Chamberlain of London, and that Mr. Williams replied to this argument on the 19th Jany. The matter was again argued before the said Judges' Delegate by Councillor Norton at Sergeants' Inn Hall on behalf of Mr. Alexander, and by Councillor Cox on behalf of the Chamberlain, that Mr. Norton replied, and Mr. Sergt. Poole attended these arguments, and took notes ready for another argument, but the Delegates required no further arguments, and had agreed to give judgment on the Wednesday before the following Easter Term. That Mr. Norton and Mr. Williams had greatly exerted themselves in their several arguments and replies for the service of the Society.

The thanks of the Society were ordered to be given by Mr. Mason to Mr. Norton, Sergeant Poole, and Mr. Williams for their kind assistance in the said cause. The Prolocutor returned the Society's thanks to Mr. Mason for his great care and diligence in the cause.

Mr. Mason informed the Society, that on the occasion of the arguments before the Judges' Delegates on the Writ of Error he had employed Mr. Thomas Cooke to take down in shorthand the several arguments on both sides, which arguments Mr. Cooke had transcribed at length, and that he was likewise to attend at the time of the Judges' Delegates giving judgment, and that Mr. Cooke had greatly served the Society in this way; and Mr. Mason submitted to the Society that a satisfaction should be made to Mr. Cooke for his trouble and attendance. The Secretary was ordered to pay to Mr. Cooke such sum

as the General Committee should direct to be paid to him as a satisfaction for his trouble and attendance.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 26 June, 1758. Present :—

Mr. Brigstock,	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. White, and
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	The Secretary.
„ Mason.		

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last audit, were £45 2s. 2d., and his disbursements and allowances £10 9s. 0d., leaving a balance of £34 13s. 2d.

At the General Meeting of the Society held on Friday the 30th June, 1758. Present :—

	Mr. Arthur Beardmore.	} Stewards. and Messrs.
	„ Lawrence Holker.	
	„ Albany Wallis.	
	„ John Nicholson.	
Adams.	Dubuc.	Partridge.
Briggs.	Dowding.	Poole.
Bowman.	Dagge.	Paterson, Evan.
Barnes.	ffothergill.	Petre.
Benton.	Grubb.	Partington.
Bothom.	Goostre.	Potts.
Bargrave.	Gregg.	Rogers.
Barnardiston.	Harrison, Wm.	Rees.
Brown, John.	Hull.	Skinner.
Cromwell.	Inge.	Sanderson.
Coppinger.	Jesser.	Seawell.
Cranston.	Jenkinson.	Sayer, Henry.
Cowper, Thomas.	J'Anson, John.	Seagrave.
Callamy.	Lane.	Skyrme.
Crewys.	Lucas.	Smith, John.
Chambre.	Mason.	Thomas.
Cobb.	Monk.	Taylor.
Colston.	Massey.	Upton.
Chapone.	Morgan.	Waddlilove.
Coulthard.	Masterman.	White.
Crawley.	New.	Wall.
Clarkson.	Powell.	Winckley.
Crosby.	Palmer, Wm.	Walley.
Denton.	Pardoe.	Wilson.
Dax.	Penvold.	Welby.

Mr. Mason informed the Society that since the preceding Genl. Meeting the

Judges' Delegate in the affair between Harrison, Chamberlain of London, and Alexander, had appointed Friday, the 3rd Novr., to give judgment.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 10th Novr., 1758. Present:—

Mr. David Thomas, in the Chair.

Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Barnes.	Mr. Pardoe.
„ C. Brown.	„ Mason.	„ ffothergill.
„ Skynner.	„ Marriot.	„ Brigstock.
„ Comeline.	„ Cromwell.	„ White.
„ Baskerville	„ Whishaw.	„ Monk, and
„ Colston.	„ J. Brown.	The Secretary.
„ Waddilove.	„ Powell.	

Mr. Mason laid before the Committee Mr. Thos. Cooke's transcript of the arguments before the Judges' Delegate in the cause between the Chamberlain of London and Mr. Alexander, and of the Judges' opinions given on the 3rd Novr., and in consequence of the Order made at the Genl. Meeting he moved that the Committee order such satisfaction to be made to Mr. Cooke as they thought proper. The Secretary was ordered to pay to Mr. Cooke twenty guineas for his trouble and attendance.

Mr. Mason having reported to the Committee the substance of several conferences which he had had with Mr. Sergt. Poole, Mr. Norton, and Mr. Williams since the affirmances of the judgment by the Judges' Delegate, and the advice given by those gentlemen, it was resolved that Mr. Mason from time to time pursue the advice already given, and thereafter to be given by the said gentlemen, and return them the thanks of the Society for all their obliging services.

The Committee thinking it necessary that an advertisement be put in the public papers, drew up and settled the following advertisement.

“The resolution of the Judges' Delegate between the Scriveners' Company and an Attorney residing within the City of London being confined to a point of privilege only, and not on the merits of the case, we are assured That the Attorneys are Determined to Dispute the Merits of the Question in the Court to which the Action is confined.”

Resolved That the above Advertizement be Incerted in the *Gazetteer* on Monday next and the two following days.

The resolution of the Select Committee of the 20th Novr., 1752, relating to the expense of defending the severall suits brought and to be brought against Attorneys and Sollicitors upon the Bye Laws of the City of London, and confirmed at the Gen. Meeting of the Society on the 23rd Feb., 1753, being read, it was resolved, that in order to encrease the fund for that purpose, a further sume of one guinea be paid by every member of the Society into the hands of the Secretary. The members of the Committee then present paid this sume accordingly.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 17th Novr., 1758. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Barnes.	„ Pardoe.
„ Skynner.	„ ffothergill.	„ Geekie.
„ Bernard.	„ Benton.	„ I. Brown.
„ Baskerville.	„ New.	„ Whishaw.
„ C. Brown.	„ Mason.	„ White.
„ Comeline.	„ Marriot.	„ Bowman,
„ Cromwell.	„ Letch.	Secretary.

Mr. Mason said, that since the last Committee night he had mett Mr. Sergt. Poole, Mr. Norton, and Mr. Williams, the Society's councill, in consultation, & that he had by their directions stated a short case relating to the cause between the Chamberlain of London & Mr. Alexander, upon which case they had given and signed a written opinion as to what was proper further to be done in the matter and in any future action to be bröt agt any other Attorneys at the instance of the Scriveners' Compy, and Mr. Mason laid before the Committee the said case & opinion, which was read. It was resolved that Mr. Mason pursue the advice given by the Society's councill.

The Committee thinking it necessary to retain council on behalf of the Society in the Court of Chancery, the Prolocutor, Mr. Cromwell, Mr. Mason, and Mr. White by their desire forthwith went and retained the Attorney-Genl., the Sollr.-Genl., Edwd. Willes, Esqre., & Randall Wilbraham, Esqre., as councill for the Society.

Mr. James Bernard, one of the Committee, produced a summons in a Plaint levied agt him in the Mayor's Court, in the name of the Chamberlain of London, for the recovery of £5 on a Bye Law of that city. Mr. Skynner produced a like summons served on Mr. Robert Winbolt, a member of the Society, and a like summons served on Mr. Thos. Banks, Clerk of the Goldsmiths' Compy, London, which several summons's being read, & the Committee finding that such Plaints were levied at the instance of the Scriveners' Compy agt the above persons for acting as Scriveners in the said City, not being free thereof, it was resolved to defend the said actions at the Society's expense, agreeable to the former resolutions on the like occasions, and Mr. Mason was desired to take such steps for that purpose as he (with the advice of ye Society's councill if necessary) should think proper, with the concurrence of the sevl persons on whom such summonses were served. The Secretary was ordered to lay before Roger Altham, Esqr., all necessary papers and instructions to enable him to prepare a Bill to be fyled in the Court of Chancery against such persons and for such purposes as the Society's councill had advised.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 10th Jany, 1759. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas, in the Chair.		
Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Benton.	Mr. Letch.
„ Bernard.	„ New.	„ T. Cowper.

Mr. ff. Cooper.	Mr. Marriot.	Mr. J. Brown.
„ Cromwell.	„ Mason.	„ White.
„ Pardoe.	„ Jackson.	„ Bowman, Secretary.

Present likewise at the Committee's desire—

Mr. John Worlidge for his Bro., Philip Worlidge.
Mr. Cruttenden, and Mr. I. Smith.

Mr. Mason informed the Committee, that since their last meeting several summons's in the like Plaints levyed mentioned in their last Minitts had been served on Mr. Philip Worlidge, Mr. Joseph Cruttenden, Mr. John Smith, and Mr. Thos. Kingsley, and that he had taken the proper steps for their defence. Mr. Mason also informed the Committee that, in pursuance of their last order, a draft of a Bill to be fyled in the Court of Chancery agreeable to the advice of the Society's councill had been prepared, and had been perused, settled, and signed by Mr. Wilbraham and Mr. Altham, the Society's councill, and he produced a draft of the same which was read to the Committee. The Committee unanimously approved of the draft as settled, and desired that the Bill might be forthwith fyled, and that Mr. Mason act as Sollicitor for the Society in the said suit. The Secretary was ordered out of the first moneys he should collect from the members, in pursuance of the Committee's resolution of the 10th Novr., to pay to Mr. Mason fifty pounds on account of his Bill of fees and disbursements in the Society's affairs.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 19th Feby, 1759. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas.	Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. White, and
„ Mason.	„ Powell.	The Secretary.
„ Comeline.	„ Baskerville.	

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including the ballance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, were £133 1s. 2d., and his disbursements and allowances £95 15s. 2d., leaving a balance in his hands of £37 6s. 0d., and the Committee settled their Rept. on stating the Secretary's accounts.

At a Genl Meeting of the Socy on Friday, the 23rd Feby, 1759, at the Devil Tavern at Temple Bar. Present :—

	Mr. Richd. Jenkinson.	} Stewards.
	„ Thos. Cobb.	
	„ Charles Massey.	
	„ Edmund Wilson.	
Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Dagge, John.	Mr. Partington.
„ Ayton.	„ Dagge, Henry.	„ Potts.
„ Athaws.	„ ffothergill.	„ Rogers.
„ Baskerville.	„ ffisher.	„ Rees.
„ Bowman.	„ Gregg.	„ Saunderson.

Mr. Burton.	Mr. Harrison, Wm.	Mr. Southouse.
„ Benton.	„ Hull.	„ Seawell.
„ Bothom.	„ Harrison, John.	„ Sayer, Henry.
„ Bargrave.	„ J'Anson, John.	„ Seagrave.
„ Beardmore.	„ Kerkby.	„ Smith, Joseph.
„ Brown, John.	„ Lewis.	„ Thomas.
„ Cromwell.	„ Lucas.	„ Taylor.
„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Le Britton.	„ Troughton.
„ Callamy.	„ Mason.	„ Upton.
„ Comeline.	„ Monk.	„ Wells.
„ Cecil.	„ Morgan.	„ Whishaw.
„ Clare.	„ New.	„ Waddilove.
„ Coulthard.	„ Nicol.	„ Whitchurch.
„ Crawley.	„ Powell.	„ White.
„ Dax.	„ Pardoe.	„ Wynter.
„ Durore.	„ Partridge.	„ Wellard.
„ Dubuc.	„ Palmer, Charlton.	„ Welby.
„ Dowding.	„ Paterson, Evan.	„ Winterbottom.

The Prolocutor, Mr. Thomas, took the Chair.

The General orders for the members contributing towards the ffund for discharging the expenses of the Society, and the Comittee's Resolution of the 20th Novr., 1752, and the confirmation thereof and order made thereon at a General Meeting held ye 23rd of ffebry, 1753, and the Comittee's resolution of the 10th Novr., 1758, were read. And the Secretary recd from Messrs. ffisher, Le Britton, Troughton, Winterbottom, James Dagge, and Henry Dagge 10s. 6d. each, for the use of the Society for their contribution towards the ffund for discharging ye expeces of the Society.

And the Secretary reced from the same persons one guinea each, in consequence of the Comittee's resolution of ye 20th of Novr., 1752, and order made thereon at the General Meeting ye 23 ffeby, 1753. And the Secretary reced from Messrs.

Ayton.	Dagge, Henry.	Rogers.
Bothom.	Dagge, James.	Southouse.
Burton.	ffisher.	Seagrave.
Bargrave.	Gregg.	Smith, Joseph.
Callamy.	Le Britton.	Troughton.
Cecill.	Massey.	Wells.
Coates.	Nicol.	Whitchurch.
Clare.	Partridge.	Wynter.
Durore.	Palmer, Charlton.	Wellard.
Dowding.	Potts.	

One guinea each, in pursuance of the Comittee's Resolution of the 10th of Novr. last.

The Prolocutor reported that the Committee had audited the Secretary's Accounts, and found

That his receipts, including £34 3s. 2d., the	}	£	s.	d.
ballance in his hands at the last General Meeting,				
amted to		133	1	2
And that his disbursments and allowances amted to		95	15	2
And that there remained in his hands in cash		37	6	0

It was ordered that such members of the Society as had not paid in their respective guineas in consequence of the Committee's resolutn, and all future members, should pay the same to Mr. Edwd Bowman, the Secretary of the Society.

Mr. Mason informed the Society, that since the last General Meeting the Judges' Delegate in the affair betn Harrison, Chamberlain of the City of London, & Alexander had given judgment of affirmance, and that he had taken care to appear to & defend the sevl new actions mentioned in the Minutes of the Committee, & had filed in the Court of Chancery the Bill mentioned in the preceding minits, to be brought agt the several persons therein named, agreeable to the advice of the Society's councill, and that he had filed the bill in the Court of Chancery mentiond in the minits of the 10th Jany, & served all the Defendants with process, & that they had appeared & prayed time to answer, upon which the common injunction for stay of execution until answer & further order had been obtained and served. The Society unanimously approved of what Mr. Mason had done, & the Prolocutor by their desire returned him thanks for his great care and dilligence in the Society's affairs. It was ordered that the Committee retain such person as they shd think proper to be of councill for the Society in the place of the late Mr. Williams, & that the Committee from time to time have power at any meeting of theirs to add such other persons to their number as they think proper in the place of those who die, or decline attending the service.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 16th July, 1759. Present:—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Brigstock.	Mr. ffothergill.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ White.
„ Baskerville.	„ Pardoe.	„ Bowman, Secretary.
„ Mason.		

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last audit, were £151 14s. 8d., and his disbursements and allowances £78 9s. 0d., leaving a balance of £73 5s. 8d.

The Committee nominated Mr. Southouse and Mr. Philip Roberts to be added to the General Committee, and directed Mr. Harrison, one of the four City pleaders, to be retained as Councill for the Society in the place of Mr. Williams, decd.

At the General Meeting of the Society on Friday the 20th July, 1759.
Present :—

	Mr. Francis Duroure.	} Stewards.
	„ Charlton Palmer.	
	„ John Nicoll.	
	„ Henry Sayer.	
Mr. Adams, Cain.	Mr. Farrer.	Mr. Philips.
„ Bowman.	„ Grubbe.	„ Potts.
„ Barnes.	„ Gregg.	„ Rosewell.
„ Benton.	„ Geering.	„ Rees.
„ Boyfield.	„ Hindley.	„ Sloper.
„ Bargrave.	„ Holker.	„ Southouse.
„ Brigstock.	„ Hall.	„ Staninought.
„ Bennet, Thos.	„ Inge.	„ Seawell.
„ Buxton.	„ Jacombe.	„ Seagrave.
„ Cromwell.	„ J'Anson, John.	„ Smith, Joseph.
„ Callamy.	„ Langmore.	„ Skyrne.
„ Chambre.	„ Letchmere.	„ Stratton.
„ Cobb.	„ Le Britton.	„ Smith, John.
„ Comeline.	„ Mason.	„ Thomas.
„ Colston.	„ Monk.	„ Taylor.
„ Crawley.	„ Morgan.	„ Upton.
„ Dax.	„ New.	„ Wallis.
„ Dubuc.	„ Powell.	„ White.
„ Dowding.	„ Pardoe.	„ Winckley.
„ Dagge, John.	„ Penfold.	„ Wally.
„ Dagge, James.	„ Partridge.	„ Wilson.
„ Fothergill.	„ Paterson, Evan.	„ Welby.
„ Francis.	„ Petre.	„ Welch.
„ Frosselicque.	„ Partington.	

The Secretary reced from Messrs. Frosselicque, Farrer, Geering, and Welch 10s. 6d. each for the use of the Society for their contribution towards the fund for discharging the expences of the Society, and the Secretary reced from the same persons one guinea each, in consequence of the Committee's resolution of the 20th Novb., 1752, and order made thereon at the General Meeting ye 23rd february, 1753, and the Secretary reced from Messrs. Cain, Adams, Boyfield, Bennet, Thos. Buxton, Holker, Jacombe, Penfold, Walley, Welch, Frosselicque, Farrer, Geering, one guinea each, in consequence of the Committee's resolution of the 10th of Novr., 1758, and order made thereon at the last General Meeting.

The Prolocutor reported that the Committee had audited the Secretary's accounts, and found

That his rectx, including £37 6s. od. Ballance in	}	£	s.	d.
his hands at the last General Meeting amount to		151	14	8
And that his disbursemts and allowances amt to	.	78	9	0
And that there remains in his hands in cash	.	73	5	8

Mr. Mason informed the Society, that since the last General Meeting, the Defts to ye Bill fyled in Chancery mentioned in the former minitts, had obtained further time to answer ye same, and that no answers were as yet come in. Mr. Mason also said that he had by the advice of the Society's Council again pleaded privilege to the several actions brought agt the several persons named in the former minitts, to which pleas the plt. in those actions had demurred, and that the Demurrers had been argued and judgments of Respondeas Ouster given thereon. That at that time of arguing those Demurrers, he had informed the Court that the aforesd Bill had been fyled, and then prayed the Court for three months time to plead in chief to those actions, which the Recorder thought reasonable, but being opposed by plts Council, Rules were made unless cause at the next Sitting of the Court, and that at ye next Sitting, the plts council being absent, the Rules were further enlarged. The Society unanimously approved of what Mr. Mason had done, and the Prolocutor by their desire returned him their thanks for his great care and dilligence in the Society's affairs.

At a meeting of the Committee on Saturday, the 19th Jany., 1760. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Mason.	„ Marriot.	

Mr. Mason laid before the Comitte a brief of the Bill fyled at the Society's instance in Chancery, as mentioned in former minitts, and of the several answers which had been put in thereto, and also a notice of motion in that cause for inspection of records, books, papers, writings, &c., which he had served, and copys of the Brief intended to be delivered to council, and the Committee perused the Brief and considered the notice, and unanimously approved the same, and agreed that the motion should be made accordingly.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday the 15th Feb., 1760. Present :—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. P. Roberts.	Mr. Marriot.	Mr. White.
in the Chair.	„ Mason.	„ Powell.	„ Bowman.
„ Baskerville.	„ ffothergill.		

Mr. Mason informed the Committee that the Motion mentioned in the last minitts was made on the 12th instant, and that the Lord Keeper did not think fit to grant, but was pleased to deny the same, and that Mr. Mason proposed on Tuesday next to apply to the Mayor's Court for time to plead in chief to the actions brot there, in order to have an opportunity of consulting with council as to what pleas were proper to be pleaded.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday the 18th Feb., 1760. Present :—

Mr. Thomas, in the Chair. ,, Powell.	Mr. White. ,, Fothergill. ,, Baskerville.	Mr. Mason. ,, Bowman.
--	---	--------------------------

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, were £101 6s. 8d., and his disbursements and allowances, £22 12s. 10d., leaving in his hands in cash £78 13s. 10d.

At a Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 22nd Feb., 1760.
Present:—

	Mr. Thomas Bennett.	} Stewards. and Messrs.	
	,, Wm. Jacombe.		
	,, John Dax, <i>ill.</i>		
	,, Francis Buxton.		
Alexander.	Constable.	Le Britton.	Rees.
Atkinson.	Clare.	Mason.	Stubbs.
Baskerville.	Colston.	Monk.	Southouse.
Bowman.	Coulthard.	Massey.	Seawell.
Barnes.	Duroure.	Morgan.	Smith, John.
Benton.	Dubuc.	New.	Thomas.
Brown, Charles.	Dagg, John.	Nicholl.	Taylor.
Bargrave.	Dagge, Henry.	Powell.	Upton.
Brown, John.	Fothergill.	Pardoe.	Wallis.
Cowper, Thomas.	Francis.	Poole.	White.
Callamy.	Hull.	Paterson, Evan.	Worldidge, John.
Crewys.	Jenkinson.	Petre.	Walley.
Cobb.	J'Anson, John.	Partington.	Welby.
Comeline.	Letch.	Potts.	Welch.
Cecil.			

The General orders as to contributions towards the expenses of the Society, the Secretary reced from Mr. Atkinson one guinea, in consequence of the resolution of 20th Feb., 1752, and from Messrs. Stubbs and Atkinson one guinea each, in consequence of the Committees resolution of the 10th Novr., 1758.

Mr. Mason informed the Society that the Judge of the Mayor's Court not sitting on Tuesday last, he had no opportunity of applying for time to plead in chief to the action brought in that Court, but that he proposed to do so on the next Tuesday, and that in the meantime the case had been prepared and digested to be laid before the Society's Council for their advice in consultation intended to be had as to what pleas were proper to be pleaded in the said action. The Secretary was ordered out of the ballance of cash in his hands to pay to Mr. Mason £50 on account of his fees and disbursements in the Society's affairs. The Secretary was also ordered to wait on the several members of the Society who had not paid their respective subscriptions, in consequence of the several resolutions and orders made by ye Society, and to

desire them to pay the same on or before the 1st day of Trinity Term, or give such answers relating thereto as they shd choose, to be reported by the Secretary at ye next Genl Meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 18th April, 1760. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. White.
in the Chair.	„ Mason.	„ Powell.
„ Alexander.	„ Benton.	„ Bowman.
„ C. Browne.	„ Comeline.	

Attended by the Committee's desire :—

Mr. Banks.	Mr. Smith.	Mr. Kingsley.
„ Cruttenden.	„ Winbolt.	

Mr. Mason informed the Committee of the several steps which had been taken since the last General Meeting with regard to the several actions depending in the Mayor's Court, and laid before the Committee the brief intended for counsel on the trial of those actions, and the same was read and approved of.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 21st May, 1760. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Mason.	Mr. Powell.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ Bowman.
„ Baskerville.	„ ffothergill.	

Attended by the Committee's desire :—

Mr. Kingsley.	Mr. Winbolt.
„ Cruttenden.	„ J. Smith.

It was ordered that a Special General Meeting of the Society be held at the Devil Tavern at Temple Bar, on the 2nd June, at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. A General Meeting of the Society was accordingly held on that day. Present :—Messrs.

Adams.	Duroure.	Martin.	Rogers.
Baskerville.	Dubuc.	Morgan.	Sheffield.
Bowman.	ffothergill.	New.	Smith.
Barnes.	fferminaque.	Nix.	Thomas.
Cromwell.	ffreslique.	Owen.	Taylor.
Beardmore.	Geekie.	Powell.	Upton.
Buxton.	Grubb.	Palmer, Wm.	Wells.
Cruttenden.	Grove.	Plumtree, ffrs.	Whishaw.
Cowper, Thos.	Goostry.	Partridge.	Whitchurch.
Callamy.	Hurst.	Paterson, Evan.	Wallis.
Chambre.	J'Anson.	Partington.	Worldige, Philip.
Chapone.	Kingsley.	Philips.	White.
Currie.	Letch.	Potts.	Welby.
Dodd.	Mason.	Ryder.	Winbolt.

It being represented to the Society by Mr. Mason that several members of the Society would probably be called upon as necessary witnesses for the Defendants on the trial of the cause depending in the Mayor's Court, at the suit of the Chamberlain of the City of London, and that matter being taken into consideration, it was resolved, ordered, and declared by the Society, with the consent of the persons after named, That in order to avoid and remove all objections to the competency of the testimony of the following members of the Society, in case they should be called upon to give evidence, that they should be and were thereby discharged from the Society, and declared to be no longer members thereof, nor in any way bound to contribute to the charge or expenses of those suits or any other charges or expenses of the Society, nor should they nor any of them from that time forth have any right to or interest in any stocks, moneys, or effects of or belonging to the Society, viz. :—Messrs.

Edward Benton.	James Mead.	Charles Brown.
Robert New.	Thomas Hardwick.	Thomas Banks.
Henry ffothergill.	Richard Clive, Esqr.	Joseph Cruttenden.
Henry Barnes.	Philip Cateret Webb,	Thomas Kingsley.
George Baskerville.	Esqr.	Robert Winbolt.
William Mason.	Robert Henshaw.	John Smith.
George North.	Nathaniel Andrews.	Philip Worlidge.
John Mitchell.	John Howell.	Thomas Brigstock.
Wm. Cranstone.	Thos. Vaughan.	Edward Bowman, and
Edwd. Woodcock,	Thos. Hanzell.	Charles Rogers.
Esquire.		

At a meeting of the Committee on the 7th July, 1760. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Whishaw.
in the Chair.	„ White.	„ Pardoe.

The accounts of the Secretary were audited, and his receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, were found to be £121 5s. 4d., and his disbursements and allowances £88 12s. 4d., leaving in his hands £32 13s. 0d.

At the General Meeting of the Society on the 11th July, 1760. Present :—

	Mr. John Smith.	} Stewards. and Messrs.	
	„ Charles Morgan.		
	„ Thos. Francis.		
	„ Isaac Bargrave.		
Ayton.	Dagge, John.	Monk.	Skyrne.
Adams, Cain.	Dagge, Henry.	Massey.	Seawell.
Adams, Patience Thos.	Edison.	Nicholson.	Sayer, Henry.
Buxton.	ffreslique.	Powell.	Thomas.
Brown, John.	ffarrer.	Palmer, Wm.	Taylor.

Blake.	Geekie.	Pardoe.	Totton.
Callamy.	Grubb.	Penfold.	Upton.
Chambre.	Goostry.	Partridge.	Wells.
Cobb.	Geering.	Poole.	Waddilove.
Chapone.	Harrison, Wm.	Palmer, Charlton.	Woodhouse.
Currie.	Hall.	Paterson, Evan.	Whitchurch.
Crawly.	Inge.	Petre.	Wallis.
Dax.	Jackson, Chas.	Partington.	White.
Dodd.	Langmore.	Potts.	Winckley.
Dubuc.	Le Briton.	Rosewell.	Walley.
Dowding.	Lee.	Rees.	Welby.

The Prolocutor, Mr. David Thomas, informed the Society that since the last General Meeting, the actions against Mr. John Smith, at the instance of the Scriveners' Compy, came on to be tried on the 4th June, but for want of a sufficient number of the special jury attending, the trial was postponed to the 4th Novr.

At a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday, the 3rd Novr., 1760. Present :—

Mr. Geekie,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Marriot.	Mr. White.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Whishaw.	

Present at ye Committee's desire :—

Mr. Mason.	Mr. Cruttenden.	Mr. Smith.	Mr. P. Worlidge.
„ Benton.	„ Baskerville.	„ New.	„ Henshaw.

Mr. Mason informed the Committee what steps had been taken since the last General Meeting with regard to the action against Mr. John Smith, at the suit of the Chamberlain of London, and the Committee approved of Mr. Mason's conduct in the affair. Mr. Mason also stated that the cause was to come on for trial on the following day at the Guildhall, before the Recorder of London and a special jury of Merchants, not freemen of London.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Devil Tavern at Temple Bar, on Wednesday the 17th Decr., 1760. Present :—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Wells.	Mr. Powell.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ White.
„ Alexander.	„ Cowper, Thos.	„ Monk.
„ Jackson.	„ Comeline.	„ [Marriott.
„ Geekie.		

Present at the Committee's desire :—

Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Barnes.	Mr. Chas. Brown.
„ Mason.	„ Fothergill.	„ Henshaw.

Mr. Mason represented to the Committee, that the action brought at the instance of the Scriveners' Compy, in the name of Sir Thomas Harrison, the

Chamberlain of the City of London, against Mr. John Smith, in order to compel the Attorneys and Solicitors exercising the conveyancing branch of their profession in London into the freedom of the City and of the Scriveners' Compy contrary to all former usage, was on Thursday, the 11th December, tried before the Recorder, by a jury of merchants of London, who upon the full merits of the question gave their general verdict, without the least hesitation, for the Defendant, Mr. Smith; and that Mr. Norton conducted the defence for the Attorneys and Solicitors with suitable zeal and distinguished abilities. The Committee resolved that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Norton for his generous and eminent services in their favor, and that a piece of plate of £50 value be presented to him at the same time by the Committee. It was also represented that Mr. Morton, Mr. Yates, Mr. Harrison, and Mr. Hyde all assisted with great abilities as Councill for the Defendant, and it was resolved that the thanks of the Society be also returned to those gentlemen for their generous assistance, and that a proper present be made to them at the same time by the Committee. The thanks of the Society were also returned to Mr. filmer, Mr. Wilbraham, Mr. Capper, Mr. Harper, Mr. Booth, and Mr. Webb for their attending as witnesses on the part of the Defendant. The thanks of the Society were also returned to the Trustees of the British Museum, for having, at the instance of Mr. Webb, one of their members, and formerly a member of the Society, permitted their officer, Dr. Morton, to attend the trial with many of the ancient Chartæ repositæ there, the same having been introduced by Mr. Webb in his evidence, and considered a very material part of the Defendant's case. It was resolved that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Mason for his unwearied application and apparent services in favor of the Society, and it was referred to the Committee to consider an appropriate compliment to be made to him, and report the same to the next General Meeting of the Society.

The Committee resolved that each of the members of the Society be desired forthwith to contribute two guineas to meet the expenses of the Society, and the gentlemen present paid the Secretary two guineas each accordingly.

It being further represented that Mr. Mason was greatly in disburse, and was answerable for sundry other necessary payments in the course of the proceedings, the Secretary was desired out of the first moneys to be received by him to pay to Mr. Mason £200 on account. The thanks of the Society were returned to Mr. Cook for his services in taking the trial down in short-hand, and the said trial was ordered to be printed at large under the direction of the said Committee.

At the Special Genl Meeting of the Society at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, on the 17th Decr., 1760. Present :—Messrs.

Alexander.	Gregg.	Owen.	Seagrave.
Blake.	Highmore.	Pardoe.	Thomas.
Cowper, 'Thos.	Hurst.	Powell.	Taylor.

Callamy.	Hamilton.	Palmer, Willm.	Wells.
Cobb.	Jackson, John.	Partridge.	Whishaw.
Comeline.	Jenkinson.	Poole.	Woodhouse.
Cecil.	Jacombe.	Paterson, Evan.	Whitchurch.
Clare.	Letch.	Partington.	Wallis.
Duroure.	Life.	Phillips.	Worlidge, John.
Dubuc.	Marriott.	Potts.	White.
Dagg, Henry.	Monk.	Ryder.	Winter.
Dagg, John.	Martin.	Southouse.	Welby.
Geekie.	Morgan.	Sayer, Henry.	Walton.

The Prolocutor, Mr. David Thomas, took the Chair.

The minutes of the proceedings of the Special Genl Meeting, on the 2nd June, relating to the discharge of several members of the Society, in order to enable them to be witnesses in the trial of the action at the instance of the Scriveners' Compy being read, it was resolved to restore the said gentlemen to be members of the Society, and to the same rights and privileges to all intents and purposes as they wd have had in case they had not been discharged, and the following gentlemen then attending were introduced, viz. :
Messrs.

Banks.	Brown, Chas.	Fothergill.	Mason.
Barnes.	Brigstock.	Henshaw.	Smith.
Baskerville.	Cranstone.	Kingsley.	Bowman.

The Minutes of the proceedings of the Committee of the same day's date were read, and the resolutions of the Committee were approved, and ordered to be carried into effect.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 21st Janry, 1761. Present:—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Mason.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. New and
in the Chair.	„ Whishaw.	„ Thos. Powell.	„ Bowman.
„ Baskerville.	„ Geekie.	„ Fothergill.	

The Minutes of the Special Genl Meeting of the 17th Decr. were read, and the Committee took into consideration the two resolutions then made with reference to the sevl pieces of plate to be presented to the Society's counsel who attended the trial at the Guildhall, and it was unanimously agreed that the sevl pieces of plate so to be presented should be silver cups and covers of the following respective values:—

Mr. Norton's,	50 guineas.
Mr. Morton's,	30 guās.
Mr. Yates's,	25 guās.
Mr. Harrison's,	20 guās.
Mr. Hyde's,	15 guās.

amounting in all to £147.

The Committee postponed the further consideration of the several matters referred to them till Monday, the 2nd Feb. ; and the Secretary was ordered to send letters to the Committee to convene them together for that purpose.

The Committee accordingly met again on the 2nd Feb., 1761. Present :—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Wishaw.	Mr. T. Cowper.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Brigstock.	„ Marriot.	„ Jackson, and
„ Baskerville.	„ ffothergill.	„ Powell.	„ Bowman.
„ Mason.	„ New.	„ White.	

The Committee took into consideration the resolutions of the Society at the Special Genl Meeting, and adjourned the für consideration thereof till Friday the 6th Feb.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday the 6th Feb., 1761. Present :—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. Letch.	Mr. Pardoe.
in the Chair.	„ Geekie.	„ Monk.
„ Brigstock.	„ Baskerville.	„ Charles Brown, and
„ Wishaw.	„ Mason.	„ Bowman.
„ Powell.		

It was resolved to engrave the following inscription on the cup to be presented to Mr. Norton :—

Jurisconsulto Peritissimo
FLETCHER NORTON
Qui Legum Cognitoribus Immunitatem,
Quam Civitas Londinensis,
Urgente et advitente Scriptorum Societate,
Invaserat.
Miro Mentis acumine, et Singulari Facundiâ,
Salvam integramque præstitit,
POCULUM HOC
Grati Clientes
D. D. D.
MDCCLX.

At a meeting of the Committee, on the 16th Feb., 1761. Present :—

Mr. Geekie.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Letch.
„ Skynner.	„ Mason.	„ Monk.
„ Baskerville.	„ Powell.	„ Bowman.

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, were £410 7s. 0d., and his disbursements and allowances £308 14d. 4s., leaving in his hands £101 12s. 8d.

The Committee took into consideration the resolution of the Special Genl

Meeting of the 17th of December, with regard to Mr. Mason, and adjourned the further consideration of the same till after the taxation of the costs in *Harrison v. Smith*.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday the 20th Feb., 1761.
Present:—

	Mr. John Dowding.	} Stewards. and Messrs.	
	„ Luke Currie.		
	„ Christopher Hall.		
	„ Hopkin Rees.		
Baskerville.	Dubuc.	Letchmore.	Southouse.
Bowman.	Dagg, John.	Le Britton.	Seawell.
Burton.	Dagg, Henry.	Mason.	Sayer, Henry.
Benn, Antony.	Edison.	Marriott.	Skyrme.
Beardmore.	ffothergill.	Monk.	Smith.
Brown, John.	Grubb.	Massey.	Thomas.
Cruttenden.	Geering.	Morgan.	Taylor.
Cowper, Thos.	Highmore.	Powell.	Tolton.
Callamy.	Harrison, Wm.	Pardoe.	Wells.
Crofts.	Hobson.	Paterson, Evan.	Whishaw.
Cobb.	Henshaw.	Popham.	White.
Cecil.	Jackson, John.	Petre.	Winckley.
Constable.	Jenkinson.	Partington.	Wilson, Edmd.
Crawley.	J'Anson.	Potts.	Welby.
Chamberlayne.	Jackson, Chas.	Rogers.	Webb, David.
Cracraft.	Letch.	Skynner.	

It was ordered that Mr. Wm. Chamberlayne, Mr. Wm. Cracraft, Mr. Christopher Hobson, and Mr. David Webb, that day admitted as members of the Society, and all future members, should pay only 2½ guineas each towards the funds for discharging the expenses of the Society. After the ordinary reports had been made, it was resolved that an inscription be put on each of the silver cups to be presented to Mr. Morton, Mr. Yates, Mr. Harrison, and Mr. Hyde, and it was referred to the Committee to consider of and settle such inscriptions, and that whatever inscription they should think proper be forthwith engraved on the said cups.

It appearing to the Society that several counsel by themselves and clerks transacted business properly belonging to Attorneys and Solicitors, it was referred to the Committee to consider the proper methods to discountenance, and prevent such practices.

At a meeting of the Committee on Wed., the 25th Feb., 1761. Present:—

Mr. Thomas,	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. J. Brown.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Monk.
„ Baskerville.	„ Whishaw.	„ Bowman.
„ Mason.		

The Committee took into consideration the Order of reference made at the last Genl Meeting with regard to the inscriptions therein mentioned, and resolved to engrave the following inscription on the cup to be presented to Mr. Morton :—

Jurisconsulto peritissimo
 JOHANNI MORTON
 ob auxilium insigne
 Legum Cognitoribus præstitum
 Grati Clientes
 D. D. D.
 MDCCLX.

It was resolved to have the following inscription engraved on the cups to be presented to Mr. Yates, Mr. Harrison, and Mr. Hyde respectively :—

Jurisconsulto perito
 JOSEPHO YATES. { Thomæ Harrison
 Johanni Hyde
 ob auxilium insigne
 Legum Cognitoribus præstitum.
 Grati clientes
 D. D. D.
 MDCCLX.

On the 28th of February, 1761, several of the Committee met at the Anchor and Baptist's Head Tavern, in order to wait on the Council to present the cups; but they not being compleatly finished, the further meeting was adjourned to Monday, the 3rd of March.

The Committee met on the 3rd March, 1761. Present :—

Mr. David Thomas. Mr. Fothergill. Mr. Mason. Mr. Letch, and
 „ Baskerville. „ J. Brown. „ Powell. The Secretary.

They adjourned to the several houses and chambers of the Society's Counsel, and presented them with the silver cups, agreeable to the orders of the Society.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 17th June, 1761. Present :—

Mr. Fothergill, Mr. Mason. Mr. Powell. Mr. Bowman,
 in the Chair. „ Whishaw. „ White. Secretary.
 „ Pardoe.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £212 14s. 2d., and his disbursements and allowances to £173 8s. 6d., leaving a balance of £39 5s. 8d. due to the Society.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 19th June, 1761. Present :—

	Mr. Danl. Highmore.	} Stewards. and Messrs.	
	„ John Edison.		
	„ Thomas Winckley.		
	„ William Welby.		
Alexander.	Duroure.	Marriott.	Potts.
Adams, Thos.	Dubuc.	Monk.	Rogers.
Baskerville.	Dowding.	Massey.	Rees.
Bowman.	Dagge, John.	Morgan.	Southouse.
Barnes.	ffothergill.	Mainwaring.	Stanninought.
Benton.	Grubb.	New.	Sayer.
Bargrave.	Holker.	Powell.	Skyrme.
Brown, John.	Hall.	Paterson, John,	Totton.
Blake.	Henshaw.	Esqr.	Upton.
Cowper, Thos.	Hobson.	Palmer, Wm.	Whishaw.
Callamy.	Jenkinson.	Pardoe.	Waddilove.
Chambre.	J'Anson.	Penfold.	Worlidge, John.
Cobb.	Langmore.	Partridge.	White.
Coulthard.	Letchmore.	Palmer, Charlton.	Wilson, Edmund.
Crawley.	L'Breton.	Paterson, Evan.	Walton.
Chamberlayn.	Lee.	Petre.	
Dax.	Mason.	Partington.	

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, it was referred to the Committee to report to the Society at the next Genl Meeting their opinion of the most proper method to be taken to discountenance and prevent council by themselves or their clerks transacting business properly belonging to Attorneys and Solicitors.

A motion was made to repeal the order of the General Meeting of the 23rd Feb., 1759, with regard to the Committee's nominating persons to be of their number as they thought proper in the place of those who shd die or decline attending, but "it passed in the negative."

The Society having a high opinion of the great learning and abilities of DANBY PICKERING, ESQRE., Editor of the Cambridge Edition of the Statutes, and being desirous of encouraging the laudable endeavour of that University to reduce the present exorbitant price of so necessary a work, unanimously resolved to subscribe for the same, and recommend it to the members of the Society to encourage the same by becoming subscribers thereto. The Secretary was ordered to transcribe and send a copy of the said resolution to Danby Pickering, Esqr., and to subscribe for one copy of the work.

(From this point forward the notes are taken from the draft Minutes.)

At a meeting of the Committee on the 15th Feb., 1762. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Comeline.	Mr. Letch.	Mr. Mason, and
„ Powell.	„ Whishaw.	„ Baskerville.	The Secretary.
„ Pardoe.	„ Alexander.	„ Monk.	

The Secretary's accounts were audited, and his receipts, including £39 5s. 6d. balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £56 6s. 2d., and his disbursements and allowances to £18 12s. 6d., leaving due to the Society £37 13s. 8d.

At the same meeting the Committee took into consideration the order made at the Genl Meeting on the 19th June, 1761, to the effect that the Committee were to consider and report to the Society their opinion of the most proper method to be taken to discountenance and prevent counsel by themselves and their clerks transacting business which properly belonged to the profession of Attorneys and Solicitors, and were of opinion that the most proper method to discountenance such practice was to prosecute every person so acting without being duly qualified, and that the Society ought to bear the expense of such prosecutions.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 19th Feb., 1762.
Present:—

The Prolocutor, Mr. David Thomas, in the Chair.

Mr. John Worledge.	} Stewards.
„ Stevens Totton.	
„ ffrancis Chambré.	
„ Thos. Walley Partington.	

Mr. Austin.	Mr. ffisher.	Mr. Pye.
„ Adams, Cain.	„ ffrancis.	„ Roose.
„ Ayton.	„ Gason.	„ Robinson.
„ Bridge.	„ Gunter.	„ Roberts, James.
„ Bargrave.	„ Grove.	„ Saunderson.
„ Barnardiston.	„ Gwatkin.	„ Skynner.
„ Baynes.	„ Harrison, Thos.	„ Stanninought.
„ Beard.	„ Henshaw.	„ Sheffield.
„ Chalfield.	„ Jesser.	„ Simpson.
„ Cranston.	„ Langmore.	„ Sherrard.
„ Cope.	„ Lessure.	„ Troughton.
„ Craddock.	„ Marriot.	„ Worlidge, P.
„ Clare.	„ Mitchell, F.	„ Wall.
„ Crosby.	„ Martin.	„ Winterbottom.
„ Cracraft.	„ Nicoll.	„ Waddilove.
„ Dickenson, M.	„ Owen.	„ Webb.
„ Dickenson, Edwd.	„ Peale.	„ Winter.
„ D'Yong.	„ Pread.	„ Yeo.

After the usual reports had been made, the Secretary was ordered to write

to the several members of the Society who were in arrear with their subscriptions, and acquaint them with the amount thereof, and that if they did not pay the same to the Secretary by the first day of the following Trinity Term, they wd be considered as having withdrawn themselves from ye Society. It was afterwards thought most proper for ye Secretary to give a proper intimation to such members.

At a meeting of the Committee held the 5th July, 1762. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Morgan.	Mr. Mason.	Mr. Chamberlayne.
in the Chair.	„ White.	„ Powell.	

The Secretary's accounts were audited, and his receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £72 6s. 5d., and his disbursements and allowances to £12 1s. 2d., leaving in his hands a balance of £60 5s. 3d.

A General Meeting of the Society was held on the 9th July, 1762. Present :—

Mr. Robert Henshaw took the Chair as Prolocutor *pro hac vice*.

Mr. Ralph ffresselique. Mr. Thos. Le Breton.

„ John Blake. „ Wm. Chamberlayne.

Mr. Austin.	Mr. Gason.	Mr. Plumtree.
„ Adams.	„ Grove.	„ Pread.
„ Ayton.	„ Gunter.	„ Peale.
„ Burgh.	„ Gwatkin.	„ Pye.
„ Bridge.	„ Hindley.	„ Parker.
„ Buxton.	„ Harrison, Jno.	„ Roberts, James.
„ Barnardiston.	„ Harrison, Thos.	„ Sympson.
„ Beech.	„ Harrison, Wm.	„ Sheffield.
„ Benn, Antony.	„ Hamilton.	„ Skyrme.
„ Benn, Thos.	„ Jesser.	„ Saunderson.
„ Beard.	„ Lesure.	„ Sherrard.
„ Craddock.	„ Lucas.	„ Stubbs.
„ Currie.	„ Marriot.	„ Stanninought.
„ Crosby.	„ Moxon.	„ Thomas.
„ Crofts.	„ Martin.	„ Timms.
„ Cox, James.	„ Murgatrod.	„ Thurston.
„ Chalfield.	„ Massey.	„ Troughton.
„ Cecil.	„ Michell.	„ Unwin.
„ Cope.	„ Morse.	„ Woodhouse.
„ D'Yong.	„ Mitchell.	„ Worledge.
„ Dickinson, M.	„ Nicholl.	„ Webb, David.
„ Dickinson, E.	„ Nicholson.	„ Wylde.
„ Elers.	„ Noel.	„ Yeo.
„ ffraine.	„ Owen.	

The draft Minutes only give particulars of the ordinary reports submitted to every General Meeting.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 21st Feb., 1763. Present:—

Mr. David Thomas,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Morgan.
in the Chair.	„ ffothergill.	„ Letch.	„ White.
„ Pardoe.	„ Chamberlain.		

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £71 10s. 3d., and his disbursements and allowances to £17 19s. 11d., leaving a balance of £53 10s. 4d.

The Minutes of a General Meeting of the Society held on the 25th Feb., 1763, are missing.

At a meeting of the Come on the 18th May, 1763. Present:—

Mr. Whishaw,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Bowman,
in the Chair.	„ White.	„ Powell.	Secretary.
„ Letch.	„ Baskerville.	„ Chamberlayne.	

The Minutes of the General Meeting of the Society on the 25th Feb. preceding were considered, and the three orders of reference made to the Come therein contained were read, and were as follows:—

To consider whether any and what für gratuity should be given to Mr. Cooke for his services to the Society.

To consider a proper gratuity and compliment to be made to Mr. Colston for his extraordinary trouble and services relating to the Society.

To consider what was proper für to be done in the several causes depending with the Scriveners' Compy, and that the Come give directions to proceed therein as they should think proper.

The Come having considered the order made with reference to Mr. Cooke, and a letter received by the Secretary from Mr. Cooke, and the resolution at the Special General Meeting of the Society on the 17th Decr., 1760, whereby the thanks of the Society were directed to be given to Mr. Cooke for his services, the Committee were of opinion that any further gratuity to Mr. Cooke would be improper.

The Committee adjourned the consideration of the Order of reference as to a proper gratuity and compliment to Mr. Colston till their next meeting.

As to the order with reference to the several causes depending with the Scriveners' Compy, the Committee were of opinion that the costs in the cause of Harrison against Smith ought to be taxed forthwith by the proper officer, and the judgment completed and entered up, and for that purpose that a proper bill of costs be prepared by Mr. Hannam, who, with Mr. Brown, the late Mr. Mason's nephew, was in possession of the papers, and that such bill be laid before the Committee at their next meeting.

The Committee met on the 4th July, 1763. Present :—

Mr. Whishaw,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Letch.	Mr. Powell.
in the Chair.	„ ffothergill.	„ Morgan.	„ Chamberlayn.

The Secretary's accounts were audited, and his receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £74 8s. 11d., and his disbursements and allowances £13 os. 10d., leaving due to the Society a balance of £61 8s. 1d.

The further consōn of the order of reference with regard to Mr. Colston was adjourned till the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee resumed the consideration of the order of reference with regard to what was proper to be done in the cause depending with the Scriveners' Compy, and the Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee having been read, the Secretary reported that he had applied to Mr. Hannam for the Bill of Costs therein referred to, and that Mr. Hannam was digesting the papers, and would make out the Bill with all convenient speed. The Committee therefore postponed the consideration of the order till their next meeting.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 8th July, 1763. Present :—

Mr. Peter ffermignac.	} Stewards.
„ John Nix.	
„ Stephen Popham.	
„ James Dagge.	

Mr. Austin.	Mr. Elers.	Mr. Peale.
„ Adams, C.	„ ffraine.	„ Pye.
„ Ayton.	„ ffisher.	„ Parker.
„ Barnes.	„ Gason.	„ Pardon.
„ Burgh.	„ Grove.	„ Rees, Hopkins.
„ Bridge.	„ Harrison, T.	„ Roberts.
„ Bargrave.	„ Hindley.	„ Reynolds.
„ Buxton.	„ Hamilton.	„ Sheffield.
„ Barnardiston.	„ Harrison, Wm.	„ Sanderson.
„ Baynes.	„ Harrison, Jno.	„ Stubbs.
„ Brown.	„ Hobson.	„ Simpson.
„ Bonn, Antony.	„ Hodgson.	„ Thomas.
„ Beard.	„ Jackson, J.	„ Unwin.
„ Butler.	„ Jones.	„ Waldo.
„ Combs.	„ Jefferson.	„ Woodhouse.
„ Cox, James.	„ Jesser.	„ Worledge.
„ Cox, Joshua.	„ Kingsley.	„ Wall.
„ Chalfield.	„ Lesure.	„ Walton.
„ Cecil.	„ Lee.	„ Wylde.

Mr. Cope.	Mr. Murgatrod.	Mr. Webb, John.
„ Dage, John.	„ Masterman.	„ Wynter.
„ Dickinson, M.	„ Nicholl.	„ Wilson, G.
„ Dickinson, E.	„ Owen.	

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, it was referred to the Committee to consider of and pursue such methods as they should think proper to obtain the repeal of any order or orders made by the Benchers of the several Inns of Court, tending to preclude Attorneys and Solicitors from being called to the Bar until they should have discontinued practising as such for the space of two years. In the draft Minutes appears a form of resolution which was cancelled in favor of that just given, and which is as follows :—

“Ordered that it be referred to the Committee to draw up a proper remonstrance, to be delivered to the Benchers of the sevl Inns of Court, against the Order or Resolution made by them to prevent Attorneys and Solicitors being called to the Bar till two years after they shall have left off practising as Attorneys or Solicitors, and to desire the repeal of so much of the Order as relates to them, and that the Committee do further therein as they shall think proper.”

At the meeting of the Committee on the 10th Feb., 1764. Present :—

Mr. Alexander,	Mr. Skynner.	Mr. Pardoe.
in the Chair.	„ Wishaw.	„ Morgan.
„ Comeline.	„ Powell.	„ White.
„ Baskerville.	„ Chamberlayne.	„ Bowman.

The order of reference made at the General Meeting on the 8th July, with regard to the order made by the several Benchers of the Inns of Court, was read, as well as the Order of the Society of Lincoln's Inn, dated the 13th June, 1762, with regard to the precluding of Attorneys and Solicitors being called to the Bar until they should have discontinued practising as such for two years, and the Committee were of opinion that a Memorial ought to be presented to the sevl Societies of Lincoln's Inn, Inner Temple, Middle Temple, and Gray's Inn, relating to the said order or orders made by them, and such memorial was ordered to be prepared, and was to be taken into consideration by the Committee at their next meeting.

The Committee met on the 20th Feb., 1764. Present :—

Mr. Skynner,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. ffothergill.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Morgan.
„ Alexander.	„ Wishaw.	„ Chamberlayne.
„ Baskerville.		

The Secretary's accounts were audited, and his receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £77 18s. 1d., his dis-

bursements and allowances to £27 11s. 4d., leaving due to the Society £50 6s. 9d.

At the same meeting the Committee resumed the consideration of the order of reference made at the last Genl Meeting, and prepared and approved a memorial to be presented to the sevl Societies of Lincoln's Inn, Inner Temple, Middle Temple, and Gray's Inn, agreeable to the opinion of the Committee at their last meeting, and ordered the Secretary to deliver the said Memorials to the several Societies at their council.

The Committee also took into consideration the Order of reference made at the General Meeting of the Society on the 23rd Feb., 1763, whereby it was refd to them to consider what was proper further to be done in the several causes depending with Scriveners' Compy, and to give directions and proceed therein as they should think proper; and the Secretary reported that the judgment in the cause of the Chamberlain of London against Smith had been entered up, but that the costs had not been taxed by reason that Mr. Hannam, who with Mr. Brown was in possession of the late Mr. Mason's papers, had not been able to perfect the Bill of Costs for that purpose.

At the General Meeting of the Socy on the 24th Feb., 1764. Present :—

	Mr. John Whitesides.	} Stewards.	
	„ Charles Rogers.		
	„ Nathaniel George Petre.		
	„ Thomas Lechmere.		
Mr. Austin.	Mr. ffraine.		Mr. Pardon.
„ Adams, C.	„ ffisher.		„ Robert, Junr.
„ Ayton.	„ Gwatkin.		„ Rees.
„ Barns.	„ Gregg.		„ Richards.
„ Buxton.	„ Gason.		„ Sheffield.
„ Brook.	„ Grove.		„ Seawell.
„ Briggs.	„ Harrison, Thos.		„ Sanderson.
„ Beard.	„ Hurst.		„ Swale.
„ Clare.	„ Hindley.		„ Simpson.
„ Crewys.	„ Hamilton.		„ Thomas.
„ Crofts.	„ Harrison, Jno.		„ Unwin.
„ Cox, James.	„ Hodgson.		„ Woodhouse.
„ Cox, Joshua.	„ Jesser.		„ Worlidge.
„ Chalfield.	„ Jenkinson.		„ Worlidge.
„ Cecil.	„ Lesure.		„ Walley.
„ Cope.	„ Lewis.		„ Walton.
„ D'Yong.	„ Murgatrod.		„ Wylde.
„ Dennison.	„ Noel.		„ Webb, Jno.
„ Evans.	„ Owen.		„ Winter.
„ Elers.	„ Parker.		„ Wellard.
„ Emmonson.	„ Partridge.		

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, it was resolved that for the future every member of the Society, on the tender of a ticket for the Trinity Vacation dinner, pay 10s. for the same, which should entitle him to a ticket for the following Hilary Vacation dinner also.

The Committee met on Friday, the 18th May, 1764. Present :—

Mr. Baskerville. Mr. Chamberlayne. Mr. Powell, and the Secretary.

There not being sufficient members to constitute a Committee, no business could be entered upon.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 23rd May, 1764. Present :—

Mr. Skynner,	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	,, Pardoe.	,, Whishaw.

The Committee took into consideration the Memorial to be presented to the Inns of Court mentioned in the Minutes of the 20th Feb., 1764, and ordered the same to be fairly transcribed and signed by the Secretary, and to be presented to the several Inns of Court, and that the members of the Committee or any five or more of them attend with the Secretary upon presenting the said Memorial.

At the same meeting a Bill of Costs in the case of the Chamberlain of London against Smith having been prepared, in pursuance of the order of the Society, by Mr. Hannam, the Committee resolved that the same be forthwith taxed, and the judgment in that action entered on the record, and that Mr. Hannam, who was in possession of the papers, be desired to attend such taxation.

There is with the papers a copy of a circular sent by the Secretary to the members of the Committee, dated the 15th May, 1764, convening a meeting for the following Friday at 8 o'clock, at the Horn Tavern, in Fleet St., to consider of the Memorial to be presented to the several Inns of Court, and on other special matters; and in a postscript the Secretary adds :—"You are desired to attend, as for want of a sufficient number of members to make a Committee at the last meeting, no business could be done. 21st May, 1764." The draft Minutes of this meeting are not with the papers.

There is another circular by the Secretary, dated the 21st June, 1764, convening a meeting for the following Friday at 6 o'clock, at Serle's Coffee House in Lincoln's Inn, to present the Memorials to the several Inns of Court, but in this case also there are no Minutes of the meeting so convened with the papers.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 16th July, 1764. Present :—

Mr. Skynner, in	Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Powell.
the Chair.	,, ffothergil.	,, Morgan.	,, Monk.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including the balance

in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £58 4s. 3d., and his disbursements and allowances to £21 5s. 4d., leaving due to the Society a balance of £36 18s. 11d.

At the General Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 20th July, 1764.
Present :—

Mr. Abraham Winterbottom.	} Stewards.
„ Robt. Wimbolt.	
„ Edward Benton, Junr.	
„ Charles Jackson.	

(Names not given.)

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, the Memorial presented by the Committee to the sevl Inns of Court was read, and the Committee were desired to continue their care, and to attend on the sevl Inns of Court in regard thereto.

At the same meeting it was ordered that no motion should be made or business done at any Genl Meeting after 7 o'clock in the afternoon.

With the papers is a copy of a circular sent by the Secretary to the members of the Committee, dated 23rd July, 1764, summoning them to meet on the following Wednesday at 7 o'clock at Serle's Coffee House in Lincoln's Inn, to attend the Masters of the Bench of the Society of Lin. Inn by their appointt, with regard to the Memorial presented to them, but the Minutes of this meeting (if it took place) are not to be found.

At a meeting of the Committee at the Horn Tavern, Fleet St., on Monday the 18th Feb., 1765. Present :—

Mr. Thomas, in the Chair.	Mr. Skynner. „ Comeline.	Mr. Southouse. „ Baskerville.	Mr. Chamberlayn.
------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £60 15s. 11d., and his disbursements and allowances to £15 0s. 0d., leaving in his hands a balance of £45 15s. 11d.

The matter of the application to the sevl Inns of Court upon the Memorials presented, relating to their late Order of the 30th June, 1762, tending to preclude attorneys and solicitors being called to the Bar, being taken into consideratn, it was resolved that, in the opinion of the Committee, some member of the Society who had been admitted as a student in either of the Inns of Court, and had duly conformed in all respects to the rule of the House to which he belonged, apply to such House for admissn to the Bar, notwithstanding the above-mentd order, and if refused, that a mandamus be brought, or such other legal applōn be made, as should be thought necessary, at the expense of the Society, to try the validity of such Order.

At the Genl Meetg of the Society on Friday, the 22nd of Feb., 1765.
Present :—

Mr. Thomas Constable.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given).
„ John Walton.	
„ John Irving.	
„ Edward Parker.	

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, it was referred to the Committee to take the advice of counsel as to what methods were proper to be pursued in order to try the validity of the order of the several Inns of Court of the 30th June, 1762, tending to exclude attorneys and Solicitors from being called to the Bar, as mentioned in that Order.

At a meeting of the Committee on Wed., the 19th June, 1765, at the Horns Tavern, Fleet St. Present :—

Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Chamberlain.
„ Comeline.	„ White.	„ Powell.	„ Bowman.

The order of reference made to the Committee at the last Genl Meeting was read, and the Committee settled a case for the advice of Counsel, with regard to the proper methods to be pursued to try the validity of the order of the several Inns of Court of the 30th June, 1762, and the Secry was ordered to make two copies of the case, and the extracts from Dugdale's *Origines Judiciales*, and to lay the same before Mr. Sergeant Glynn and Mr. Sergt Leigh for their opinions thereon.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 8th July, 1765, at the Horn Tavern in Fleet Street. Present :—

Mr. Skinner, C.	Mr. ffothergil.	Mr. Letch.	Mr. Monk.
„ Baskerville.	„ Whishaw.	„ Chamberlayne.	„ Bowman.
„ Pardoe.	„ Powell.		

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £56 5s. 11d., and his disbursements and allowances £38 os. 0d., leaving a balance of £18 5s. 11d. due to the Society.

At the same meeting the Secretary laid before the Committee the opinions given by Mr. Sergt Glynn and Mr. Sergt Leigh on the case settled at the last meeting of the Committee, and it was ordered that the case and opinions be laid before the Society at their next Genl Meeting.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 12th July, 1765. Present :—

Mr. Thomas Brown.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given).
„ James Hutchinson.	
„ James Coulthard.	
„ Antony Pye.	

After the usual reports had been made, the cases laid before Counsel with regard to the Orders of the Inns of Court, and the opinions given by Mr. Sergt Glynn and Mr. Sergeant Leigh thereon, were read, and the thanks of the Society were ordered to be returned to the learned Sergeants for the great pains they had taken on the occasion, and the Prolocutor and such members of the Committee as could attend were desired to wait on the learned gentlemen for that purpose.

At the same meeting, it appearing to the Society that the resolution of the Genl Meeting of the 24th Feb., 1764, with regard to the delivery of tickets for leasts had not answered the purpose for which the same was intended, it was repealed; but the members who had taken tickets for that feast, and paid 10s. each for them, were to have a ticket gratis for the following Hilary Vacation dinner.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 17th Feb., 1766. Present:—

Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Letch.	Mr. White.
„ Pardoe.	„ Chamberlain.	„ ffothergill.

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £54 12s. 5d., and his disbursements and allowances to £15 15s. 0d., leaving in his hands a balance of £38 17s. 5d.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 21st Feb., 1766. Present:—

Mr. James ffarer.	} Stewards.
„ Wm. Russell.	
„ ffrancis Potts.	
„ Bateman Robson.	

and Messrs. (names not given).

No business appears to have been done, with the exception of reading and approving the usual reports, and appointing Stewards for the following feast.

At the Meeting of the Committee on the 23rd June, 1766. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskervill.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. White.
in the Chair.	„ Wishaw.	„ Powell.	„ Bowman.

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £46 14s. 11d., and his disbursements and allowances to £24 15s. 0d., leaving a balance in his hands of £21 19s. 11d.

At the Genl Meetg of the Socy on Friday, the 27th June, 1766. Present:—

Mr. John Reynolds.	} Stewards.
„ Lazarus Venables.	
„ Wm. Browne.	
„ Thos. Brooke.	

and Messrs. (names not given).

The Prolocutor, Mr. Henry Barnes, took the Chair.

After the ordinary reports had been made, it was represented to the Society that Sergeant Davy, at a late trial as Counsel for the Plaintiff, said, addressing himself to the Jury: "You gentlemen who are on the outside of the curtain do not see the tricks and management within; we that are on the inside see the whole, and I will take it upon me to say, that out of the many mistakes that happen in the management of causes, 19 out of 20 happen by the ignorance of attorneys," and it was resolved that, in the opinion of the Society, any Counsel at the Bar making use of such like reflections upon the attorneys in general, ought not to be employed as counsel by any member of the Society.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 16th Feb., 1767. Present:—

Mr. Southouse.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Monk.
„ Baskerville.	„ White.	„ Bowman.

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £46 7s. 5d., and his disbursements and allowances to £22 17s. 0d., leaving a balance in his hands of £23 10s. 5d.

At the Genl Meeting of the Socy on the 20th Feb., 1767. Present:—

Mr. Saville Read.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given).
„ ffletcher Partis.	
„ John Buckle.	
„ Wm. Harrison.	

In the absence of the Prolocutor, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Wishaw was unanimously requested to take on him the office of Prolocutor pro hac vice, and he took his place accordingly.

After the ordinary reports had been made, Mr. ffothergill laid before the Society the following letter which he had received from Mr. Sergt Davy, enclosed in a cover to himself:—

“DEAR SIR,

“Understanding that the Society of Attorneys and Solicitors are now meeting, I take the liberty of desiring you will present my most respectful compliments to them; and to assure them that it gives me the utmost concern to have incurred their displeasure by means of an unguarded and very improper expression which dropped from me last Summer, in the course of an unpremeditated reply, which I am extremely sorry for.

“I also declare that I never meant to cast the least reflection on the profession in general, or any gentleman concerned in it; but on the contrary, I have always held the attorneys and solicitors in the most esteem and gratitude.

“It is but by general report I have heard of their displeasure, and therefore

I hope it will not be deemed improper that I thus address the Society through the medium of a friend. If I knew a more respectful method of applicatn I would gladly embrace it.

“ I am, Sir,

“ Your most obliged and most obedient humble servant,

“ W. DAVY.

“ Feb. 20, 1767.”

The Society taking into consōn the above letter, resolved unanimously to accept the same as a suitable and proper acknowledgment and apology. With the Minutes is another draft of this resolutn, to the following effect : “ Resolved that Mr. Sergt Davy having in public Court, and by a letter now received from him, expressed his concern for the words he spoke on a late trial, and declaring that the same were contrary to his sentiments, and inadvertently dropped from him, it is the opinion of this Society that he has made proper satisfaction.”

At the meeting of the Comittee on Monday, the 13th July, 1767.
Present :—

Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Monk.	Mr. Letch.	Mr. Pardoe.
„ ffothergill, C.	„ Wells.	„ Powell.	„ Bowman.
„ Chamberlayne.			

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £39 16s. 11d., and his disbursements and allowances to £12 4s. 0d., leaving a balance of £27 12s. 11d. in his hands.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 17th day of July, 1767.
Present :—

Mr. Richard Clark.	} Stewards.
„ John Ellis.	
„ Wm. Merrick.	
„ Saml. Cooper.	

and Messrs. (names not given).

The Prolocutor, Mr. Henry Barnes, took the Chair.

The usual reports were received and approved of, and Mr. Edwd Bowman, Junr., was, nem. con., appointed Assistant Secretary of the Society. No other business was done.

At a Genl Meeting of the Society held at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, the usual reports were made, and the Minutes were read and approved of.

At a meeting of the Comittee on the 4th July, 1768. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Letch.	Mr. Upton.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Baskerville.	„ White.

The Secretary's accounts were audited, and his receipts, including £15 9s. 9d. in his hands at the precedg Genl Meeting, were found to be £40 5s. 4d., and his disbursements and allowances £10 11s. 8d., leaving a balance in his hands due to the Society of £29 13s. 8d.

At this time (July 1768) consisted of twenty-five members, whose names are as follows, as appears by a list given on the back of one of the Secretary's circulars :—

Alexander.	Brigstocke.	Cowper.
Benton.	Baskerville.	Chamberlayne.
Barnes.	Cornelius.	ffothergill.
Brown, Chas.	Colston.	Heaton.
Henshaw.	Pardoe.	Whishaw.
Jackson, Jno.	Powell.	White.
Letch.	Southouse.	Sayer.
Monk.	Wells.	Upton.
	and Grubb.	

At the General Meeting of the Society held on the 8th July, 1768, at the Devil's Tavern, Temple Bar. Present :

Mr. Richard Brown.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given).
„ Jas. Thompson.	
„ Thos. Seagrave.	
„ Jno. Manley.	

The Prolocutor, Mr. Barnes, took the Chair.

After the ordinary business of the meeting had been disposed of, it was referred to the Committee to use their endeavours to get the hours and days of attendance at the Seal Office for sealing Writs altered, and they were ordered to report their proceedings to the Society at the next Genl Meetg. It was also referred to the Committee to make proper application to the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, to make a rule for registering attorneys admitted in that Court similar to that made by the Judges of the Court of King's Bench.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 20th Feb., 1769. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Upton.	„ Sayer.	„ Bowman.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including £39 13s. 8d. in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £43 11s. 2d., and his disbursements and allowances to £28 5s. 1d., leaving in his hands £15 16s. 1d., besides £200 Three per cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities. At the same meeting Mr. ffothergill reported that applõn had been made to Mr.

Goddard, the principal agent, or sealer at the Seal Office, for altering the hours of attendance for sealing Writs in the Common Law Courts, and also for a copy of the Patent or Grant of that office. Mr. Goddard would not comply without application being made to Mr. Rooke, at the Rolls Chapple, to search for and inspect the enrolment of the Grant. Mr. Rooke had obligingly given him (Mr. ffothergill) all the assistance in his power, without reward, on account of the search being for the Society. (The MS. here becomes very difficult to make out, but the effect of it seems to be that Mr. ffothergill had made the search, but had not succeeded in finding what he wanted.) Mr. ffothergill also reported that application had been made to the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, for making a rule to the like purpose as was made in Hilary Term, 1768, by the Judges of the Court of King's Bench, for attorneys entering their names and places of abode, or other places where notices, summonses, orders, and rules might be served upon them, but that the Court of Com. Pleas had in the last Term made a Rule for such entries to be made in a book to be prepared and kept for the purpose by the Clerk of the Warrants.

A meeting of the Committee was summoned by the Secretary in a circular dated the 16th Jany., 1769, to meet on the following Wed. at 7 o'clock, at the Horn Tavern in Fleet St., to consider the two references made to them at the last Genl Meetg with regd to the hours of attendance at the Seal Office, and as to applying to the Judges of the Common Pleas to make a like rule for registering Attorneys as in the King's Bench. The Minutes of this are missing. At the Genl Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 24th Feb., 1769. Present:—

Mr. Geogory Geering.	} Stewards.
„ John Harrison.	
„ Charles Hunt.	
„ John Philpot.	

and Messrs. (names not given).

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, the Committee was ordered to proceed on the order of reference made to them relating to the Seal Office for Writs at the preceding Genl Meetg with the utmost despatch, and take every necessary step in their power to carry the matter of that reference into execution.

At the same meeting it was also refd to the Committee to consider an applōn to be made to the Postmaster-General, that the general Penny Post Office lately removed from Chichester's Rent in Chancery Lane to Blackmore Street, may be restored to the former place, or as near thereto as a proper place of reception could be procured.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 21st April, 1769. Present:—

Mr. Wells,	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Letch.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ Bowman.

The Committee took into their further consōn the order of reference with regd to the alteratn of the hours of attendce at the Seal Office for sealing Writs, and the Secretary reported that he had sevl times attended with Mr. Rooke of the "Rolls Chapple," to search for and inspect the enrollment of the Grant of that office, but the same could not be found. The Committee were of opinion that application should be made to have the office open from 10 to 12 in the morning on all the usual days of attendance, and from 4 till 7 in the afternoon during Term, and for a fortnight after every Hilary and Trinity Term, and for a week after every Easter and Michaelmas Term, and for the rest of the year from 4 till 6 in the afternoon. The Secretary was ordered to prepare a Memorial to be settled at the next meeting of the Committee, in order to be presented to the Patentee of the Seal Office for the purpose aforesaid. The Secretary was also ordered to summon the Committee to meet again on the 3rd May, when the order of reference with regard to the removal of the Penny Post Office wd be taken into consideration.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 3rd May, 1769, the consideratn of the order of reference with regd to the Seal office was again proceeded with, and the Secretary, pursuant to the order of the Committee at the last meetg, laid before them a Memorial to be presented to His Grace the Duke of Cleveland, Patentee of the Seal Office, and the same was settled by them, and ordered to be signed by the Secrety, and presented to His Grace.

The Committee then proceeded with the reference as to the removal of the Penny Post Office, and adjourned the further consōn of it to their next meeting.

There is with the papers a circular dated the 28th April, 1769, addressed by the Secretary to the members of the Committee, summoning a meeting for the following Wed. at 7 o'clock, to consider the orders of reference made at the last Genl Meeting. The Minutes of this meeting are not with the papers.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 27th June, 1769. Present:—

Mr. Fothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. White.	Mr. Pardoe.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ Monk.	„ Chamberlayne.
„ Baskerville.			

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meetg, amounted to £30 15s. 10d., and his disbursements and allowances to £22 9s. 2d., leaving in his hands a balance of £8 6s. 8d.

The Secretary informed the Committee, that since their last meeting he had several times applied to Mr. White at the Seal Office, to know whether any answer had been returned to the Memorial presented to His Grace the Duke of Cleveland, and was acquainted that there had been none. The Secretary was ordered to make a diligent search at the proper office to find whether the Lords of the Treasury had made any order for the regulation of the Seal Office,

in pursuance of the power given by the grant of that office, and if any such orders had been made to procure copies thereof.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society held on the 30th June, 1769. Present:—

Mr. Oliver Cromwell.	}	Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given).
,, Saml. Goodman.		
,, Christopher Hobson.		
,, Thos. Rowleson.		

The ordinary routine business appears to have been done.

A meeting of the Committee was summoned by a circular from the Secretary, dated the 12th Janry., 1770, to be held on the Monday following, to consider the order of reference with regard to the Seal Office, but the minutes of this meeting are not with the papers. There is, however, with the papers a document of which the following is a copy:—

“ Seal Office, 6th Febr., 1770.

“ The hours for sealing Writs in this Office are appointed from and after this day from 10 to 12 in the morning, and from 4 in the afternoon until 6 in the evening, and in Term time to 7.”

At a meeting of the Committee on Thursday, the 18th of Janry., 1770, at the Horn Inn in Fleet Street. Present:—

Mr. Fothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Chamberlayne.
in the Chair.	,, Upton.	,, Sayer.
,, Baskerville.	,, Pardoe.	,, Bowman.

The draft of a memorial to be presented to the King's Bench and Common Pleas was produced, read, and approved.

Ordered that two copies of the said memorial be fairly transcribed and signed by the Secretary, to be presented to the said respective courts, and that the Secretary do summon the Committee to meet at Oliver's Coffee House, Westminster, for the purpose on the first day of the next term at 9 of the clock in the morning.

On the 19th Feb., 1770, the Committee audited the Secretary's accounts. His receipts, including £8 6s. 8d., the balance in his hands at the preceding Genl Meeting, amounted to £22 4s. 2d., and his disbursements and allowances to £27 7s. 6d., leaving a balance due to the Secretary of £5 3s. 4d.

The following bill by the Secretary appears to have been delivered abt this time:—

The Secretary's Bill of Craveings.

1769, June 28. Attending at the Treasury Office, Whitehall, £ s. d.
to enquire if any order had been made by the Lords of the
Treasury with regard to the Seal Office, but could get no informa-
tion from the Clerk 6 8

	£	s.	d.
1770. Fair copy of the Memorial to the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, as ordered by the Committee on the 18th Janry.	2	6	
Two fair copies to be presented to the Judges	6	0	
Two fair copies of the Memorial to the Duke of Cleveland for the Judge	4	0	
Attending several of the Committee with the copies before presented			
Jan'y 23. Attending Westminster Hall on presenting the Memorials to the Judges	6	8	
Several attendances at the Seal Office to get notice of the alteration of the hours stuck up in the Seal Office			
General allowance for extra trouble	2	2	0
	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>

At the Genl Meetg of the Society on the 23rd Feb., 1770. Present:—

Mr. John Poole.	}	Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given).
„ George Hamelt.		
„ Wm. Kaye.		
„ Meredith Price.		

After the ordinary business had been done, it was refd to the Committee to consider of the present mode of putting in, taking, and justifying bail in the several Courts in the Kingdom. It was also referred to the Committee to enquire if some attorneys had not lately been surreptitiously admitted.

At the same meeting the Secretary informed the Society that Mr. David Thomas and Mr. Southouse, in whose name, with others, the £200 Bank Annuities belonging to the Society were held, were one of them dead, and the other unwilling to act any longer as trustee. Mr. Barnes and Mr. ffothergill were accordingly appointed trustees in the place of the said gentn, and were ordered to give a letter of attorney to the Secretary, empowering him to draw the annuities in their names.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 25th June, 1770. Present:—

Mr. Wells,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Powell.	„ White.
„ Baskerville.	„ Sayer.	„ Bowman.

The orders of reference made at the last Genl Meeting were consid, and the further consõn of the same adjourned to that day "sevenight." In the draft minutes for this day appear the following notes written apparently

by a member of the Committee. "No Jew to be bail for any person but a Jew.

Abraham-Abrahams } Fore Street in the Artillery Ground,
 Jacobs. }
 admitted as attorneys."

The Committee met again on the 2nd July, 1770. Present :—

Mr. Wells,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. White.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Upton.	„ Powell.	„ ffothergill.
„ Baskerville.	„ Pardoe.		

The consōn of the orders of reference was resumed, but as no sufficient information was given or produced, the further consōn of those orders was postponed to the next meeting of the Committee.

At the meeting of the Come on Monday the 16th July, 1770. Present :—

Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Powell.	Mr. White.
------------------	------------------	-------------	------------

The accounts of the Secry were audited. His disbursements and allowances, including £5 3s. 4d., due to him at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £21 6s. 10d., and his receipts at the last Genl Meeting to £19 7s. 4d., leaving due to the Secretary a balance of £1 19s. 6d. In addition to this, the Come found that there was due to Mr. Charles Bathurst £7 12s. 0d., on a bill delivered for Mr. Pickering's edition of the Statutes at Large, subscribed for by order of the Society.

The Committee again resumed their consōn of the orders made at the last Genl Meetg, relating to Bail, and an order of reference made at the Genl Meeting held on the 22nd Feb., 1754, on that subject together with the opinion of the Committee thereupon on the 17th May, 1754, being read and no further informn having been received touching the same, the Committee proceeded no further upon the said order.

The Committee also resumed the consōn of the order made at the last Genl Meeting with regard to the surreptitious admission of attorneys, and the same being comprehended with the Standing Orders of the Society, and no evidence having been produced to enable the Committee to prosecute such enquiry, they proceeded no further upon the said order.

At the meeting of the Committee on the 30th July, 1770. Present :—

Mr. Wishaw,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Pardoe.
in the Chair.	„ Upton.	„ ffothergill.	„ White.
	Mr. Beardmore.		
	„ Brown.	} attended.	
	„ Blake.		
	„ Skerrow.		

The order of reference relating to the mode of putting in, taking, and justifying bail in the several Courts of law was consid, and after making some

progress therein, the Committee adjourned the further consōn thereof to the following Wednesday sevenight. A meeting of the Committee was accordingly summoned by a circular, dated the 6th Augt., but the Minutes of the meetg are not with the papers.

There are three circulars summoning meetings in the beginning of 1771, of which meetings the minutes are missing. The first circular is dated the 30th Jany., 1771, summoning a meeting on the following Friday at 7 o'clock, to consider the orders of refce and the Committee's resolns thereon; the second is dated the 4th Feb., 1771, and summons a meeting for the following Wednesday at 7 o'clock, to consider the orders of refce, and a Memorial to be presented to the Judges of the Court of King's Bench then to be laid before the Committee; and the third is dated the 7th Feb., 1771, and summons the Committee to meet on the following Saturday at 9 o'clock in the Forenoon at Oliver's Coffee House, near Westminster Hall Gate, in order to present a Memorial to the Judges of the Court of King's Bench, with regard to the hours of attendance of the officers of that Court.

The Committee at their meeting on the 18th Feb., 1771 (the names of those present are not given), audited the Secretary's accounts, and found that his disbursements and allowances, including £1 19s. 6d. due to him at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £42 3s. 7d., and his receipts at and since the last Genl Meeting to £24 7s. 6d., leaving due to the Secretary a balance of £17 16s. 1d.

It appearing to the Committee on auditing the Secretary's accounts that there is due to him a ballance of £17 6s. 1d., and that there is also due to Mr. Charles Bathurst £7 12s. 0d. for Mr. Pickering's edition of the Statutes at large subscribed for by the Society,

It was resolved that, in the opn of the Committee, in order to discharge those debts, and to defray the future expenses of the Society, the respective members doe forthwith pay half a guinea each into the hands of Mr. Edward Bowman, the Secretary.

With the Committee's report on the audit of the Secretary's accounts is found the following :

“ The Secretary's Bill of Craveings

1770, 9th Aug. Paid for three books wherein to enter the lists of bails in the King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer ...	£	s.	d.
		3	6
Ruling the three books, and writing the titles to the Columns ...		10	0
For five days attendg at the Filazer of Middlesex in the Court of Common Pleas, and taking transcript of bails for Easter and Trinity Terms		2	2 0
Making an alphabetical index thereof		10	0
Attending the several Judges' Clerks in the Court of King's Bench several times in Trinity Vacation, to get the list of bails taken in that Court, but could not then procure the same ...		13	4

	£	s.	d.
Attending at the Exchequer Office, and procured a list of bails put in in that Court in Easter, Trinity, and Michaelmas Terms, 1770	6	8	
Entering the same in the book, and making an alphabetical list thereof	10	0	
In pursuance of the directions of the Come on the 21st Feb., 1771, attending the sevl Clerks of the Judges of the King's Bench, to procure a list of bails taken in that Court for Easter, Trinity, and Michaelmas Terms, 1770, and Hilary Term, 1771, and bespoke the same	6	8	
Attending them sevl times afterwards for the same	6	8	
Attending the Filazer of the King's Bench to get a list of bails put in, or original writs, but could not procure the same	6	8	
Paid Lord Mansfield's Clerk for list of bails	11	3	
To be put into next acct. {			
Paid Judge Aston's Clerk for Do.			} Not perfect.
Paid Judge Willes' Clerk for ,,			
Paid Judge Blackstone's Clerk for Do. in Easter Term, 1770			
Paid Judge Ashhurst's Clerk for list of bails			
General allowance for extra trouble	2	2	0
	8	8	9

At a general meeting of the Society held on the 22nd day of february, 1771, it was ordered that the resolution of the above meeting of the Committee be carried into effect.

By a circular dated the 11th March, 1771, the Secretary summoned a meeting of the Committee for the following Wed. at 7 o'clock, at the Horn Tavern in Fleet Street (by desire), to consider whether an attorney of the Courts of King's Bench or Common Pleas could be obliged to serve as a Militiaman, but the Minutes of this meeting do not appear to be with the papers.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 24th June, 1771. Present:—

Mr ffothergill,	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Hull.
in the Chair.	,, Monk.	,, Blake.

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts amounted to £78 19s. 6d., and his disbursements and allowances, including £17 16s. 1d., balance due to him at the last Genl Meeting, to £47 1s. 7d., leaving in his hands a balance due to the Society of £31 17s. 11d. The Come were of opinion that this was not a proper sum to be invested in 3 per cent. Bank Annuities.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society on the 28th June, 1771. Present:—

Mr. Richard Atkinson.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given).
„ John Acton.	
„ Joseph Hodges.	
„ John Allen.	

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, Mr. Brookes informed the Society, that in the month of March he had delivered his Writ of Privilege mentioned in the Committee's Minutes of the 13th March, 1771, to the Chairman of the Court of Lieutenancy for the County of Middlesex, and that the said Writ had been obeyed.

It being represented to the Society that the hours of attendance of the Clerk of the docquets of the Court of King's Bench had not been altered, pursuant to the Memorial of the Society presented on the 9th Feb., and recommended by the said Court, it was referred to the Committee to take proper measures to have the prayer of the said Memorial, so far as concerned the said Clerk of the Docquets, carried into execution.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday the 17th Feb., 1772.
Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Chamberlayne.	Mr. Brown.
in the Chair.	„ Monk.	„ Pardoe.

The accounts of the Secry were audited. His receipts, including the £37 17s. 11d. in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £46 16s. 5d., and his disbursements and allowances to £29 9s. 2d., leaving due to the Society a sum of £17 7s. 3d.

The Minutes of the Genl Meeting of the Society summoned to be held on the 21st Feb., 1772, are missing.

At the meeting of the Committee on Thursday, the 27th Feb., 1772.
Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Whitchurch.	Mr. Sayer.	Mr. Brown.
in the Chair.	„ Upton.	„ Monk.	„ Blake.
„ Baskerville.	„ Pardoe.		

The order of refce made at the last Genl Meeting relative to the Bankruptcy laws was considered, and the further consōn thereof adjourned to the following Monday.

At the next Meeting of the Committee on the 2nd March, 1772.
Present:—

Mr. Pardoe,	Mr. Upton.	Mr. Blake.	Mr. Hull.
in the Chair.	„ Baskerville.	„ Chamberlayne.	„ Bowman.
„ Smith, Jnr., City.	„ Life.	„ Sayer.	

The matter above-mentioned was again considered, and the further consōn of it adjourned to the following Wed., the 11th of March.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 11th March, 1772. Present :—

Mr. Pardoe,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Life.	Mr. Hull.
in the Chair.	„ Grubb.	„ Brown.	„ Bowman.

The consōn of the order of reference relative to the law of bankrupts was resumed, and the Committee being informed that Mr Walker, one of the Commissioners, was preparing several amendments to these laws, it was agreed to submit the following matters to Mr. Walker for his consōn, and that Mr. Life, Mr. Blake, and Mr. Pardoe, attend Mr. Walker thereupon :—

That in all suits brought by or against Assignees under Commission of Bankrupt relating to the Bkrupt's estate (otherwise than by the Bkrupt himself), the Commission and proceedgs under the same that the Assignment of the Bkrupt's estate be taken as sufficient evidence of the tradg, the Petitioning Cr.'s debt, and the act of bankruptcy.

That in case the Bkrupt shall bring any suit agst the assignee to try the validity of the bankruptcy, then the proof of a sufficient debt to any real creditor or credrs of the Bkrupt, previous to the Bankruptcy, be as effectual as a proof of the Petitioning Creditor's debt.

That the Act of the 19th of George II. Chap 32, sec 1, be extended to the case of goods sold for money by the Bkrupt, and to sales of estates, mortgages, and other specific securities, for bona fide consōns paid at the execution thereof.

That interest on debts carrying interest at law (though no interest is expressed) be allowed to the date of the Commission.

That in the case of annuity bonds or other debts payable on contingencies that the Bkrupt, if he obtain his certificate, be cleared of such contingent debts.

That the Bkrupt be not arrested for any debts due to the Crown or subject during the day on which he passes his last examination.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 16th April, 1772, at which three members were present, the business for which the meeting was summoned was to consider the measures to be taken to have the prayer of the Society's Memorial presented to the Court of King's Bench on the 9th Feb., 1771, so far as it concerned the Clerk of the Docquets of that Court carried into execution, but for want of a sufficient number of members to constitute a Committee, the consideration of the matter was postponed to a future day. The Committee met again on the 4th May, 1772, six members being present, and settled the Memorial to be presented to the Judges of the Court of King's Bench relative to the hours of attendance of the Clerk of the Docquets of that Court, and it was ordered that a copy of the said Memorial was to be transcribed and signed by the Secretary, and be presented to the Judges of the Court by the Committee on the following Thursday, and the Secretary was ordered to summon the Committee to meet at Oliver's Coffee House, near

Westminster Hall Gate, at 9 o'clock in the forenoon of that day for that purpose.

At the same meeting the Committee took into consōn the Order of refce relative to a convenient place for the Society to dine in at their next meetg, and being of opinion that Clifford's Inn Hall was a proper place in point of situation, they resolved to apply to the Principal and Rules of the Society of Clifford's Inn at their next Parliament, for the use of their Hall for the above purpose.

Annexed to the foregoing minutes is the following note :—

“ 7 May, 1772. The Memorial mentioned in the preceding Minutes was presented at Westminster Hall to the Lord Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Aston, Mr. Justice Willes, and Mr. Justice Ashurst by Mr. Pardoe, attended by the following gentn of the Committee :—

Mr. Grubbe. Mr. Monk. Mr. Bowman.”

There are also with the papers the following circulars by the Secry summoning meetings of the Committee about this time, the Minutes of which meetings are missing. The first circular, dated the 10th June, 1772, informs the Stewards that the Society of Clifford's Inn had given permission to the Society to use their Hall to dine in at their next meetg, and summoned them to meet for the purpose of considering the proper measures to be taken for that occasion. The second circular is dated the 7th July, and is also addressed to the Stewards, desiring them to meet for the purpose of giving the necessary directions preparatory to the feast. The third circular is as follows :—

“ Sir, You are desired to meet your bretheren, the Stewards, for the feast of the Law Society on Tuesday next, at 8 o'clock in the evening, at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, to make a return of what tickets you have disposed of, and to give your final orders for the feast, and to spend the evening there.

“ I am, Your most humble servt.

“ EDW. BOWMAN.”

At the meeting of the Committee on the 20th July, 1772. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Monk.	Mr. Blake.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ Hull.	„ Brown.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including £17 7s. 3d., balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £41 13s. 11d., and his disbursements and allowances to £16 9s. 8d., leaving in his hands a balance of £25 4s. 3d.

In the draft Minutes of this meeting the following note appears :—

“ Mr Pardoe reported to the Committee that the matters proposed by the Committee for the Amendt of the Bankruptcy Laws on the 11th March, 1772, were in a few days afterwards delivered to Mr. Fowler Walker, who declared that proper attention shd be paid thereto.”

At the Genl Meetg of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on the 24th July, 1772. Present :

Mr. Rt. Smith.	} Stewards.
„ John Skerrow.	
„ Richd Way .	
„ Allaston Burgh.	

and Messrs. (names not given).

After the ordinary business had been disposed of, it was referred back to the Committee to take proper measures for obliging the Clerk of the Docquets of the Court of King's Bench to attend his duties at his office during the hours the Seal Office should be open.

The thanks of the Society were ordered to be given to the Principal and Rules of the Society of Clifford's Inn, for their obliging permission of the use of their Hall, and to request them to grant the like favor to the Society at their next Genl Meeting, and the Prolocutor was ordered to wait on the Principal for that purpose with a copy of this order.

The Secretary informed the Society that he had received the following letter from Mr. Henry Barnes, the Prolocutor :—

“ Mr. Secretary,

“ Being no longer able to support the honor and dignity of the Society in the seat conferred on me, I beg leave with the utmost gratitude and reverence to resign my office of Prolocutor, which doubtless the Society's Choice will supply with a much more fit and able brother. Wishing them all imaginable prosperity, I remain theirs and, Sir,

“ Your most humble servant,

“ H. BARNES.

“ *Bartletts Bldgs,*
21st July, 1772.”

It was ordered that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Barnes for his past services as Prolocutor to the Society, and his attentn in support of the honor and dignity thereof, and that the Secretary wait on Mr. Barnes for that purpose, with a copy of the order of the Society. Mr. Henry ffothergill was unanimously elected Prolocutor of the Society in the place of Mr. Barnes.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 1st day of february, 1775, at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Wishaw.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Russell.	„ Mr. Hull.	

The Committee resumed the consōn of the order of reference with regard to Mr. Goodman's complaint against Mr. Wm. Brown, for practising as an atty, not having been duly admitted, and which was continued at the last General Meeting, and directed to be further inquired into.

It appeared to the Committee that the said Wm. Brown was by indenture dated the 21st of Decr., 1769, articed as a clerk to Mr. Edwd Hoblyn of Bodmin, in the County of Cornwall, one of the Attys of the Court of Common Pleas for the term of five years from the date of the articles, and that on the death of Mr. Hoblyn on the 6th of June, 1773, the said Wm. Brown was by indenture, date the 12th of June, 1773, articed to Mr. George Robinson, one of the Attys of his Majesty's Court of King's Bench, for the remainder of the sd term, which expired the 27th day of Decr. last, and that affts of the execution of those articles were duly fyled, and Mr. Brown having made an affdt of his service agreeable to the sd articles, and on the first day of the present term was admitted and sworn an atty of the Court of Common Pleas. It did not appear to the Committee that the sd Wm. Brown. practized as an atty before such his admission.

The Masters in Chancery at this time appear to have been

1. Mr. Peter Holford.
2. „ Thos. Harris.
3. „ John Browning. Lives at Chelsea, comes
when able each morning at 11, and stays till 3.
4. „ Wm. Graves.
5. „ Saml. Pechell.
6. „ John Eames.
7. „ Edward Montague.
8. „ Edward Leeds.
9. „ Wm. Weller Pepys.
10. „ John Holt.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 20th day of february, 1775, at the Crown and Rolls in Chancery Lane. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Grubb.	„ Hull.	

The Committee took into consōn the Secretary's accounts, and found that his disbursements and allowances amounted to £31 12s. 10d., and that his receipts, including £10 1s. 6d. ballance in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £26 11s. 6d., and that there was therefore a ballance due to the Secretary of £5 1s. 4d.

At a General Meeting of the Society at Clifford's Inn Hall on ffriday, the 24 day of february, 1775. Present:—

Mr. Joseph Gibbs.	} Stewards.
„ William Finch.	
„ Thomas Evans.	
„ James Mountfort.	

and Messrs. (56) (names not given).

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair. After the usual business was transacted, it was ordered that the proceedings on the complaint of Mr. Chamberlayne of the 25 of february, 1774, against Mr. Rol^t. Simpson, be further prosecuted by the Secretary, under the inspection of the Committee, at the expense of the Society.

The Prolocutor produced a copy of an affidavit recd from Mr. Tristram of Hitchin, of the execution of articles of Clerkship, dated the 16th of April, 1770, between Robert Tyler of the Parish of St. John, Southwark, in the County of Surrey, Gentleman, one of the attys of the Court of King's Bench, of the one part, and Lawrence Times of the other part, whereby the sd Lawrence Times, for the considerations therein mentioned, was bound to serve the sd Robert Tyler as his clerk for the full term of 5 years from the date of the sd articles; and the sd copy was read, and it was represented to the sd Society that the sd Lawrence Times had for 7 years past, and then kept a day school at Hitchin in Hertfordshire, where he had a wife and family, and constantly resided, and during the time had not lived a week together out of Hitchin.

It was referred to the Committee to enquire into the matter, and the Secretary was ordered to summon Mr. Tyler to attend the Committee, and the Committee were directed to take such necessary steps on the occasion as they shd think proper.

It was resolved that the order of the 21st of february, 1772, relating to the Bankrupt laws, and the report of the Committee made in pursuance of that order, be continued in the minits of the Society from time to time untill the subject matter of the sd order and report may render it necessary to make an applôn to Parliament.

The Secretary informed the Society that he had recd a letter from Mr. Southouse expressing his best wishes for their prosperity and success, and that he was truly sensible of the honor they did him in appointing and continuing him one of their trustees of the fund raised for the purpose of supporting their laudable designs, but he was advanced in years, and had retired from business. He requested the ffavor of the Society to appoint a new trustee in his stead, and which letter was read.

And Mr. Henry Barnes (in whose name jointly with Mr. Southouse and Mr. ffothergill the £200 3 per cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities belonging to the Society stood) being dead,

It was ordered that Mr. Robert Pardoe and Mr. Grubb be added as Trustees in the rooms of Mr. Southouse and Mr. Barnes.

It was ordered that the Secretary shd forthwith procure the sd Bank Annuities to be transferred into the joint names of the sd Mr. Henry ffothergill,

Mr. Robert Pardoe, and Mr. Edward Grubb, and that they should accept the same, and execute a declaration of trust that such annuities standing in their joint names are for the use of the Society.

It was ordered that the sd Bank Annuities when transferred and accepted, and the dividends to arise therefrom, shd from time to time be subject to the orders and resolutions of the Society at their general meetings.

It was ordered that Messrs. ffothergill, Pardoe, and Grubb shd execute a letter of Atty to empower the Secretary in their names to accept the transfer of the sd annuities, and from time to time to receive the dividends which shd arise and become payable on account thereof.

It was referred to the Committee to enquire into the attendance of the Clerk of the Errors in the Exchequer Chamber, and to take such measures for the due regulation thereof as they shd think proper, and the Committee were ordered to meet on the matter, and such enquiry on that day sevensnight, and that Mr. Henry Townly Ward shd be then summoned to attend the meeting.

The thanks of the Society were ordered to be given to the principal and rules of the Society of Clifford's Inn for their obliging permission of the use of their Hall, and that they be requested to grant the like favor to the Society at their next General Meeting, and the Prolocutor was ordered to wait on the Principal of the sd Society with a copy of the above order.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on ffriday the third day of March, 1775. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Chamberlayne.	„ Monk.	

The Committee took into consideration the order of reference with regard to Mr. Robert Tyler articing Lawrence Times as his clerk, to serve him for 5 years from ye date of the articles. Mr. Tyler attended, and undertaking to deliver up his grant of the articles, and to write to Mr. Times to deliver up his part, the further consõn of the matter was postponed to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee likewise considered the order of reference with regard to the allowance of the Clerk of the Errors in the Exchequer chamber, and Mr. Ward attended, and it was agreed that 3 gentlemen of the Committee doe wait on Mr. Cecil, the Deputy Clerk of the Errors, and report his answer to the Committee at their next meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on Monday, the 21st day of June, 1775. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Whishaw.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Grubb.	„ Hull.	

The Secretary informed the Committee, that in consequence of the order made at the last Genl Meeting, he had served Mr. Simpson with the Rule of

Court for his showing cause why he shd not be struck out of the Roll of attorneys of the Court of Common Pleas ; and that on the Society's applōn in Easter term last a rule was made for striking the name of the said Robert Simpson out of the Roll of Attys of the sd Court, and that he had been since struck out accordingly.

Mr. Robert Tyler attended the Committee, and delivered to the Secretary both parts of the articles of clerkship between him and Mr. Lawrence Times cancelled. Mr. ffothergill represented to the Committee that Mr. Pardoe, Mr. Chamberlayne, and himself had attended Mr. Cecil, the Deputy Clerk of the Errors in the Court of Exchequer, pursuant to the minitts of the Committee at their last meeting, and that in their representation Mr. Cecil readily consented to alter the time of attendances in his office to such hours as the Society thought convenient, and had since regulated the hours of attendance accordingly.

The Secretary reported that, agreeable to the directions of the Society at their last General Meeting, the £200 3 per cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities had been transferred into the joint names of Mr. ffothergill, Mr. Pardoe, and Mr. Grubb, and by them accepted, and that they had executed a letter of Atty for the Secretary receiving the dividends thereon, and signed a declaration of trust that the said annuities standing in their joint names were in trust for the use of the Society, and that the same, and the dividends to arise thereby and therefrom from time to time, to be subject to the orders and resolutions of the Society at their future general meetings.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 17th of July, 1775, at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Hull.
in the Chair.	„ Baskerville.	„ Monk.
„ Chamberlayne.	„ Pardoe.	„ Bowman.

The Committee took into consōn the Secretary's accounts, and found that his receipts amounted to £26 10s. 6d., and his disbursements and allowances, including £5 1s. 4d. ballance due to him at the last General Meeting, amounted to £22 2s. 4d., and that the balance in the Secretary's hands amounted to £4 8s. 2d.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on ffriday, the 21st day of July, 1775. Present :—

Mr. William Bolton.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ John Grubb.	
„ John Vernon.	
„ Samuel Denton.	

A copy of the notice fixed up in the office of the Clerk of the Errors in the

Exchequer Chamber, with regard to his hours of attendance in the office, was produced and read, viz.

“Exchequer Chamber Office in Norfolk Street, Strand.

“This office will be opened during the times of business every morning from 10 to 12, and in term time from 5 to 7 in the afternoon, Court days and holidays excepted.

“WILLIAM CECIL,
“Deputy Clerk of the Errors.”

It was ordered that it be referred back to the Committee to have the hours of attendance more particularly ascertained.

The following paragraph is scored through, viz. :—

The Prolocutor informed the Society, that on the late application to the Court of Common Pleas on the complaint against Mr. Robert Simpson, Mr. Sergeant Davy was so obliging to appear as counsellor for the Society, and accepted a Brief, refusing to take any fee, expressing himself ever ready to serve the Society to the utmost of his power. It was resolved that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Sergt. Davy, and that the Secretary do wait on Mr. Sergt. Davy with a copy of this resolution.

At a meeting of the Committee held at Mr. Greenley's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on Monday, the 19th day of February 1776. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Chamberlayne.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Smith.	„ Hull.	„ Bowman.

The Committee took into consōn the Secretary's accounts, and found that his disbursements and allowances amounted to £33 12s. 2d., and that his receipts, including £4 8s. 2d. bal. in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £18 5s. 8d., leaving a ballance due to the Secretary of £15 6s. 6d.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 23rd day of february, 1776. Present :—

Mr. William Brent.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ William Townsend.	
„ William Skinn.	
„ Thomas Lowton.	

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

It was ordered that the reference to the Committee at the last General Meeting with regard to the more particularly ascertaining the hours of attendance of the Clerk of the Errors in the Court of Exchequer be continued, and the matter further enquired into, and that the Committee report their proceedings at the next General Meeting.

Ordered that the Committee do meet on the above reference on this day sevensnight, at the Crown and Rolls, Chancery Lane, at eight o'clock, and that the Secretary do summon them for that purpose, and that notice be sent to Mr. Cecil desiring him to attend.

Bankrupt order continued.

Thanks to ye Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn.

At a meeting of the Committee held at Mr. Greenley's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on ffriday, the 1st day of March, 1776. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Chamberlayne.	Mr. Whishaw.
in the Chair.	„ Monk.	„ Bowman.

In pursuance of the order made at the last General Meeting with regard to having the hours of attendance of the Clerk of the Errors in the Exchequer Chamber more particularly ascertained, the above members of the Committee mett, and were attended by Mr. Henry Townly Ward and Mr. Cecil, the Deputy Clerk of the Errors in the Exchequer Chamber, and a notice was settled and agreed upon with the approbation of Mr. Cecil, to be fixed up in the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas.

The Committee nominated Mr. Isaac Bargrave and Mr. Gerrard to be members of the Committee.

“NOTICE.

“Exchequer Chamber Office in Norfolk Street in the Strand.

“This office will be opened for the transaction of business every morning in term time from 10 to 12 o'clock, and in the afternoon from 5 to 7 o'clock; and in vacation time from 10 to 12 o'clock in the morning.

“Except in affirrance days and such days in which the Seal Office is not open, and from the last general Seal in Chancery after every Trinity Term, to the first general Seal before every Michaelmas Term.

“WILLIAM CECIL,
“Deputy Clerk of the Errors.”

At a meeting of the Committee held at Mr. Greenley's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Fleet Street, on Monday the 8th day of July, 1776. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Baskerville.	Mr. Pardoe.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Chamberlayne.	„ Monk.	

The Committee took into consōn the Secretary's accounts, and found that his disbursements and allowances, including £15 6s. 6d. ballance due to him at ye last General Meeting, amounted to £26 13s. 8d., and that his receipts amounted to £22 3s. 0d., leaving a ballance due to ye Secretary of £4 10s. 8d.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 12th day of July, 1776. Present :—

Mr. Wm. Chamberlayne.	Mr. Robert Pardoe.	and Messrs. (names
„ John Smith.	„ Wm. Monk.	not given.)

After the ordinary business had been gone through, it was reported that several of the Masters in Chancery not granting warrants to attend in the afternoon, had been found inconvenient to the suitors and practicers in that Court.

Resolved that it be recommended to the Committee to consider whether any and what steps could with propriety be taken to remedy that inconvenience, and to report their opn thereon to the next General Meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on Monday the 3rd day of February, 1777. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Sayer.	Mr. Gerrard.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ Monk.	„ Bowman.

The Committee took into consideration the reference to them whether any and what steps could with propriety be taken to remedy the evil complained of to suitors and practicers on account of the Masters in Chancery not granting warrants to attend in the afternoon ; and the Committee were of opn, that as the Masters in Chancery attended longer in the morning than before, and as several of them would grant warrants in the afternoon if desired, and as others were so infirm that they could not attend in the afternoon (especially in the winter season), that no steps could with propriety be taken pursuant to the said reference.

“Sir,

“Enclosed is my charge relative to the matter of complaint against Robert Simpson, wch you'l please either to lay before the Society, or the Gentlemen of the Committee, as you shall think proper.

“I am, Sir,

“Your most humble servant,

“(Signed) GREG. GEERING.

“Capel Court, Bartho Lane.

4 July, 1776.”

In the Common Pleas

The Charge of Gregory Geering, a member of the Law Society, in the matter of complaint against Robert Simpson, one, &c.

1774, June.	Paid stamp for my afft to move for rule to show cause	<i>s. d.</i>
	why Simpson shd not be struck off the Roll of Attys and oath	... 2 7
June 9.	Paid for Rule 3 0

The Committee took into consōn the Secretary's accounts, and found that his disbursements and allowances, including £4 10s. 8*d.*, ballance due to him at the last General Meeting, amounted to £34 10s. 6*d.*, and that his receipts amounted to £22 5s. 6*d.*, leaving a ballance due to the Secretary of £12 5s. 0*d.* The Committee ordered this account to be laid before the next General Meeting.

At a General Meeting held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 21st of February, 1777. Present :—

Mr. Edward Grubb.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ George Baskerville.	
„ Henry ffothergill.	
„ Henry Sayer.	

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair, and stated how the Society's account stood. The orders with regard to the Bankrupt laws, and with regard to the thanks to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn, were continued.

Whishaw. Decency Rule and order to be observed at all general meetings. At the time of general business every member who thinks proper to speak on any subject proposed, be candidly heard, without interruption.

No member to speak twice on any subject, unless by way of reply or to explain what he has advanced.

That the Prolocutor be supported in his conduct while in the Chair.

Moved as an Exhortation only.

At a meeting of the Committee held on the 20th Feby, 1778, at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Whitchurch.	Mr. Blake.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Bargrave.	„ Monk.	

The Committee took into consideration the Secretary's accounts, and found that his disbursements and allowances, including £6 9s. 10*d.*, ballance due to him at the last General Meeting, amounted to £33 6s. 10*d.*, and that his receipts amounted to £19 2s. 6*d.*, leaving a ballance due to the Secretary of £14 4s. 5*d.*

The Committee resolved, that in their opinion, in order to discharge the ballance due to the Secretary, the members be recommended at the next General Meeting to pay 10s. 6*d.* each into the hands of the Secretary.

It was ordered that Mr. Thos. Mainwaring be added to the Committee in the place of Mr. Thos. Life deceased; Mr. John Manley in the place of Mr. Southouse, who is retired from business, and never attends; Mr. Thomas Winckley in the place of Mr. Joseph Letch, who is ill and never attends; Mr. Bateman Robson in the place of Mr. Thomas Cooper, who never attends; Mr. Joseph Hodges in the place of Mr. Welby, who never attended since chosen on

ye Committee; Mr. Joseph Cruttenden in the place of Mr. George Baskerville, dead; Mr. Joseph White in the place of Mr. Jonathan Colston.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall, on Monday, the 25th day of February, 1778. Present:—

Mr. Alexander Whitchurch.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ Charleton Palmer.	
„ John Blake.	
„ Thomas Winckley.	

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

The Prolocutor reported that the Committee had audited the Secretary's accounts, and found that his disbursements and allowances, including £6 19s. 10d., ballance due to him at the last General Meeting, amounted to £33 6s. 10d., and that his receipts amounted to £19 2s. 6d., leaving a balance due to the Secretary of £14 4s. 5d.

Ordered that, agreeable to the recommendation of the Committee at their last meeting, the respective members of this Society do forthwith pay into the hands of Mr. Edward Bowman, the Secretary, half a guinea each to discharge the ballance due to him, and to defray the future expenses of the Society. The Secretary reported the receipt of half guineas from 56 members then present. †

The Secretary was ordered to wait on the absent members for payment of their respective half guineas, and to report to the Committee at their next meeting the names of those members who have not paid their subscriptions, or who refuse or decline to pay ye same.

It was referred to the Committee to consider the several laws now in being relating to affidts to be made with respect to the execution of articles of clerkship to attorneys and solicitors, and the affidts of service of such clerks and their admission as attys and solrs in pursuance thereof, as well under the general acts of Parliament, as under any acts of indemnity, and to take such methods to remedy any defects of those laws as they should think proper.

At a meeting of the Come at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern, Chancery Lane, on Monday the 4th May, 1778. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Hodges.	Mr. Gerrard
in the Chair.	„ Monk.	„ Mainwaring.	„ Bowman.

The Committee resumed the consideration of the matter refd to them concerning the admission of attorneys and solicitors (which had been adjourned from the Committee meeting held on the 1st of the preceding March), and it being represented to the Committee that a Motion was pending in the Court of Common Pleas regarding the subject of such reference, the further consideration of the matter was adjourned till the determinatn of that Court upon the said Motion should be made known. The following note appears in the Draft Minutes of this Meeting, but it is unfinished and crossed through:—

“ The Committee resumed the consōn of the order of reference to them with regd to the several laws in being relating to affidavits, and on reading the Act of the 22nd of George the 2nd, and the last Act for indemnifying persons who have omitted to file affidavits in pursuance of that Act, and are of opinion that the said several Acts passed for——”

The circular convening this meeting states that it is to be held to further consider the order of reference made at the last Genl Meeting with regard to the laws now in being relating to affidavits of the due execution of articles of clerkship, &c.

The Committee at this time (May, 1778) consisted of the following gentlemen :—

Blake.	Monk.	Whitchurch.	Mainwaring.
Brown, Wm.	Pardoe.	Bargrave.	Manley.
Chamberlayne.	Sayer.	Gerrard.	Winkley.
ffothergill.	Smith, Jno. (City).	Cruttenden.	Robson.
Grubb, Edw.	Whishaw.	White.	Hodges.
Hull.			

In March, 1778, the Society presented a Memorial to the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, stating the inconvenience which had arisen from the want of a place in England, where stamps impressed pursuant to the Laws of Ireland could be procured, and praying that directions might be given for the distribution of such stamps by the proper persons in England.

This memorial was transmitted by the Treasury to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and on the 23rd of May a letter was received from the Treasury, to the effect that they had received a letter from the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, dated the 8th of May, to the effect that, pursuant to the request of the Society, the Lord-Lieutenant had directed the Commissioners of Stamps in Ireland to appoint Mr. John Hughes, Stationer, in Chancery Lane, to distribute Irish Stamps.

At the Genl Meetg of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall, on Friday, the 24th July, 1778. Present :—

Mr. Joseph Cruttenden.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ Stevens Tolton.	
„ Isaac Bargrave.	
„ Thos. Mainwaring.	

The Secretary received certn subscriptions, the usual reports were read, and the minutes of the last General Meeting, and of the Committee meetings subsequent thereto, were read and approved of, with the exception of the Minute of the Committee on the 20th July, respecting a gratuity and compliment proposed by the Committee to be given to the widow of Mr.

Jonathan Colston, which was ordered to be rescinded. The Society, however, passed the following resolution on the subject :—

“ It being represented by the Prolocutor that Mr. Jonathan Colston, late Registrar of the Mayor's Court, and a member of this Society, had during the several years' contest between this Society and the Scriveners' Company been very assiduous, and rendered great services to the Society in those affairs without having in his lifetime received any gratuity or satisfaction for his extraordinary trouble and services to this Society, and it appearing to the Society, that by an order made at the Genl Meeting held on the 25th Feb., 1763, it was referred to the then Committee to consider of a proper gratuity and compliment to be made to the said Mr. Colston for his extraordinary trouble and services to this Society, and that the considn of that reference had been from time to time adjourned by the Committee, and nothing effectually done therein, nor any gratuity or compliment ever paid him, and the Prolocutor informing the Society that the said Jonathan Colston is lately dead, leaving a widow and two children, and that the said Mr. Colston's widow had applied to him, and informed him of her having been left in very distressed circumstances, and begged that the same might be left to the consideration of this Society, and the same being this day taken into the consideration of this Society—

Ordered—That Mr. Edward Bowman, the Secretary, do, out of the Society's cash in his hands, pay to Mrs. Eliz: Colston, the widow of the said Mr. Jonathan Colston, the sum of 20 guineas in lieu of and as a satisfaction and compliment for the services of the said Mr. Colston to this Society.”

At the same meeting the order of reference with regard to the Bankcy laws was ordered to be continued.

It was also ordered that the reference to the Committee of the 25th Feb. last, to consider the several laws now in being relating to affidavits to be made with respect to the execution of articles of clerkship to attorneys and solicitors, and the affidavits of service of such clerks and their admission as attorneys and solicitors in pursuance thereof, as well under the General Acts of Parliament as under any Acts of Indemnity, that the Committee should take such methods to remedy any defects of those laws as they should think proper, be contind to the next Genl Meeting of the Socy, and that the Committee in the meantime take such methods to remedy any defects on those laws as they shall think proper.

The Secretary laid before the Society a list of the several Members' names who had not paid their respective half-guineas, pursuant to the order of the 25th Feb. last, and it was ordered that the Secretary write to such members for payment of their respective half-guineas, and that he report to the next Genl Meeting of the Society the names of those members who refuse or decline to pay the same.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 22nd Feb., 1779, Mr. ffothergill in the Chair.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including £52 10s. 9d. balance in his hands at the last Genl Meetg, amounted to £84 15s. 9d., and his disbursements and allowances to £53 0s. 6d., leaving due to the Society £31 15s. 3d.

The following new members were proposed this day :—

Mr. John Windus, Tooke's Court, Castle Yard, by Mr. Mainwaring.
 Mr. Rowland Maltby, Old Jewry, by Mr. Bolton.
 Mr. James Mainstone, Essex St., by Mr. Gerrard.
 Mr. John Roberts, Clifford's Inn, by Mr. ffothergill.

There is a note to the effect that Mr. Roberts refused to take a ticket, and did not choose to belong to the Society, and one as to Mr. Maltby to the following effect :—"Rowland Maltby of the old Jewry. Searched in the King's Bench Office, and found in the Book containing a list of the practising Attorneys of that Court a Rowland Maltby, of No. 3 Bucklersbury, but none of Old Jewry, Do. at Warrant of Attorney Office, but could not find any such name."

At the Genl Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall, on Friday, the 26th Feb., 1779. Present :—

Mr. John Acton.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ George Jemmett.	
„ James Coulthard.	
„ Wm. Welby.	

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

After the usual reports had been read and orders made, the Secretary laid before the Society a list of the sevl members who had not up to that time paid, or had declined to pay their respective half-guineas, pursuant to the order of the 25th Feb. last ; and it was ordered that the Secretary send letters to such members who had not paid, or declined to pay their respective half-guineas, requesting them to pay the same to him before the next Genl Meeting, or that their names would be struck out of the General List, and they no longer be esteemed members of the Society. The order of reference relating to the Bankruptcy Laws was continued, and the thanks of the Socy were returned to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn.

The order of reference to the Committee of the 25th Feb., 1778, to consider the sevl laws then in being relating to affidavits to be made with respect to the execution of articles of clerkship to attorneys and solicitors, and the affidavits of such clerks and their admission as attorneys and solicitors in pursuance thereof, as well under the general Acts of Parlt as under any Acts of Indemnity, and that the Committee should take such methods to remedy any defects in those laws as they should think proper, was discharged.

It was referred to the Committee to enquire into the practice of the sevl clerks employd in the Writ of Error Office, from the allowance of the Writ of Error in the King's Bench, to the affirmance of the judgment in the Exchequer Chamber, or non pros, and that the said Committee report to the Society at their next Genl Meeting if there were any, and what grievances proper to be remedied in relation to that matter. It was also ordered that at the respective meetings of the Committee to consider the above reference, that the following members be summoned, viz. Robert Smith of Castle Yard, Jno. Acton, Saml. Purlewent, and Gregory Geering, to attend the Committee.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday, the 12th March, 1779.
Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Monk.	Mr. Winckley.	Mr. Hodges.
in the Chair.	„ Brown.	„ Gerrard.	„ Bowman.
„ Sayer.			

The Committee took into consõn the order of reference with regard to the enquiry into the conduct and practice of the clerks employed in the Writ of Error Office, from the allowance of the Writ of Error in the King's Bench, to the affirmance of the judgment in the Exchequer Chamber, or non pros, and whether any and what grievances were proper to be remedied in relation to that matter. Messrs. Robert Smith of Castle Yard, John Acton, and Samuel Purlewent attended the meeting, and gave their respective opinions with regard to the subject matter of the referce, and it was resolved to adjourn the further consõn of the matter to the next meeting of the Come.

At the meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 19th April, 1779.
Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ Bowman.

The consideratn of the above order of reference was adjourned to the next meeting of the Come, and Mr. Way, the Clerk of the Errors of the Court of King's Bench, having expressed his desire to attend the Committee at their next meeting, the Secretary was ordered to send a letter to Mr. Way for that purpose.

At a meeting of the Committee at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern, Chancery Lane, on Friday the 18th June, 1779. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Bargrave.	Mr. Hodges.	Mr. Gerrard.
in the Chair.	„ Monk.	„ Manley.	„ Bowman.
„ Grubb.			

The Committee took into further consõn the order of reference with regard to the Clerk of Errors in the King's Bench, Messrs. Robert Smith of Castle

Yard, John Acton, and Saml. Purlewent attendg the Committee. John Way, Esquire, the Clerk of the Errors in the King's Bench, likewise attended the Committee, and alleged that no complaints had ever been made to him on the subject of the grievances laid before the Society; and he submitted to the Committee that from the invariable rules and practice laid down and exercised by his predecessors in office, that if a Writ of Error was returnable on the first or second Return of any Term, the Clerk had time to transcribe the record, and was not compellable to deliver the same over till the Essoign day of the next Term, and on Writs of Error returnable on the last Return of any Term, that the Clerk of the Errors had time to transcribe the record, and was not compellable to deliver the same over till the last Return of the subsequent Term, notwithstanding the Rule to codify the record in 8 days, was given at the return of the Writ, and Mr. Way stated that it had been usual for his predecessors to receive money in part payment of the transcript, and not to insist on payment of the whole transcript money within 8 days, and having received part of the transcript money, the Clerk of Errors had never signed non proses until the party had been called on for payment of the residue, and had neglected to pay the same, and that after such a uniform practice had obtained in his office, he doubted his power to alter it. Upon hearing this statement the further consõn of the matter was adjourned to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee met on Monday the 5th July, 1779. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Wynkley.	Mr. Monk.
„ Blake.	„ Gerrard.	„ Bowman.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including £31 15s. 3d., the balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, were found to amount to £49 16s. 3d., and his disbursements and allowances to £15 12s. 4d., leaving due to the Society a balance of £34 3s. 11d.

The Committee further considered the order of reference with regard to the Clerk of the Errors in the King's Bench, and agreed on the following Report :

“That it appears to this Committee that it is the duty of the Clerk of the Errors to sign a non pros at the expiration of the 8 day rule, if the whole of the transcript money be not then paid. That it appears to the Committee that the Clerk of the Errors when he receives a part of the transcript money does not give the party paying it credit for the whole transcript money, but if the remainder of it is not paid at such period as the Clerk of the Errors thinks proper to allow, he signs a non pros in such manner as if no part of the transcript money had been paid, without ever making any part of the transcript, or returning any part of the money deposited, and the Plaintiffs in Error thereby obtain a delay at a trifling expense. It appears to this Committee that if Plaintiffs in Error were obliged to pay the whole of the transcript money within the 8 day rule, it would greatly discourage the bringg of Writs of

Error for delay. That the time claimed by the Clerk of the Errors, as stated in the Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, for transcribing and delivering over the proceedings in Error, appear to this Committee to be too long and unreasonable for the purpose, and a great delay to the Defts' proceedings, and therefore the Committee are of opōn, that an applōn shd be made to the Judges of the Court of King's Bench to limit the time for making and delivering over the transcripts by the Clerk of the Errors to some shorter period."

The Secretary by a circular dated the 18th Feb., 1780, for the following Monday at 8 o'clock, at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern, in Chancery Lane, to audit the Secretary's accounts, and on other special affairs, but the Minutes of this meeting are not with the papers.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 21st Feb., 1780. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Hodges.	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Monk.
in the Chair.	„ Hull.	„ Gerrard.	„ Bowman.
„ Brown.	„ Chamberlayne.		

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including £34 3s. 11d., balance in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £42 16s. 5d., and his disbursements and allowances amounted to £29 os. 8d., leaving in his hands a balance of £13 15s. 9d.

The Committee having taken into consōn the refce to them to consider whether a representation to the Judges would not be proper setting forth that great inconvenience, injury and delay arose from the Clerk in the Writ of Error Office being concerned in prosecuting, defending, and soliciting Writs of Error, and that therefore the Society submitted to the consōn of the Judges of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, whether it might not be proper to order and direct that no clerk should in future be concerned or employed in prosecuting, defending, or soliciting any Writ or Writs of Error in his Majesty's Court of King's Bench. The Committee were of opōn, that any person aggrieved by the premes so referred to, and the same was read accordingly, and it was referred back to the Committee to reconsider that report.

The order of reference with regd to the Bankruptcy laws was also continued, and the thanks of the Society were ordered to be returned to the Principal and Rules of the Society of Clifford's Inn as usual.

At the Genl Meetg of the Society at Clifford's Inn Hall on the 25th Feb., 1780. Present :—

Mr. Thomas Constable.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ Richard Browne.	
„ John Irving.	
„ George London.	

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

The Minutes of the preceding Genl Meeting, and the subsequent Committees, were read and confirmed, with the exception of so much of the Committee's proceedings of the 21st Feb., 1780, as contained the Committee's report on the reference relating to the clerks of the Clerk of Errors being concerned or employed in prosecuting, defending, or soliciting any Writ of Error in the Court of King's Bench, and it was referred back to the Committee to reconsider that report. It was ordered that, on the application of the Committee to the proper officers of the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas for allowing in future the reasonable fees mentioned in the Committee's report of the 15th Decr., 1779, on taxing costs as between party and party, that they likewise make an allowance on such taxation of costs of the sum of 6s. 8d. as and for a Term fee in all cases in which a sum of 5s. is now only allowed.

It was moved, that so much of the Report of the Committee of the 5th July preceding as related to the practice and proceedings on Writs of Error be read.

At the Genl Meetg of the Socy held on Friday, the 30th June, 1780, at Clifford's Inn Hall. Present :—

Mr. Hutchinson.	} Stewards. and Messrs. (names not given.)
„ Finch.	
„ Hodges.	
„ Skerrow.	

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

The Secretary recd from five members 2½ guineas each in consqce of the resolution of the Genl Meeting of the Socy of the 20th Feb., 1761. The usual reports were made, thanks were returned to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn for the use of the Hall, and the order of refce with regard to the Bkcy laws was continued. A motion was made and seconded, and it was resolved and ordered, "That the Committee meet on Friday next, being the 7th of July, and that they do then nominate and appoint several other members of the Society, not exceeding the number of 10, to be added to the present Committee, and that the Secretary do summon the Committee to meet accordingly."

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday, the 7th July, 1780. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Whishaw.	Mr. Bargrave.	Mr. Manley.
in the Chair.	„ Mainwaring.	„ Grubb.	„ Bowman.
„ Pardoe.	„ Hodges.		

The Committee, in pursuance of the Resolution and Order made at the last Genl Meeting of the Society, nominated and appointed the several gentlemen hereafter named to be added to the Committee, namely :—

Messrs. James Garth.	Saml. Pulewent.
John Skerrow.	Stevens Totton.
Richd. Brown.	Robt. Smith.
Wm. Finch.	Saml. Denison and
Jas. Hutchinson.	Richd. Way.

The Committee requested the Secretary to notify to the above gentlemen the aforesaid nomination and appointment.

The following papers were laid before the Committee at this meeting :—

“COMMITTEES.

- G. M., 1739, 13 Feb. Committee appointed (21), Aug. 5, A sufft Come to act.
- G. M., 1740, July 11. Committee continued.
- G. M., „ 13 Feb. 5 added to ye Committee.
- G. M., 1741, 18 June. Committee increased to 33, 5 to be of ye Quorum, to proceed to business, and to call a Genl Meeting when they think fitt. Secretary at the request of any one of the Committee to summon the Committee.
- G. M., 1742, 23 Feb. Committee desired to consider of proper persons to be added to ye Committee.
- C., 1743, 1st July. Seven Gents recomd to be of ye Committee.
- G. M., 1748, 22 Feb. Committee have power till next Genl Meeting to nominate any other member or members to be of the Committee. Several then added.
- C., 1748, 6 March. First Monday in every month, except Jan., Aug., Sep., and Octr., be stated Committee nights.
Mr. Paterson and Mr. Moxon named of the Committee.
- G. M., 1752, 21st Feb. Committee to prosecute any Attorneys Guilty of Illegal practices, and Members to give notice to Dep. Sec.
- G. M., 1754, 22 Feb. Attwood and White added to the Committee.
- G. M., „ 19 July. Several members added to ye Committee.
- G. M., 1755, 27 June. Committees consolidated.
- G. M., 1757, 25 Feb. Henry Wilmott, Esq., added to the Committee.
- G. M., 1759, 23 Feb. Ordered that Committee have power to chuse from time to time such persons as they think proper to be added to their number in the places of those dying or declining to attend the service.
- C., 1759, 16 July. Messrs. Southouse and Roberts added to the Committee.
- G. M., 1761, 19 June. Motion to repeal the Order of 23rd Feb., 1759, with regard to the Committees passed in the negative.
- C., 1762, 15 Feb. Messrs. Morgan and Chamberlayne added to the Committee.

L

C., 1767, 13 July. Messrs. Sayer, Grubb, and Upton added to the Committee.

C., 1770, 8 Aug. Messrs. Life and John Smith added to the Committee.

C., 1771, 6 Feb. Messrs. Blake, Hull, Welby, and Wm. Brown ditto.

C. „ 18 „ Mr. Whitchurch ditto.

C., 1774, 21 Feb. Mr. Russell ditto.

C., 1776, 1st March. Mr. Bargrave and Mr. Gerrard ditto.

C., 1778, 20 Feb. Messrs. Cruttenden, White, Mainwaring, Manley, Winckley, Robson, Hodges.

G. M., 30 June, 1780. Order for Committee to add 10 members.

Com. 7 July, 1780. Messrs. Garth, Skirrow, Browne, Finch, Hutchinson, Purlewent, Totton, Smith, Denison, and Way added to the Committee.”

The next paper gives a list of the Committee with the dates of their appointment.

“ A List of the General Committee of the Law Society.

1. Bowman, Edward	27 June, 1755.
2. Blake, John	6 Febry, 1771.
3. Browne, Wm.	6 Febry, 1771.
4. Chamberlayne, Willm.	15 Febry, 1762.
5. ffothergill, Henry	14 Feb., 1745.
6. Grubb, Edwd.	13 July, 1767.
7. Hull, Christopr.	6 Feb., 1771.
8. Monk, Wm.	27 June, 1750.
9. Pardoe, Robt.	22 Feb., 1748.
10. Sayer, Henry	13 July, 1767.
11. Smith, John	8 Aug., 1770.
12. Whishaw, Richd.	19 Febry, 1747.
13. Whitchurch, Alexr.	18 Feb., 1771.
14. Bargrave, Isaac	1 March, 1776.
15. Gerrard, Alexr.	„ 1776.
16. White, Joseph	20 Feb., 1778.
17. Mainwaring, Thos.	„
18. Manley, John	„
19. Winckley, Thos.	„
20. Robson, Bateman	„
21. Hodges, Joseph	„
22. Garth, James	7 July, 1780
23. Skirrow, John	„
24. Browne, Richd.	„
25. finch, Wm.	„
26. Hutchinson, James	,

27. Parlewent, Saml.	7 July, 1780.
28. Totton, Stevens	"
29. Smith, Robt. (City)	"
30. Dennison, Saml.	"
31. Way, Richd. Dead	"

There is a letter from Mr. Stevens Totton, dated the 17th Janry, 1781, declaring his inability to act as a member of the Committee through pressure of other engagements.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday, the 8th Decr., 1780. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Manley.	Mr. Dennison.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Bargrave.	„ Finch.	

The Committee took into consideration the several orders of reference made at the last Genl Meetg held on the 23rd Feb., 1780, by one of which orders it was referred back to the Committee to reconsider their report of the 21st of the said month of Feb., relating to the clerks of the Clerk of the Errors being concerned or employed in prosecuting, defending, or soliciting any Writ or Writs of Errors in the Court of King's Bench; and by the other of which orders it was referred back to them to reconsider the Committee's report of the 5th July, 1779, relative to the practice and proceedings on Writs of Error; and the Committee saw no reason to alter either of the said reports. Mr. R. Wishaw wrote to the Secretary on the day of this meeting :—“ Pray excuse me to the worthy Committee for my non-attendance this evening—the anniversary gout having seized me on Sunday last detains me at home. I am truly sorry I cannot attend on the important business named in your summons, but hope by the means of the new Elect that the affairs will be conducted with discreet vigour.”

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday, the 19th Janry., 1781. Present :—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Mainwaring.	Mr. Dennison.	Mr. Purlewent.
in the Chair.	„ Monk.	„ Skerrow.	„ Bowman.
„ Hodges.	„ Wishaw.		

Consid a complt by Mr. Thos. Lloyd, a member of the Socy, to the effect that Mr. Jonathan Dean, an attorney-at-law, residing at Ashbourne, in the county of Derby, had entered into articles with one John Edkins of Shipston-upon-Stower, in the county of Worcester, Schoolmaster, for him, the sd J. Edkins, to serve the sd J. Dean as his Clerk in the bus of an attorney, for the term of five years, and that the sd J. Edkins practised as an attorney in the character of clerk to the said Mr. Dean, and sevl copies of Writs being produced in which the names of Messrs. Barber and Ward appeared as agents for the sd Mr. Dean, the Committee thought it proper to give Messrs. Barber and Ward

notice of such complaint, in order that they may have an opportunity of writing to Mr. Dean thereon before they proceeded any further upon the complt; and the Committee adjourned the further consōn of the said matter until Friday, the 2nd Feb., at 8 o'cl in the evening; and the Secretary was directed to summon the Committee to meet at that time, and to deliver to Messrs. Barber and Ward a copy of this Minute.

The Committee met again at the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane on the 2nd Feb. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Whishaw.	Mr. Skerrow.	Mr. Gerrard.
in the Chair.	„ Dennison.	„ Monk.	„ Bowman.

Mr. Thos. Lloyd being also present. The Mins. of the meeting of the Committee held on the 19th Janry being read, and Messrs. Barber and Ward attending, and producing letters whereby it appeared that Mr. Jonathan Dean had lately had a fall from his horse, by which means he was unable as yet to attend to any business, the Committee fūr adjourned the consōn of the complaint against him and Mr. John Edkins until Monday the 19th Feb.

At a meeting of the Committee on Monday, the 19th Feb., 1781. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. R. Browne.	Mr. Manley.	Mr. Grubb.
in the Chair.	„ Pardoe.	„ Purlewent.	„ Monk.
„ Whishaw.	„ Hull.	„ Gerrard.	„ Bowman.
„ R. Smith (City).			

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His disbursements and allowances amounted to £46 11s. 3d., and his receipts, including £24 17s. 0d. remaining in his hands at the last Genl Meeting, amounted to £43 19s. 6d., leaving due to the Secretary £2 11s. 9d.

The Committee was attended by Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Barber, and Mr. Ward, and the complt against Mr. J. Dean and Mr. Edkins was taken into fūr consōn, and the Committee were of opōn that caveats shd be entered with the Judges of the sevl Courts at Westminster, to prevent the said John Edkin from being admitted an attorney or solicitor.

The following new members were proposed at this meeting:—

Mr. Thos. Martin, Gray's Inn, Recomd by Mr. Parnter.
 Mr. Thos. Rashleigh, Hatton Street, Recomd by Mr. Parnter.
 Mr. Michl. Baker of Fetter Lane, Recomd by Mr. Fothergill.
 Mr. John Ward of „ „ Recomd by „ „

At the Genl Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall, on Friday, the 23rd Feb., 1781. Present:—

Mr. James Farrer. }
 „ Robert Parnter. } Stewards.
 „ John Allen. }
 „ Wm. Strong. } and Messrs. (names not given.)

The Prolocutor, Mr. Fothergill, took the Chair.

The Secretary read from three members $2\frac{1}{2}$ guineas each, in consequence of the resolution of the Genl Meeting held on the 20th Feb., 1761, the Minutes were read and approved, and the usual reports made and accepted. A motion was made and seconded, and it was resolved that the usual paragraph inserted in the Minutes of the Genl Meetings of the Socy relating to the Bankcy laws be for the future omitted. The Secretary was ordered to write a letter to Major Wright, of Wellclose Square, desiring to know of him whether he proposed to continue a member of the Socy, and that he send the Secretary an answer in writing on that subject.

In pursuance of the resolution of the Committee at the meeting held on Monday, the 19th Feb., 1781, in the month of March following, caveats were entered with the Judges to prevent Mr. John Edkins from being admitted an attorney or Solicitor, and on the 8th May, the said John Edkins applied to Mr. Justice Gould to be admitted an attorney of the Court of Common Pleas, notice of which application being given to Mr. Thos. Lloyd, he and the Secy of the Socy attended Mr. Justice Gould, who directed the matter to be heard before all the Judges of the said Court in the Treasury Chamber on the 11th May; when the Judges were attended accordingly, and the affidavit on which the complaint against Mr. Edkins was founded being read, the Judges thought proper to indulge Mr. Edkins with time to answer the said affidavit. On the 17th all the parties again attended before the Judges in the Treasury Chamber, and several affidavits on behalf of Mr. Edkins were then produced, and the Lord Ch Justice directed the affidavits on both sides were left with him for his consideration. On the 19th the parties again attended the Judges in the Treasury Chamber, when, after considering the affts on both sides, and Mr. Edkins having made the usual afft of having served his clerkship agreeable to his articles, he was ordered to be admitted an attorney, and he was accordingly so admitted afterwards. The following papers relating to this matter have been found with the Draft Minutes :

“Mr. Lloyd’s Bill abt entering Caveats abt Edkins.”

In the Matter of John Edkins.

1781, March.	Paid entering Caveats at all the Judges’ Chambers	£	s.	d.
	by order of the Law Socy against the said John Edkins being			
	admitted an attorney
	Paid entg Do. at the Publick Office against his being admitted a			
	Solicitor
			5	0
			1	15 0

Reced the contents. Tho. Lloyd.

"May 8th. Attendg Mr. Lloyd on his being served with notice to attend at Mr. Justice Gould's Chambers on the 9th, with regd to the Caveat entered agst Edkins, when he desired me to attend on the 9th with the Society's Minitt Book ...	s. d. 6 8
9th. Attendg with Mr. Lloyd at Mr. Justice Gould's Chambers, but the Judge being engaged in the House of Lords, nothing done	6 8
10th. Attendg with Messrs. Whishaw and Lloyd at the Judge's Chambers, when the Judge directed the matter to be moved before all the Judges in the Treasury	6 8
11th. Attendg with Mr. Lloyd on the Judges in the Treasury, when Prettie's afft was read, and time given to Mr. Edkins to answer it	6 8
17th. Copy of the Society's Minitts for Mr. Lloyd, and attendg him therewith, and with the papers on the Motion agst Greenwood and Sliper	6 8
17th. Attendg the Judges at Westminster in the Treasury Chamber, when Lord Loughborough took the afft made on the behalf of Mr. Edkins to consider, and appointed a further meetg on the matter to be had the 19th	6 8
19th. Attendg with Mr. Lloyd at Westminster, when the matter was fully opened before the Judges in the Treasury Chamber, and the Judges on considg the affidts on both sides, ordered Mr. Edkins to be admitted an attorney	6 8

"Gazetteer, Tuesday, May 22nd, 1781.

"The Law Society having entered a Caveat *to prevent* Mr. John Edkins of Shipston in Worcestershire from being admitted an attorney, the matter came on before the Justices of the Common Pleas on Saturday last.

"The Statute Law relating to the admission of attornies was very clearly and ably expounded to the Judges by Mr. Lloyd, in support of the Caveat, in a Speech of upwards of an hour, but the young man having fully answered the affidavits against him to the satisfaction of the Judges, they approved of his conduct, and accordingly admitted him an attorney."

At a meeting of the Committee at the Crown and Rolls Tavern, Chancery Lane, on Monday, the 16th July, 1781. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Grubb.	Mr. Robt. Smith (City).
in the Chair.	„ Gerard.	„ Monk.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts at the last Genl Meeting amounted to £18 6s. 6d., and his disbursements and allowances,

including the sum of £2 11s. 9d., balance due to him at the last General audit, came to £18 1s. 1d., leaving in his hands due to the Society 5s. 5d., besides £200 3 per cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities then standg in the names of Messrs. Fothergill, Pardoe, and Edw. Grubb, and half a year's interest due thereon on the 5th inst.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 20th July, 1781. Present :—

Mr. J. H. Wimbolt.	} Stewards.
„ T. Meggison.	
„ J. Purlewent.	
„ Edmd. Estcourt.	

and Messrs. (names not given).

The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

The Secrey recd from four of the members then present 2½ guineas each, in pursuance of the resoln of the Genl Meeting of the 20th Feb., 1761. The Minutes were read, and the usual reports made and approved of. A motion was made and seconded, and it was resolved and ordered, nemine contradicente, that one guinea be collected and received from each member of the Society for the support thereof, and that the same shd be disposed of by the Prolocutor and the Committee as they in their judgment shd think right, and the Secry accordingly recd from sixty-six members then present their respective guineas, amounting to £69 6s. 0d. The Secretary was ordered to wait upon the respective members of the Society who had not that day paid, for their respective guineas. It was also resolved, that any private donations may be sent to the Committee to be disposed of for the benefit of the Society in the same manner as the voluntary contributions of this day. Resolved also that the former orders respecting the increase of the fees be continued on the Minutes.

A letter to the Secretary from Mr. Parnter, one of the Members of the Socy, being read, it was referred to the Committee to enquire into the facts stated in that letter, and the Committee was to be at liberty to take such steps relating thereto as they shd judge right, and the Committee was ordered to be summoned to meet for that purpose at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern, in Chancery Lane on the following Wednesday, and Mr. Meggison and Mr. Parnter were to be summoned to attend. The thanks of the meeting were returned to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn for the use of their Hall by the Society.

Annexed to the Minutes is the following List :

“ 20th July, 1781.

A List of the Members of the Society who this day paid their respective contributions of 1 Guinea each, pursuant to an order of the Genl Meeting held this day :

At a meeting of the Committee on Wed., the 25th July, 1781. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. R. Brown.	Mr. Sayer.	Mr. Finch.
in ye Chair.	„ Monk.	„ Hodges.	„ Bargrave.
„ Dennison.	„ Gerrard.	„ Purlewent.	„ Bowman.

Mr. Robt. Parnther likewise attending, the Committee took into consōn the letter from Mr. Parnther mentioned in the Minutes of the last Genl Meeting, and the facts therein stated, and adjourned the fūr consōn thereof to the next meeting of the Committee; and in the meantime the Secretary was ordered to search and enquire whether or no any affidavits had been made and filed of Chas. Cotterell having been articed to any and what attorney of the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas since his being ordered by the Court of Common Pleas, in Easter Term, 1778, to be struck off the Roll of attorneys of that Court.

The Committee having taken into consōn the order of the last Genl Meeting, directing one guinea to be collected and recd from each member of the Society for the support thereof, and that the same should be disposed of by the Prolocutor and the Committee as in their judgmt they should think right, and finding that there had been collected in consequence of such order a sum of £72 12s. *od.*, and that the Secretary received at the last Genl Meeting a sum of £10 10s. *od.* for the admission of four new members, both of which sums being added together amounted to the sum of £86 2s. *od.*, they thought right that the sum of £28 6s. be paid thereout in discharge of so much of the expenses of the last Dinner, as the money in the Secretary's hands was deficient for that purpose and having taken into consōn the long service of Mr. Edw. Bowman, the Secretary, and the very small gratuities he had received for his trouble therein, they thought it right to desire Mr. Bowman to accept out of the money at present collected the sum of fifty guineas, as a token of the acknowledgment of the Society for his services.

			£ s. d.				£ s. d.				
1.	Allen, John	...	1	1	0	13.	Chamberlayne, Wm.	...	1	1	0
2.	Abbott	...	1	1	0	14.	Denton, Saml.	...	1	1	0
3.	Browne, Wm.	...	1	1	0	15.	Donce, Hy.	...	1	1	0
4.	Browne, Richd.	...	1	1	0	16.	Estcourt, Edmund	...	1	1	0
5.	Bolton, Thos.	...	1	1	0	17.	Ellis, John	...	1	1	0
6.	Brooke, Thos.	...	1	1	0	18.	ffothergill, Hy.	...	1	1	0
7.	Burgh, Allatson	...	1	1	0	19.	ffarrer, James	...	1	1	0
8.	Blake, John	...	1	1	0	20.	ffinch, Wm.	...	1	1	0
9.	Barber, Michl.	...	1	1	0	21.	ffairbank, Francis	...	1	1	0
10.	Berry, John	...	1	1	0	22.	Grubb, Edw.	...	1	1	0
11.	Bullock, Wm.	...	1	1	0	23.	Griffin, George	...	1	1	0
12.	Claridge, John	...	1	1	0	24.	Grogan, Francis	...	1	1	0

<i>£ s d.</i>		<i>£ s d.</i>	
25. Gapper, Wm. 1 1 0	47. Price, John 1 1 0
26. Green, Nathl. 1 1 0	48. Pearson, Geo. 1 1 0
27. Geering, Gregy. 1 1 0	49. Purlewent, Saml. 1 1 0
28. Gerrard, Alexr. 1 1 0	50. Parker, John 1 1 0
29. Green, Thos. 1 1 0	51. Parnther, Robt. 1 1 0
30. Greenwollers, Chas. Garland 1 1 0	52. Rashleigh, Thos. 1 1 0
31. Hamilton, Wm. 1 1 0	53. Sayer, Henry 1 1 0
32. Hodges, Joseph 1 1 0	54. Smith, Robt. Frederick's Pl. 1 1 0
33. Irving, John 1 1 0	55. Sheppard, Chas. 1 1 0
34. Kenaston, Edw. 1 1 0	56. Shaw, Richd. 1 1 0
35. Lowdon, Geo. 1 1 0	57. Skinn, Wm. 1 1 0
36. Lawton, Thos. 1 1 0	58. Shepheard, Wallwyn 1 1 0
37. Lane, Thos. 1 1 0	59. Smith, Robt., Castle Yard 1 1 0
38. Lyon, Joseph 1 1 0	60. Tudman, Robt. 1 1 0
39. Meggison, Thos. 1 1 0	61. Totton, Stevens 1 1 0
40. Monk, Wm. 1 1 0	62. Windus, John 1 1 0
41. Martin, Thos. 1 1 0	63. Wishaw, Richd. 1 1 0
42. Manley, John 1 1 0	64. Welby, Wm. 1 1 0
43. Maltby, Rowland (twice)	1 1 0	65. White, Joseph 1 1 0
44. Natteress, Thos. 1 1 0	66. Ward, John 1 1 0
45. Palmer, Charlton 1 1 0	67. Malbon, Saml. 1 1 0
46. Philpot, John 1 1 0		

At a meeting of the Committee on the 18th Feb., 1782, the Committee audited the Secretary's accounts. His receipts, includg 5s. 5d. balance in his hands at the last Genl Meetg, amounted to £161 13s. 5d., and his disbursements and allowances to £96 3s. 1d., leaving in his hands a balance due to the Society of £65 10s. 4d., besides £200 3 p.c. Consolidated Bank Annuities. It was resolved to report to the Society that on stating the Secretary's accounts, and on the representations made to them by the Secretary, that 34 members of the Society had not yet contributed one guinea each, pursuant to the resoln and order for that purpose made at the last Genl Meeting, and the Committee resolved to submit to the Society how the money collected and to be collected subsequent to the 25th of the precedg July should be applied.

At the Genl Meetg of the Socy held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 22nd Feb., 1782. Present:—

Mr. Danl. Sill.	}	Stewards.
„ Francis Fairbank.		
„ Christopher Morris.		
„ George Pearson.		

and Messrs. (names not given.)

And Messrs. to the amount of 42. The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

The Secretary recd from two gentn then present 2½ guineas each in consequence of the resoln of the Genl Meeting of the 20th Feb., 1761. The Minutes of the Committe of the 18th Feb., 1782, were read, and the Socy taking into consōn the long service of Mr. Edwd. Bowman, the Secretary thought fit to desire Mr. Bowman to accept and retain to himself the sum of £52 10s. 0d. out of the balance now appearing in his hands, on stating his accounts, in addition to the sum of fifty guineas which he has already received in conseqce of the resoln of the Committee of the 25th July, 1781, as a fūr token of the acknowledgment of the Society for his services. It was also ordered that the Secretary wait on the respective members who had not as yet subscribed their guineas pursuant to the resoln and order made at the Genl Meetg on the 20th July last, and that he report to the next Genl Meeting the names of those members who refuse or decline to pay the same. It was also resolved to continue the former orders with respect to the increase of fees, and that the thanks of the Society be returned to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn as usual.

At a meetg of the Committee at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern, Chancery Lane, on Wed. the 5th June, 1782. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Blake.	Mr. Manley.	Mr. Gerrard.
in the Chair.	„ Skerrow.	„ Purlewent.	„ Bowman.
„ Pardoe.	„ Dennison.		

The Committee pursuant to their adjournment of the preceding day, again took into consōn the Act mentioned in the preceding Minutes, and after sevl observations thereon and oþjoñs thereto, postponed the further consōn thereof till after the same shd be read a second time in the House of Lords.

At the Genl Meetg of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall, on Friday, the 5th July, 1782. Present:—

Mr. Bullock.	} Stewards.
„ Rowland Maltby.	
„ George Griffin.	
„ John Berry.	

And Messrs. to the amount of 80. Names not given. The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

The Secretary recd from six gentlemen then present 2½ guineas each, in conseqce of the resoln of the 20th Feb., 1761. The Minutes of the last Genl Meetg and the subseqt Committee meetgs were read and confirmed. The Prolocutor reported that the Committee had audited the Secretary's accounts, and found that his receipts at and since the last Genl Meetg, includg £65 10s. 4d., balance in his hands at the last Genl Meetg, amounted to

£98 1s. 10d., and that his disbursements and allowances amounted to £65 5s. 6d., leaving in his hands a balance of £32 16s. 4d. The Secretary, in pursuance of the order made at the last Genl Meetg held on the 22nd Feb. last, reported that sevl members had declined to pay their subscriptions of a guinea each, and the mentioning of their names was, on motion, postponed to the next Genl Meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern, Chancery Lane, on Friday the 11th July, 1783. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Mainwaring.	Mr. Hodges.	Mr. Bowman.
in the Chair.	„ Dennison.	„ Gerrard.	

They took into further consideration the order of refce made at the last Genl Meeting respecting the reviewing of the practice of the Court of Chancery, and drawing up such regulations as may appear necessary for lessening the delays and expenses of the proceedings in that Court. Mr. Forster again attended the Committee, and informed them that Mr. Vernon, Junr., and himself, with the assistance of other gentlemen, had prepared a general plan of the regulations proposed to be made for remedying the inconveniences mentioned in the said order, and that they had consulted sevl gentlemen at the Bar and practisers at the Court thereon, but such plan not having been fully digested, the Committee adjourned the further consõn of the matter to their next meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 23rd Feb., 1784. Present:—

Mr. ffothergill,	Mr. Purlewent.	Mr. Pardoe.
in the Chair.	„ Dennison.	„ Grubb.
„ Hull.	„ Skerrow.	„ Bowman.

The accounts of the Secretary were audited. His receipts, including £25 15s. 3d., balance in his hands at the last Genl Meetg, amounted to £52 15s. 3d., and his disbursements and allowances to £43 12s. 0d., leaving in his hands due to the Society £9 3s. 3d.

Mr. Forster and Mr. Vernon again attended the Committee, and reported that the plan for regulating the proceedgs in the Court of Chancery was still under consõn, and had not been so fully digested as to be laid before the Committee. The Committee therefore adjourned the fûr consõn of the matter until the plan shd be laid before them.

In pursuance of the order of the last Genl Meetg for continuing upon the Minutes of the Society, the order of refce respecting the demand made by the Clerk of the Rules in the Court of King's Bench on Rules in Ejectment, the Committee caused further applõn to be made to Mr. Cowper touching such demand, and he declared that he had relinquished and given up all demands in that account.

At a General Meeting of the Society held on the 27th day of february, 1784.
Present:—

Mr. James Walker.	} Stewards.
„ Wm. Hamilton.	
„ Thos. Green.	
„ Joseph Lyon.	

And Messrs. to the amount of 60, names not given.

The reference to the Committee at the General Meeting held on the 28th of February, 1783, to review the present state of the practice of the Court of Chancery, and to draw up and report such regulations as may appear necessary for lessening the delays and expenses of the proceedings in that Court, and to take such matters as shd be thought expedient for the purpose of founding an application to the Lord Chancellor or the Legislature for carrying such regulations into effect, was continued on the minitts of the Society.

The usual vote of thanks to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn was passed.

A Meeting of the Committee was held on the 12th July, 1784.

The Secretary's receipts since the last Genl Meetg, including £9 3s. 3d. then in his hands, amounted to £33 3s. 7d., and that his disbursements and allowances were £11 11s. 0d., leaving in his hands a balance of £21 12s. 7d., besides £200 Three per cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities standing in the names of Messrs. ffothergill, Pardoe, and Grubb, and half a year's interest due thereon on the 5th July inst.

At a meeting of the Committee at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on Monday, the 21st day of february., 1785.
Present:—

Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Edwd. Grubb, senr.	Mr. Mainwaring.
„ Robt. Smith (City).	„ Dennison.	„ Bowman.

The Committee took into consōn the Secretary's accounts, and found that his receipts at and since the last General Meeting, including £21 12s. 7d., ballance in his hands at the last General Meeting, amounted to £51 5s. 1d., and that his disbursements and allowances amounted to £19 3s. 5d., leaving a ballance in his hands of £32 1s. 8d.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall, on the 25th of february., 1785. Present:—

Mr. Nathl. Nicholls.	} Stewards.
„ David James.	
„ Herbert Bruce.	
„ Wm. Allen.	

And Messrs. to the amount of 50, names not given.

After the usual business was transacted, a resolution was passed that every

member ought to take a ticket for the two general feasts of the Society each year, and the Secretary was directed to add this resolution to the circular letters to be delivered to the members by the stewards at every general feast. A vote of thanks was passed to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 16th day of July, 1784. Present :—

Mr. John Watson.	} Stewards.
„ Mayo Mayone.	
„ John Forster.	
„ John Kinderley.	

And Messrs. to the amount of 76, names not given. The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, took the Chair.

The Society took into consōn the order of reference to the Committee made at the General Meeting held on the 28th of february, 1783, to review the present state of the practice of the Court of Chancery, and draw up and report such regulations as might appear necessary for lessening the delays and expenses of the proceedings in the court, and to take such matters as might be thought expedient for the purpose of founding an application to the Lord Chancellor or the Legislature for carrying such regulations into effect ; and no plan having been laid before the Committee to proceed on, a motion was made and seconded that the sd order, and the subsequent orders in consequence thereof, be expunged out of the Society's minitts, which was ordered accordingly.

The usual vote of thanks to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn was passed.

At the Genl Meeting of the Socy held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 1st July, 1785. Present :—

Mr. B. Price.	} Stewards.
„ J. Windus.	
„ T. Graham.	
„ Wm. Cecil.	

and Messrs. (names not given.)

The Prolocutor reported that a meetg of the Committee had been summoned to audit the Secretary's accounts, but for want of a sufficient number to form a Come the audit had to be postponed.

A motion was made and seconded, that a contribution of one guinea each be made to discharge the debts of the Society, except the sum of £27 10s. od., alleged to be due to Mr. Greenly, but for which he had given a receipt to the Secretary of the Society, who charged the same in his account, though in fact it had not been paid. The Committee and the late Stewards were ordered to meet on the 17th July, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, at Mr. Greenly's, the Committee to be an open one. The thanks of the Society were returned to the Principal and Rules of the Society of Clifford's Inn, and they were to be requested to grant the use of the Hall for the next Genl Meeting of the Socy.

A Genl Meeting of the Society was held at Clifford's Inn Hall on the 3rd March, 1786. Present :—

Mr. Balfour.	}	Stewards.
„ Bolton.		
„ Collett.		
„ Greenwollers.		

and Messrs. (names not given.)

The draft Minutes give no particulars of what was done beyond the reading of the usual reports.

From an undated circular with the draft Minutes of the Meetings for this year, it appears that Thomas Eames, of 10 Staple Inn, was then the Secretary to the Society.

On the 23rd Feb., 1787, a Genl Meeting appears to have been held for the purpose of considering the conduct of Mr. James ffarrer, at which meeting a motion was made and seconded, that Mr. ffarrer having been appointed Steward of the Society, and having refused to take upon himself that office without assigning a sufficient reason for such refusal, he be expelled from the Society. The previous question whether the Motion should be put being moved and seconded, it was carried in the affirmative, and the Secretary was ordered to wait on Mr. ffarrer and inform him of the resolution. Mr. Lowten moved that the above question be postponed to the next meeting, and that Mr. ffarrer be informed thereof by the Secretary.

The following letter, addressed to Thomas Eames, Esquire, Secretary to the Law Society, 10 Staple Inn, gives particulars of the payments made to the Servants of the Society of Clifford's Inn, in connection with the Society's annual dinners :—

“ Sir,

“ From imagination that it has slipped your memory, I have taken the liberty to acquaint you that it has been the invariable rule for the Law Society to make a compliment to the servants of Clifford's Inn at each time of their dining in the Hall of £1 6s. 0d., which is 10s. 6d. to the Butler, the same to the Porter, and 5s. to the kitchen woman. This compliment as above has been forgot and omitted for this two years past, which is four times, otherwise we should have received £5 4s. 0d., £2 2s. 0d. to the Butler, £2 2s. 0d., and £1 to the kitchen woman. If your goodness will be so kind as to favour us with the arrears of the usual compliment, it will be very gratefully acknowledged by,

“ Sir,

“ Your most obedient humble servant,

“ SAML. ROBINSON,

“ Butler to the Hon. Socy of Clifford's Inn.

“ 26 June, 1787.

“ No. 15 Clifford's Inn.”

On the 16th of Novr., 1787, the Secretary received the following letter on the same subject.

“ Clifford’s Inn.

“ DEAR SIR,

“ Our servants here have requested me to enclose you the account of their customary gratuities from the Law Society, which they tell me are two years in arrear. You’ll easily conceive that long credit is rather inconvenient to ’em, otherwise I suppose they wd not have applied to me to give you this trouble.

“ I am yours heartily,
“ THO. GREGORY.”

Our friend Burrows’ cause against his worthy relative is set down, and stands upwards of 20 out of the Chancellor’s paper.

This gratuity was paid on the 20th of Novr., as appears by a receipt folded up with this letter.

In the draft Minutes of a meeting of the Stewards of the Society, dated the 22nd June, 1787, relating to the sale of tickets for one of the Society’s dinners, this note appears :—

“ 22 June, 1787. Called on Mr. James Farrer, who said it would be extremely inconvenient for him to attend this evening, and that he must decline acting at all. W. B.”

At a meeting of the Committee at Mr. Greenly’s, the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on Thursday, the 5th July, 1787. Present :—

Mr. Fothergill,	Mr. Blake.	Mr. Pulewent.	Mr. Hodges.
in the Chair.	„ Mainwaring.	„ Manley.	

The Secretary’s accounts were taken into consideration, and the further consideration thereof was adjourned to the 10th of the same month. On the 10th July, 1787, the Committee met again at the same place, five members attending, and took into consideration the accounts of Mr. Bowman, the late Secretary, for the year 1785, and found that a balance of £34 13s. 2d. was due from him to the Socy, which sum the Committee considered to be lost. The Committee also found that on the 17th July, 1786, there was a balance in the hands of the Prolocutor of £19 17s. 3d., and that he had since received from Mr. Pardoe £3 for half a year’s dividend due on the preceding 5th of Jany on the £200 3 per cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities, making together £22 7s. 3d., out of which he had paid to Mr. Bowman, Junr., on account of his trouble at different times, £3 3s. 0d., which being deducted from the said sum of £22 7s. 3d., there remained in the hands of the Prolocutor £19 4s. 0d., which he paid over to the Secretary.

	<i>£</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
The Committee likewise took into consōn the trouble which the son of the late Secretary had in the Society's affairs for the two feasts in 1786, and it appearing by an account delivered in by him that his charges amounted to	10	13	8
and that Mr. ffothergill, the Prolocutor, had paid him at different times on account thereof	3	3	0
there remained a balance due to him of	7	10	8
<u> </u>			

which the Committee directed the Secretary to pay to him.

The Committee also considered the present Secretary's accounts, and found that the disbursements of the late Stewards, and the allowances for the last feast, amounted to £76 10*s.* *od.*, that his receipts from the Stewards of the last feast amounted to £55 0*s.* *od.*, and that he received from Mr. ffothergill £19 4*s.* *od.*, leaving altogether £74 4*s.* *od.*, leaving a balance due to the Secretary of £2 6*s.* *od.*

With the Minutes of this meeting is the following account, which seems to have formed part of a letter addressed to "James Garth, Esqr., Temple":—

	<i>£</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
"Mr. Bowman owes the Society on balance of his account pro- duced this 27th June, 1785	37	3	2
Mr. Bowman received at the last meeting	53	0	0
Mr. Bowman owes	90	3	2
<u> </u>			

The Society Dr.

To Venison in July, 1784... ..	25	5	0
To Mr. Greenley on balance in July, 1784	27	10	0
To the last dinner in Feb., 1785, to July, 1784	37	14	0
<u> </u>			
<u>90 9 0</u>			

The following letter from a member of the Committee to Mr. Eames, the Secretary, appears with the papers:—

"Mr. Lowndes presents his compliments to Mr. Eames, and begs he may have notice of the next meeting of the Committee of the Law Society.

"19th July, 1787.

"Mr. L. has ordered a Dish of Fish, a Leg of Mutton, and a Tart for Dinner to-morrow."

There is also a letter from Mr. Barber, dated the 22nd Aug., 1787, asking to be informed when the meeting of the Committee was fixed to take into consōn the business of the Clerk of the Rules.

The Secretary by a circular dated the 18th Jany., 1788, summoned the Committee to meet on the following Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon, at Mr. Greenley's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern, Chancery Lane, to take into consōn the motion respecting the Clerk of the Rules. The Minutes of this meeting are missing.

but from a further circular by the Secretary, summoning the Committee to meet again on the 2nd Feb., it seems that the consideration of the matter referred to was adjourned to the latter day.

At the General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 29th Feb., 1788. Present:—

Mr. Edward Allen.	} Stewards.
„ John Hardcastle.	
„ Richd. Whalley Bridgman.	
„ Giles Bleasdale.	

And members to the amount of 57 (names not given). The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, being indisposed, Mr. Edwd. Allen, one of the Stewards, was voted in the Chair.

After the ordinary business of the meeting had been disposed of, a motion was made and seconded that the list of fees and mode of charging as entered at his request upon the records of the Society be printed and published for the information of the profession at large, and the following amendment to this motion was moved and seconded:—“ Provided Mr. Abbott, the Clerk of the Rules, should consent,” whereupon the question whether the Amendt proposed should stand, part of the original was put and negatived. The original motion was then put, and was also negatived.

The thanks of the Society were returned to the Principal and Rules of Clifford's Inn, and they were to be requested to grant a like favour to the Society on their next General Meeting.

At the Genl Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall on Friday, the 27th June, 1788. Present:—

Mr. John Berry, Southwark.	} Stewards.
„ James Wimbolt.	
„ Gilbert Jones.	
„ Thomas Lodington.	

and members to the amount of 62 (names not given). The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, being indisposed, Mr. Chamberlayne was voted in the Chair.

The ordinary routine business of the Society only seems to have been done, such as the reading and approval of the usual reports, returning thanks for the use of the Hall, and appointing Stewards for the following General Meeting.

There is a circular by the Secretary, dated the 17th Feb., 1789, summoning the Committee to meet on the following Tuesday, the 20th Feb., to audit his accounts. In a postscript to this circular are given the names of some new members proposed. The Minutes of this meeting have not been found with the papers.

There is also a circular dated the 3rd July, 1789, summoning a meeting of the Committee on the following Wed. to pass the Secretary's accounts. On

M

the back of this circular the following list of the names and addresses of the Committee is given :—

Henry ffothergill, Secondary's Office, Temple.
 Wm. Chamberlayne, 6 Lincoln's Inn, New Sq.
 John Blake, Essex St., Strand.
 Wm. Browne, Bedford Row.
 Joseph White, No. 6 Lincoln's Inn, New Square.
 John Manley, Lamb's Bldgs., Temple.
 Joseph Hodges, Clement's Inn.
 James Garth, Hare Court, Temple.
 John Skirrow, Lincoln's Inn Fields.
 James Hutchinson, Leatherseller's Hall.
 Saml. Purlewent, Lincoln's Inn, Old Bldgs, No. 7.
 Robert Smith (City), Old Jewry, No. 21.
 John Smith, Draper's Hall.
 Robt. Pardoe, Lincoln's Inn, New Sq.
 Saml. Denison, Bedford Row.
 Edward Grubb, Fishmonger's Hall.
 Bateman Robson, Lincoln's Inn, New Sq.
 Richard Browne, No. 10, Hatton Garden.

At the General Meeting of the Society held at Clifford's Inn Hall, on the 17th July, 1789. Present :—

Mr. Oliver Jones.	} Stewards.
„ Tortin.	
„ Thos. Brooks.	
„ Richd. Barker.	

And Messrs. Chamberlayne and members whose names are not given. The Prolocutor, Mr. ffothergill, being absent, Mr. Chamberlayne took the Chair.

Mr. Eames having expressed his desire to resign the office of Secretary, his resignation was accepted, and Mr. Wm. Bowman was ordered to succeed him in the said office.

At the same meeting the following Motions were made :—

A motion was made and seconded that £100, part of the £200 Three per cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities, be sold by the trustees, and that the money arising therefrom be paid to the Secretary of the Society in discharge of the sum of £64 17s. 0d. due to him, and to answer the other purposes of the Society.

“It was resolved that every member of this Society shall on or before the next Genl Meeting pay into the hands of the Prolocutor the sum of 3 guineas, in order to establish a fund to answer the purposes of this Society, and that all new members do pay the sum of 5 guineas on their admittance into this Society.”

The following motion was made, seconded, and carried:—"That the time limited for doing business in this Society, as mentioned in the regulation of the 20th July, 1764, be enlarged from 7 o'clock until 9 o'clock in the evening."

At a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday, the 7th July, 1790.
Present—

Mr. ffothergill.	Mr. Robert Smith.
Mr. Barber.	} two of the late Stewards.
„ Juge.	

The accounts of the late Stewards were audited. Their receipts were £42 10s. 0d., and their disbursements £41 14s. 1d., leaving a balance of 15s. 11d., which they paid over to the Sec. The Committee also took into consōn the Secretary's accounts, and found his disbursements and allowances to amount to £9 13s. 6d., and his receipts to 15s. 11d., leaving balance due to him of £8 17s. 7d. The Committee also found that there was still due to Mr. Eames, the late Secretary, £7 7s. 6d., which sum, together with the balance due to the present Secretary, the Committee recommended the next Genl Meeting to discharge forthwith.

The following figures are appended to the Minutes:—

	£ s. d.
	8 17 7
	7 7 6
	16 5 1
9 July, 1790, Cash paid more than recd by the tickets disposed of	27 10 0
	<u>43 15 1</u>

to pay which Subscription was ordered.

At a Special meetg of the Committee to consider whether some and what application should be made for increasg the fees to attorneys and solicitors in the Courts of Law and Equity held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand on Thurs. the 24th May, 1798. Present:—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Meggison.	Mr. Hardcastle.
Prolocutor.	„ Browne.	„ John Leigh.
„ Aldridge.	„ Alexander.	„ Jas. Hodgson.
„ Still.	„ Kinderley.	„ Inge.
„ Rashleigh.	„ Robt. Smith.	„ Brace.

The Committee having read two memorials prepared by Messrs. Hardcastle and Brace, and another presented by Mr. Robt. Smith, and it appearing to the Committee that the present fees of attorneys and Solrs practising in the sevl Courts of Law and Equity were founded on immemorial custom and usage only, and that as the present fees were estabd at an early period upwards of a century ago, when the valve of money was such as rendered the then allowance adequate to its purpose, but that the personal and particular imposts laid on the

practisers within the last few years and other causes, which occasion an immense increase of their capital, render an increase of their fees absolutely necessary. It was resolved that a Memorial be settled by the Committee, and presented forthwith to the Lord Chancellor, and another to the same effect to the Master of the Rolls, praying such relief in the premises as shd be deemed expedient and just.

A meeting of the Committee summoned to settle the draft of the above Memorial was held on the 15th June, 1798, but as only three members attended, viz. Mr. Manley, Prolocutor, Mr. Aldridge, Mr. Brace, Mr. Lowndes, it was adjourned to the 22nd June. At the meeting held on the latter date at the Crown and Anchor in the Strand. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. James, Serpts. Inn.	Mr. Berry.
Prolocutor.	„ Seymour.	„ Sauter.
„ Wilson.	„ James, New Inn.	„ Leigh.
„ Sykes.	„ White.	„ Foss.
„ Alexander.	„ Gellard.	„ Aldridge.
„ Richardson.	„ Hyde.	„ Wm. Browne,
„ Blandford.	„ Jones, Salisbury.	Bedford Row.
„ Jones.	„ Brace.	

The Memorial for an increase of the fees of attys and solrs, and the same being debated and considered, it was unanimously resolved to present it forthwith to the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls. The Prolocutor and the following nine gentlemen, or any six of them, were requested to present the same, viz.

Mr. Smith,	Mr. Browne.	Mr. Foss.
Basinghall St.	„ Aldridge.	„ Brace, and
„ Estcourt.	„ Hamilton,	„ Lowndes.
„ Rashleigh.	Lin. Inn.	

A copy of this Memorial is not included in or annexed to the draft Minutes.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 11th July, 1798. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Meggison.	Mr. Meredith, and Messrs.
Prolocutor.	„ Hardcastle.	Wilson and Bramwell, Stewards.
„ Browne.	„ Estcourt.	

The accounts of Mr. Lowndes, the locum tenens of the Secretary since the resignation of Mr. Long, the late secretary, were considered, and it was found that his receipts, including £14 9s. 3d., balance of Mr. Long's last account, amounted to £144 13s. 3d., and his disbursements since the last Genl Meetg, including the expenses of that feast, amounted to £56 9s. 6d.,

leaving in his hands £88 3s. 9d. In addition to the above, Mr. Lowndes was possessed of £200 3 per cent. Consol. Annys, standing in the names of Messrs. Chamberlayne, Manley, and Estcourt, and that there was one year's dividend due thereon.

The following gentn were proposed as members :—

Mr. John Lowe, of the Middle Temple.

John Dickson, Walbrook.

John Smith, Hatton Garden.

Robert Blake, Essex St.

and being ballotted for, were elected.

Mr. Edw. Bray of Gt. Russell St., and Mr. Debary of the Temple, were also proposed as members.

The Committee also considered the resolutions passed on the 24th May and 22nd June last, and doubts having arisen as to the propriety of presenting the memorial for an increase of the fees of attys and solrs signed by the Secretary only, and also as to the title of the Memorial from the Law Society, it was resolved to submit the two points in question to the Genl Meetg, to determine before presenting the Memorial.

At a General Meeting of the Socy held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, in the Strand, on Friday the 13th July, 1798. Present :—

Mr. Wilson.	} Stewards.
„ Saxon.	
„ Meredith, and	
„ Bramwell.	

Mr. Wimbolt.	Mr. R. Blake.	Mr. Inge.
„ Blandford.	„ Brace.	„ Parry.
„ Smith.	„ Bolton.	„ Hodgson,
„ Lane, R. L. Sq.	„ Claridge.	Chy. Lane.
„ White, Chy. Lane.	„ Rashleigh.	„ Jones,
„ Hodgson,	„ Meggison.	Salisbury Ct.
Symond's Inn. ;	„ Jehanley.	„ McDougal.
„ Kinderley.	„ Grogan.	„ Greenweller.
„ Smith,	„ Holloway.	„ Dickson.
Basinghall St.	„ Smart,	„ Gregson.
„ Windus.	Norfolk St.	„ Pardon.
„ Burgh.	„ Tennant.	„ Josh. Lowten.
„ Hall.	„ Philpot.	„ Dennett.
„ Long.	„ Leigh.	„ Browne.
„ Fairbank.	„ Ludlow.	„ Chilton.
„ Luttley.	„ Richardson.	„ Tarrant.
„ Sauter.	„ Townley Ward.	„ Jones,
„ Kirkley.	„ Battye.	Mansion Ho.

Mr. Richardson,	Mr. Geldard.	Mr. Alexander.
New Inn.	Berry.	Yeomans.
„ Sykes, New Inn.	„ Josh. White.	„ T. Lowten.
„ Meddowcroft.	„ Willey.	„ Aldridge.
„ Bleasdale.	„ Smart.	„ Grubb.
„ Lowe.	„ Pearson.	„ Geo. Hodgson.
„ Bingley.	„ Foss.	„ Shepheard.
„ Parnell.	„ Barber.	„ Flexney.

After the Minutes had been read and confirmed, it was resolved that the Prolocutor sign the Memorial, as it was then entitled, and that he, accompanied by the Standing Committee and such members as chose to attend, wait on the Lord Chancr. and the Master of the Rolls to present the same. The thanks of the Society were ordered to be given to Mr. Lowndes for acting as locum tenens for the Secrety.

A meeting was summoned for the 2nd Novr., 1798, at the Crown and Anchor, but as only one member (Mr. Rashleigh) attended, nothing was done. Mem: by the Secretary: "Paid room, 13s."

At a meeting of the Committee held at the same place on the 17th Jany., 1799. Present:—

Mr. Meggison.	Mr. Hardcastle.	Mr. Sandys.	Mr. Aldridge.
„ Fairbank.	„ Manley.	„ Lowndes.	

Mr. E. Bray and Mr. R. Debarry were elected members of the Society. The following gentn were proposed as members:—

Mr. B. C. Williams, of Bedford Row.

Mr. Richd. Teasdale, of Chancery Lane.

By Mr. Miller, Carey St.

and Mr. Jeremiah Simpson, King's Bench Walks. By Mr. John Barber, Grays' Inn.

The Committee having inspected the list of persons standg for admission as attorneys in the following Hilary Term, did not find any person improper to be admitted.

The Secretary having reported that the Lord Chancr. had expressed his doubts to Mr. Coates, his Secretary, whether his power extended so far as to enable him to vary the fees of Solicitors, the Prolocutor was requested to wait on Mr. Coates, and get a time appointed to wait on the Chancr., and the Secretary was directed to summon a meeting of the Committee two days previous to such appointment to consider the point in question.

At a meeting of the Committee on Tuesday, the 26th Feb., 1799. Present:—

Mr. Manley.	Mr. Geldard.	} Stewards.
„ Lowndes.	„ Welch, and	
„ Smith.	„ Richardson.	
„ Still.		

Mr. Tennant did not attend.

Arrangements were made for the next Feast on the 2nd March, dinner being ordered for sixty persons at 6s. per head, and a dessert at 4 guineas. The Secretary's accounts were audited, his receipts, including balance of £88 3s. 9d. paid to him by Mr. Lowndes, togr with payments for tickets for the present Feast, amountg to £260 18s. 3d., and his disbursements since the last Genl Meeting, including the expenses of that Feast, to £99 4s. 0d., leaving in his hands £161 14s. 3d., togr with £200 3 per cent. Consols. Mem. by Sec. : "Paid room and waiter, 10s. 6d."

At a Genl Meetg of the Socy held on Sat, the 2nd March, 1799. Present :—

	Mr. Robert Barber, Fetter Lane.	} Stewards.
	„ Phil. Wyatt Crowther, Guildhall.	
	„ John Forster, Carey Street.	
	„ John Sudlow, Monument Yard.	
Mr. Hodgson.	Mr. Jos. Lowten.	Mr. Manley.
„ Long.	„ Hamilton.	„ Lowndes.
„ Hall.	„ Geo. Pearson.	„ Aldridge.
„ Boulflower.	„ Kinderley.	„ Foss.
„ Tennant, Stewd.	„ John Barber, N. T.	„ Meredith.
„ Berry.	„ McDougal.	„ Miller.
„ Santer.	„ Welch.	„ Holloway.
„ Debary.	„ Parry.	„ Edmunds.
„ Hyde.	„ Richardson.	„ Smart.
„ Rashleigh.	„ T. Lowten, N. T.	„ Grubb.
„ Chilton.	„ Still, N. T.	„ Cooper.
„ Dennett.	„ Lowe.	„ White.
„ Parnell.	„ Inge.	„ Tarrant.
„ Chamberlayne.	„ Geldard.	„ Bramwell.
„ Dowse, N. T.	„ Jas. Hodgson.	„ Price.
„ Luttlely.	„ Batty.	„ Sykes.
„ Leigh.	„ Grogan.	„ Meggison.
„ Brace.	„ Sandys, N. T.	„ James, and
„ R. Smith.	„ Horton.	The Secretary.
„ Lane.	„ Sheppard.	

No business appears to have been done beyond the confirmation of minutes, the appointment of Stewards, and the acceptance of the resignation of three members of the Society who had declined to take tickets, and wished to withdraw, viz. Messrs. Bullock, Willey, and Meddowcroft.

A meeting was summoned to be held on the 5th April, 1799, to inspect the list of persons standg for admission in following Easter Term, and to ballot for new members, but as a sufft number did not attend to constitute a Committeæ, no business was done. The members who attended were Mr. Meggison, Mr. Rashleigh, Mr. Sandys. "Paid room, &c., 8s. 6d."

At a meeting on the 21st May, 1799. Present:—

Mr. Foss. Mr. Manley. Mr. Rashleigh. Mr. Robt. Smith.

The list above refd to was examd, and no objection found to any of the names appearing therein. Messrs. Williams, Teasdale, and Simpson were elected; and the following were proposed as members:—

Mr. Thos. Street, of Brabant Court, Fenchurch St, by Mr. James, Sergeants' Inn, and Mr. James Smith by Mr. Robt. Smith, Basinghall St.

The following note appears on the draft minutes crossed through:—

"To write to the gentn who have not attended the Committee to know if they will have their names struck out and others substituted in their room who will attend."

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Crown and Anchor on Wed., the 12th June, 1799. Present:—

Mr. Manley, Prolocutor,	Mr. Smith.	Mr. Brown.
in the Chair.	„ Meredith.	„ Flexney, Secretary.
„ Kinderley.	„ Sandys.	

also Messrs. Sudlow & Barber, Stewards.

The Sec.'s accounts were audited, and his receipts, includg £161 14s. 3d., balance of last account, amounted to £168 os. 3d., and his disbursements and allowances, including his salary up to the 7th of May, to £62 19s. 9d., leaving in his hands £106 os. 6d., togr with the £200 in consols already mentioned, on which three years' dividends wd be due on the 5th of July. The Secretary, in pursuance of a resolution of the 30th April, 1798, produced a bond entered into by him with a sufficient surety approved by the Prolocutor, which bond was left in the hands of the Prolocutor.

Mr. John Alexander of Bedford Row was proposed as a member by Mr. Brown, and Messrs. Thos. Street and James Smith were elected as members.

The Stewards, with the approbation of the Committee, ordered the next Genl Meeting to be held on Thursday the 27th June, instead of Friday the 28th, the usual day, as many members of the Socy belonging to the Bloomsbury and Inns of Court Military Assocn being obliged to attend a General Field Day on the Friday. Dinner was to be provided for 80 at 5s. per head, and 7 Haunches of Venison.

At the General Meetg of the Society held on the 27th June, 1799. Present:—

Mr. Manley, Prolocutor, in the Chair.

Mr. Greenwoller.	Mr. Josh Lowten.	Mr. Meredith.
„ Smart.	„ Berry.	„ Pardon.
„ Leigh.	„ Seymour.	„ Parnell.
„ Hall.	„ Blandford.	„ Hamilton.
„ Sauter.	„ Douce.	„ Meggison.
„ Hyde.	„ Street.	„ Sandys.
„ Richardson.	„ Crowder.	„ Dickson.
„ Robt. Smith.	„ Windus.	„ Grogan.
„ Edwards.	„ James Hodgson.	„ Sheppard.
„ Inge.	„ Kinderley.	„ Foss.
„ Hodgson.	„ Robt. Barber.	„ Dennett.
„ Burgh.	„ Forster.	„ Grubb.
„ Sudlow.	„ Lowndes.	„ Chamberlayne.
„ Simpson.	„ Browne.	„ Barber.
„ pd six guas.	„ Miller.	„ Battye.
„ Aldridge.	„ Chilton.	„ Tarrant.
„ Wm. Richardson.	„ James Smith.	„ Horton.
„ Philpot.	„ James White.	„ Cooper.
„ Wimbolt.	„ Debary.	„ Williams.
„ Finch.	„ Brace, N. T.	„ Pearson.
„ Lane.	„ Kirkley.	„ Geldard, pd 1 gua.

Certain letters from the Prolocutor to the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls were read, and the Prolocutor reported that he had made frequent applications in person to the Lord Chancellor's Secretary to request an interview with his Lordship, but that no appointment could be obtained. It was therefore resolved that the mode of proceeding on the memorial be pursued agreeable to the resolution of the Genl Meeting of the Socy on the 13th July, 1798.

The Sec. summoned a meetg for the 1st Nov., 1799, to inspect the list of persons applying for admission in Michaelmas, but no one attended.

At a meeting of the Committee held on the 20th Jany., 1800. Present:—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Smith.	Mr. Stilt.
in the Chair.	„ Rashleigh.	„ Foss.

The following were proposed as members of the Society. Present:—

Mr. Wimburn, Chancery Lane, by Mr. Lowndes of Red Lion Sq.

Mr. Geo. Edmunds of Chancery Lane, and Mr. Wm. Vizard of Gray's Inn, both by Mr. Edmunds of Chancery Lane.

The Committee examd the list of persons applying to be admitted next Term, and found the names of five persons whom they consid improper to be admitted, and the Secretary was ordered to make enquiries respecting those persons.

Mem. by the Secretary: "Take down the numbers of meetings of the Committee from Feb. 1788, and the No. of Times each member has attended—and report at a Genl Meetg."

At a meetg of the Committee held on the 7th Feb., 1800, the Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, includg £106 os. 6*d.*, balance of last account, amounted to £144 17*s.* 6*d.*, and his disbursements, including the cost of last Genl meeting, and his salary up to the 7th Novr. last, amounted to £96 7*s.*, 0*d.*, leaving in his hands £48 10*s.* 6*d.*

Messrs. Wimburn, Edmunds, and Vizard were elected Members of the Society.

The Committee inspected the list of persons applying to be admitted in the ensuing Easter Term, and ordered enquiries to be made as to one of those persons whom they considered to be objectionable.

The Genl Meetg was appointed to be held on the 28th Feb., at the Crown and Anchor, dinner for half-past four being ordered for 60 persons at 5*s.* a head.

Mr. Jonathan Rashleigh of Hatton Garden was proposed by Mr. Rashleigh of the same place as a member.

The Prolocutor reported the result of enquiries made as to certain persons applying for admission mentioned in the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, and that he found no objection to any of them; but that he found a caveat entered against one of them, Mr. Fallows, and that affidavits were in the hands of Mr. Egerton of Gray's Inn. Mr. Fallows applied for but had been refused admission in the Common Pleas. The Secretary had requested notice to be given him of the application in this matter.

The Committee finding much difficulty in obtaining the attendce of their select body for doing the business of the Socy, and much inconvenience arising to those who inclined to attend, and who frequently did attend, without being able to proceed to business for want of a sufficient number of members attending to constitute a Committee; and on enquiring into the cause, they found it to be occasioned partly by deaths, ill health, and other causes, and the Committee therefore recommended the next Genl Meetg of the Society to order that the Committee in future be ordered to nominate annually before the Genl Meetg after every Hilary Term 24 members of the Society to form a Committee and to deliver a list of such persons for the approbation of the General Meeting.

At the Genl Meeting of the Socy held on the 28th Feb., 1800. Present:—

Mr. Blandford.	Mr. Geldard.	Mr. Inge.
„ Collett.	„ Leigh.	„ Dennett.
„ Miller.	„ Jas. White.	„ Saxon.
„ Forster.	„ Lee.	„ Williams.
„ Alexander.	„ Brace.	„ Parry.
„ Lowndes.	„ Simpson.	„ Foss.

Mr. Lane.	Mr. Meggison.	Mr. Smart.
„ Seymour.	„ R. Smith.	„ Yeomans.
„ Wimburn.	„ Jos. Smith.	„ Jos. Lowten.
„ Dickson.	„ Hamilton.	„ Thos. Lowten.
„ Richardson.	„ Hyde.	„ D. James.
„ Lowe.	„ Douce.	„ Grubb.
„ Wimbolt.	„ Rashleigh.	„ Price.
„ Manley.	„ Cooper.	„ Chilton.
„ Hodgson.	„ Teasdale.	„ Claridge.
„ Long.	„ Batty.	„ Street.
„ Geo. Edmunds.	„ Sheppard.	„ Sykes.
„ Hall.	„ Bleasdale.	„ Parnell, and
„ Welch.	„ Pearson.	The Secretary.
„ Maltby.	„ Aldridge.	

Mr. Robert Smith was elected as one of the Trustees of the Society's funds in the room of Mr. Chamberlayne, deceased.

It appearing from the report of the Committee of the 7th Feb. last that there was a balance in the Secretary's hands of £142 10s. due to the Socy, and that 2½ years' dividends on the £200 3 per cents. belonging to the Socy became due on the 5th Jany. preceding, it was ordered that as much of the said balance in the Secretary's hands as would be sufficient for that purpose be laid out in the purchase of £100 3 per cent. Consol. Bank Annys in the names of John Manley, Edmund Estcourt, and Robert Smith, the Trustees of the Socy, and that the same and the dividends to arise therefrom be subject to the orders and resolutions of the Society at their General Meetings.

In pursuance of the recomn of the 7th Feb., the Committee was ordered to nominate annually before the Genl Meetg after every Hilary Term 24 persons out of the Society to form a Committee, and to deliver a list of such names for the approbation of the next General Meetg, and for the present year the Committee were to nominate 24 persons whose names should be delivered into the Society at their next Genl Meeting for their approbation.

Mr. Wm. Boutflower of North Street, Red Lion Square, and Mr. James Hutchinson of Leathersellers' Hall, having declined to take tickets, it was resolved that they be no longer members of the Society, and that their names be struck out of the list, and they were struck out accordingly.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Crown and Anchor on the 23rd May, 1800. Present:—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Robt. Smith.	Mr. Rashleigh.
in the Chair.	„ Peter Still.	„ Lowndes.

The list of persons applying for admission in Trinity Term was inspected, and no one found to be objectionable or improper.

Pursuant to the resolution of the Genl Meetg, the Committee made out a list of 24 persons to act as Committee for the present year, viz.

Mr. Aldridge, John.	Mr. Lowndes, Richard.	Mr. Brace, Herbert.
Lin. Inn.	„ Manley, John.	„ White, James.
„ Blandford, Temple.	„ Meggison, Thos.	„ Sheppard, Chas.
„ Estcourt, Edmund.	„ Meredith, Spencer.	„ Bleasdale, Giles.
„ Fairbank, Francis.	„ Rashleigh, Thos.	„ Saxon, Nathl.
Since dead.	„ Smith, Robt.	„ Lowten, Thos.
„ Foss, Ed.	„ Still, Peter.	„ Parnell, Hugh.
„ Hamilton, Wm.	„ Sudlow, John.	„ Lane, Thos., R.L.S.
„ Kinderley, John.	„ Teasdale, Richard.	„ Miller, John.

The following were proposed as members of the Socy :—

Mr. Chas. Vickers Hunter of Staple Inn, by Mr. McDougal.

Mr. Chas. Sauter of New Inn, by Mr. Berry.

Mr. Robinson, 7 Lincoln's Inn, by Mr. Miller of Carey St.

At a meetg of the Come held on the 27th June, 1800. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Aldridge.
in the Chair.	„ Foss.	„ Still
„ Rashleigh.		

Stewards, Mr. Teasdale only.

The Secretary's accounts were audited, and his receipts, including £142 10s., the balance of the last account, and £15, being two years and a half's dividends due the 5th Jany. last on the £200 3 per cent. Consols, amounted to £220 10s. 0d. Pursuant to the resolution of the last Genl Meetg, the Secy had laid out £63 2s. 6d. in the purchase of £100 3 p. c. Consols, and his disbursements, includg this amount and the expences of the last feast, and his salary up to the 7th of May, amounted to £128 18s. 0d., leaving in his hands £91 12s. 0d.

The Secretary reported that he had made frequent applications at Mr. Grapper's last place of residence in London for payment of two years' arrears of his subscriptions to the Society, and that on 19th of April last he made a similar applōn to him by letter addressed to him at Enstridge, near Wincanton, Somersetshire, but had not received any answer thereto.

The Secretary recd from five new members, viz. Messrs. Alexander, Vanderzee, Wimburn, Edmunds, & Vizard, five guineas each, pursuant to the resolution of the Society of the 17th July, 1789.

The Committee having inspected the list of persons applying for admission in Michaelmas, directed the Secy to make enquiries as to one of them, namely, Jehu Shawe, clerk to Mr. Lingard. The Secretary subsequently ascertained at the Judge's Chambers that no application had yet been made for admission, and that until the articles & necessary affidavits were brought to the Judge no opinion could be formed whether the said person ought to be admitted;

the Prolocutor then requested the Secretary to see the person in question, and demand an inspection of the articles and other documents necessary for his admission, and in case of refusal to enter caveats against his admission.

Messrs. Jonathan Rashleigh, C. V. Hunter, C. Sauter, and Geo. Jocelyn Robinson were elected members.

The Stewards gave directions for the next Feast to be held at the Crown and Anchor at half-past four o'clock on Friday, the 18th July, ordering dinner for 80 at 6s. a head.

The following plan was resolved upon with respect to the future meetings of the Committee:—

That there be four such meetings in the year, viz. on the second Friday in each Term, at 8 o'clock in the evening.

That the whole Committee (consisting of 24) be summoned for each of such meetings, and that a rota of attendance be formed, consisting of six members of the Committee, in the order they stand on the list, who shall attend either in person or be represented by some other member of the Committee, or forfeit 5s. for every default.

And in order that each member of the Committee may be apprized of the meeting on which he is on the rota, the same shall be noticed on the summons for each meeting.

That each member of the Committee be forthwith furnished with a list of the whole Committee.

It having been represented to the Committee that there were certain Barristers, Counsel, and Draftsmen who received clients and transacted their business independently and without the interventn of any attorney or solicitor, it was resolved that such practices were highly improper, and ought to be discountenanced by the Society and the profession at large.

At a General Meeting of the Socy on Friday, the 18th July, 1800. Present:—

Mr. Manley in the Chair.

Messrs. Blake, Bray, Smith, and Teasdale, Stewards.

Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Rashleigh.	Mr. Yeomans.
„ Hull.	„ J. Rashleigh.	„ B. Price.
„ Burgh.	„ Lee.	„ Jones.
„ Sauter.	„ M. Hodgson.	„ Tarrant.
„ Berry.	„ G. Edmunds.	„ Thos. Lowten.
„ Bingley.	„ Jas. Hodgson.	„ Philpot.
„ J. Richardson.	„ Batty.	„ Geldard.
„ Street.	„ Wimburn.	„ Miller.
„ Long.	„ Lane.	„ Greenwoller.
„ Ward.	„ Vizard.	„ Bruce.
„ Bramwell.	„ Dennett.	„ Edmunds.
„ Parry.	„ Price.	„ Chilton.

Mr. Forster.	Mr. Hamilton.	Mr. Gregson.
„ Wimbolt.	„ Windus.	„ Dickson.
„ Bolton.	„ Lowndes.	„ Smart.
„ Cooper.	„ Chas. Smart.	„ Foss.
„ Kinderley.	„ Lowe.	„ Aldridge.
„ Meggison.	„ Parnell.	„ Inge.
„ Sandys.	„ John Leigh.	„ Grubb.
„ Estcourt.	„ Jno. Barber.	„ Douce.
„ Jos. White.	„ Jer. Simpson.	„ Geo. R. Robinson.
„ Hyde.	„ Geo. Pearson.	„ Geo. Hodgson.
„ McDougal.		

The Report of the Committee of the 27th June, that certain Barristers, Counsel, and Draftsmen under the Bar in Conveyancing received clients and transacted business with the intervention of an atty or solicitor, and their resolution that such practices were highly improper, and ought to be discountenanced by the Socy and the profession at large, were read, and it was resolved that the meeting concurred in opinion with the Committee. It was resolved that the thanks of the meeting be returned to the Committee for their very great care and attention to the honour and interests of the Society in particular, and the profession in general, and that copies of the foregoing resolutions be sent to every member of the Society, in order that the sense of the meeting may be fully known, as a means of preventing in future a practise so highly prejudicial to the interests of Attys and Solrs.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 14th Nov., 1800. Present:—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Sudlow.	Mr. R. Smith.
in the Chair.	„ Jas. White.	„ Lane, R. L. Sq.
„ Bleasdale.	„ Miller.	„ Kinderley.
„ Teasdale.	„ Aldridge.	„ Lowndes.

The following were proposed as members of the Society:—

Mr. Hen. Jenkinson Sayer of Lin. Inn, Stone Bldgs, by Mr. Alexander, Bedford Row, and Mr. John Miller, same place, by Mr. Lane, of Red Lion Square.

The name of anōr gentn of Greenwich also appears, but is crossed thro, and there is the following marginal note: “If admissible—residing in the country.”

The Committee having inspected the list of persons applying for admission in Hilary Term did not find any improper or objectionable person among them. The Secretary reported that, pursuant to the directions of the Committee on the 27th June, he had seen the person referred to in the Minutes of that date, who appeared to them improper to be admitted, and inspected his articles and an assignmt thereof, and that such documents appeared to be perfectly

correct, and the usual affidavits of due execution and service were also correct; that the caveat had been lodged nearly two years previously, and had not been renewed, and the Judge had therefore granted his fiat, and the person referred to had been admitted accordingly.

The Trustees of the Society's Stock in the 3 p. c. Consols represented to the Committee that they had executed to the Secy a Power of Attorney to receive the dividends arising therefrom, of which the Committee approved.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 6th Feb., 1801. Present:—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Foss.	Mr. Parnell.
in the Chair.	„ T. Lane.	„ Rashleigh.	„ Smith.
„ T. Lowten.	„ Sudlow.		

Enquiries were ordered to be made respecting four persons applying for admission as attorneys in the followg Easter Term.

Mr. H. J. Sayer and Mr. John Miller were elected as Members.

The Prolocutor reported that he had had a conference with the Lord Chancr on the subject of the Memorial as to the increase of fees, and that his Lordship expressed his wish to give every assistce in his power to the profession, but had some doubts respecting his authority, and mentioned a Book of Orders in Lord Hardwicke's time in 1741 in pursuance of a certificate of the Comrs, by virtue of the powers vested in them by a Commission granted under the Great Seal upon an Address of the House of Commons. The Prolocutor informed his Lordship that the Book of Orders referred to the fees only of the officers of the Court of Chancery, and not to the fees of solrs, which were fees of right by ancient immemorial custom at Common Law, and that he conceived his Lordship on considering the subject wd find it so, and that his Lordship had the right of control over the solrs & their fees. The Prolocutor also requested his Lordship to permit a Select Committee to attend him on the subject, likewise mentioning a letter he had recd from Mr. Robert Smith of Basinghall Street, which threw much light on the subject. His Lordship desired to see this letter, and it was ordered to send a copy to him and also to the Master of the Rolls.

At a meetg of the Committee on Feb. 20, 1801. Present:—

Mr. Hamilton.	Mr. Smith.	Mr. Meggison.
„ Lane.	„ Kinderley.	

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, includg £91 12s., balance of last account, amounted to £237 11s. 0d., and his disbursements, includg the expense of the last General Meeting, to £103 4s. 6d., leaving a balance of £134 6s. 6d. in his hands, in addition to the £300 in consols.

The Committee nominated 24 persons to form the Committee for the present year. The annual Feast was appointed to be held on the 27th Feb., dinner being ordered for 60 persons at 6s. a head.

At the General Meetg of the Society held at the Crown and Anchor in the Strand, on Friday the 27th Feb., 1801. Present :—

Mr. John Alexander, Bedford Row.	} Stewards.	
„ B. C. Williams, Do.		
„ Thos. Street, Brabant Court.		
„ G. J. Robinson, Lin. Inn.		
Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Jos. Lowten.	Mr. Vanderzee.
„ Long.	„ T. Lane.	„ Crowther.
„ Hodgson.	„ Jeremiah Simpson.	„ Hamilton.
„ Parnell.	„ Horton.	„ Debary.
„ Windus.	„ Parry.	„ Pearson.
„ Wimbolt.	„ R. Smith.	„ Grubb.
„ J. Rashleigh.	„ J. Smith.	„ Robinson.
„ Chs. Sauter.	„ Leigh.	„ Harvey.
„ Blandford.	„ Forster.	„ Dickson.
„ J. Richardson.	„ Fothergill.	„ Holloway.
„ Claridge.	„ B. Price.	„ Battye.
„ Burgh.	„ Rt. Edmunds.	„ John Smith.
„ Jno. Wilson.	„ J. Lowe.	„ Bramwell.
„ Aldridge.	„ R. Battye.	„ Inge.
„ James White.	„ G. Bleasdale.	„ T. Lowten.
„ Grogan.	„ J. Alexander.	„ Sudlow.
„ Kiskley.	„ Douce.	„ J. Richardson.
„ John Barber.	„ Hyde.	„ Chilton.

Mr. Robert Smith's letter to the Prolocutor on the subject of the Memorial to the Lord Chancellor was read, and the thanks of the Society were ordered to be given to Mr. Smith for such letter.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 20th April, 1801. Present :—

Mr. Bleasdale.	Mr. James.	Mr. Sandys.
„ Still.	„ Lowten.	

Reported that he had made enquiries concerning the four persons mentioned in the Minutes of the 6th of Feb., who appeared to the Committee objectionable persons to be admitted as attorneys, and the Committee directed further enquiries to one of them, Mr. Jefferson, and that caveats be lodged against the other as three, Hadden, Baines, & Gill.

At a meetg of the Committee held on the 1st May, 1801. Present :—

Mr. Lowten.	Mr. Hamilton.	Mr. Sudlow.
„ Meggison.	„ James.	„ Smith.

The Secretary reported that he had, with the approbation of two members of the Committee, withdrawn the caveats against Baines and Jefferson, two of

the persons who appeared to the Committee objectionable, they having given satisfactory explanations. The Secretary also reported that Wm. Hadden of Essex St. had replied by letter to the enquiries directed to him; but this letter not being deemed satisfactory, the Committee determined not to withdraw the caveat against his admission. The Secretary also reported that Gill had not applied for his fiat nor given any explanation. The Committee then inspected the list of persons applying to be admitted in Trinity Term, and directed several enquiries to be made.

At a meetg of the Committee on Monday the 1st June, 1801. Present:—

Mr. Manley.	Mr. James (New Inn).	Mr. Meggison.
„ Parnell.	„ Lane.	

The Secretary reported that Mr. Hadden gave notice and applied to Mr. Justice Grose for his fiat to be admitted, that the Secry and two of the Committee attended Mr. Justice Grose thereon, who, after hearing their objections and Mr. Hadden's answers, refused to grant his fiat. The Secretary reported the result of his inquiries concerning the persons mentioned at the last meeting, which being satisfactory, except as to two, the Committee directed caveats to be lodged by the Secretary against their admission.

The following gentn were proposed as members:—

Saml. Jortin, Gray's Inn.

Wm. Dunn, Lin. Inn.

John Fallowfield Scott, Warwick Court.

Thos. Palmer, Warnford Court.

— Gale, Boswell Court, Carey St.

A. M. Setree, Cutlers' Hall, and

Thos. Geo. Knapp, Haberdashers' Hall.

proposed by Mr. Jukes, New Inn.

Emanuel Allen, Frith St., Soho.

John Corfield, Skinners' Hall.

Thos. Loggen, Basinghall St.

Thos. Smith, Chapter House, St. Paul's, and

Rt. Langley Appleyard, Lincoln's Inn.

proposed by Mr. James.

Henry Wright, 14 Paper Bldgs., Temple.

Wm. Chippendale, Gt. Queen St., Lin. Inn Flds, and

John Swale, Clifford's Inn.

proposed by Mr. Sykes, New Inn, and

Chas. James, of Gray's Inn, by Mr. Meggison.

At a meetg of the Committee on 22nd June, 1801. Present:—

Mr. James.	Mr. Alexander.	Mr. Aldridge.
„ Still.	„ Sudlow.	„ Street.
„ Sandys.	„ Lane.	„ } Smith.

N

The gentn proposed as members at the last meeting were elected.

The Secretary's accounts were audited, and his receipts, including £144 6s. 6d., balance of last account, amounted to £151 2s. 6d., and his disbursements, including the expenses of the last Feast, to £68 2s. 6d., leaving in his hands £83.

The Committee inspected the list of persons applying to be admitted in Michaelmas Term, and did not find any improper to be admitted.

The Secretary reported that, pursuant to the resolution of the Genl Meeting of the Socy on the 18th July, 1800, and a resolution of the Genl Meeting of the 27th Feb., 1801, he had had printed and transmitted to each member of the Society copies of such resolutions, which related to the action of certain Barristers and others transacting business with the intervention of an attorney or solicitor.

The Committee directed the next Genl Meeting to be held on the 10th July, at half-past four, and ordered dinner for 90 persons at 6s. a head.

At a meetg of the Committee on Thurs., the 2nd July, 1801. Present:—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Jas. White.	Mr. Still.
in the Chair.	„ Sandys.	„ Lowndes.
„ Sudlow.	„ Aldridge.	„ Kinderley.
„ Brace.	„ James.	„ Lane, R. L. S.

Mr. Manley, the Prolocutor, reported to the Committee that he had, in pursuance of the request of the Committee at their meeting of the 6th Feb., presented to the late Lord Chancellor, Lord Loughborough (now Lord Roslyn), a copy of Mr. Smith's letter respecting the Memorial of the Society, and that he had since then had sevl conferences with his Lordship previous to his resigning the Seals; that he urged as much as lay in his power, and as far as with decency and propriety he could, his Lordship deciding on the prayer of the Memorial previous to his resigning the Seals; but finding that could not be effected, Mr. Manley, since his Lordship had delivered up the Seals, frequently applied, personally and by letter, to request his Lordship's opinion on the Memorial before it was presented to the present Lord Chancellor, and on the 24th June last Mr. Manley attended his Lordship by appointment, when his Lordship said he had his doubts whether the Chancr would increase the fees of solicitors without the authority of Parliament.

The Committee passed a vote of thanks to the Prolocutor, and resolved to present a similar Memorial to the present Lord Chancellor, and Master of the Rolls.

At the Genl Meetg of the Society held on the 10th July, 1801. Present:—

Mr. Wm. Seymour, Margaret Street, Cav. Sq.	} Stewards.
„ Alexr. McDougal, Lincoln's Inn.	
„ William Richardson, Monumt. Yard.	
„ John Tarrant, Chancery Lane.	

Mr. Hodgson.	Mr. Sheppard.	Mr. C. James, Senr.
„ Thos. Hale.	„ Estcourt.	„ Meggison.
„ B. C. Williams.	„ Dennett.	„ Sandys.
„ Sudlow.	„ G. Pearson.	„ Robinson.
„ Chippendale.	„ J. Lowten.	„ R. Smith.
„ Thos. Lane,	„ Tarrant.	„ Jas. Smith.
R. L. S.	„ Wimbolt.	„ Inge.
„ Alexander, Jno.	„ Barber, J.	„ Hamilton.
„ G. Edmunds.	„ J. Simpson.	„ Vizard.
„ J. Alexander.	„ Battye.	„ James, G. J.
„ Burgh.	„ Horton.	„ T. Lowten.
„ Sayer.	„ Hyde.	„ Aldridge.
„ Miller.	„ Manley.	„ Loggen.
„ Shawl.	„ Jno. Wilson.	„ Palmer.
„ Dickson.	„ Maltby.	„ Dunn.
„ Bolton.	„ Parnell.	„ Parry.
„ Leigh.	„ Greenwoller.	„ Appleyard.
„ Bingley.	„ Foss.	„ Kirkby.
„ Lee.	„ Grogan.	„ Sykes.
„ Wright.	„ C. Smart.	„ Geldard.
„ Windus.	„ Jortin, Jr.	„ Chilton.
„ Kinderley.	„ Berry.	„ Lowe.
„ Long.	„ Bramwell.	„ Holloway.
„ Street.	„ Forster.	„ Bruce.
„ J. Richardson.	„ Townley Ward.	„ John Smith.
„ Still.	„ Meredith.	„ Douce, and
„ Setree.	„ Blandford.	The Secretary.

A resolution was passed granting 20 guineas to the Secretary for his labor in compiling an Index to the Proceedgs of the Law Society.

At a meetg of the Committee on Wednesday, 20th Jany., 1802. Present:—

Mr. James,	Mr. Smith.	Mr. Teasdale.
in the Chair.	„ Lane, R. L. S.	The Secretary.
„ Sudlow.		

The Secretary reported a communication made to him by Mr. Justice Rooke's clerk as to an attempt having been made by the father of R. Oliver Gill to get him admitted an attorney, to accomplish which perjury was meditated and unavoidable, and it was resolved to continue the caveat against Gill's admission, and to oppose him if he should apply for a Judge's fiat.

The following gentlemen were proposed as Members of the Society:—

Richd Wilson, Lin. Inn Flds, by the Secry.

Thos. Atkinson, same place, by Mr. Sykes.

— Windus, Exchequer Office, by Mr. Brace.

John Pearson, Pump Court, by Mr. Alexander of Bedford Row.

Thos. Simon, Gray's Inn, by Mr. James, New Inn.

George Barrow, Threadneedle St., by Mr. Thos. Lowten.

John Day Blake of Cook's Court, Carey St., by Mr. Alexander of Bedford Row.

The Secretary reported that a copy of the Memorial for an increase of the fees of solicitors had been presented to the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls, and his Lordship promised to take the same into consideration.

The resolution of the Genl Meetg of the 18th July, 1800, respecting Barristers, Counsel, and Draftsmen transacting business with the intervention of an attorney or solicitor, it was resolved to recommend to the Society at their next Genl Meetg to thank Chas. Barton, Esqre., of the Inner Temple, for the remarks in his book entitled "Elements of Conveyancing," which deprecated "the practice of conveyancers of assimilating with their own the business of the solicitor."

Mr. James, one of the members present, informed the Committee that since the last meetg a person acting as a conveyancer from his ignorance had made a mortgage in fee of a life estate; that another person in the country, acting also as a conveyancer, had advanced the money of his client upon a bond taken without a stamp, from his ignorance, supposing that entering into the common printed form was sufficient to secure the money; and also that a person in Jersey, who was not admitted an attorney or solicitor, advertised by public handbill to do business as a conveyancer at one-third less than the usual charges made by solicitors. It was resolved to take this matter into consideration at the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee having inspected the list of persons applying for admission in Hilary Term, ordered inquiries to be made respecting Mr. Gabriel Gregory, and to lodge caveats against the admission of Mr. Mill and Mr. Gardner.

At a meetg of the Committee on Friday, 19th Feb., 1802. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. James.	Mr. Still.
in the Chair.	„ Seymour, Steward.	„ Richardson, Steward.
„ Sudlow.		

The gentn proposed as members of the Socy at the last meeting were elected.

The next Genl Meetg was directed to be held on Friday, 5th March, dinner being ordered for 60 persons at 6s. a head.

The Secretary read the account given by Mr. Justice Rooke's clerk as to attempt made to obtain the admission of R. O. Gill, and the Committee ordered the caveat against Gill's admission to be continued.

The Secretary reported that Richd Gardner, agst whose admission a caveat was lodged, having given notice of his intention to apply to Mr. Justice Rooke for his fiat, Mr. Lowten and Mr. Teasdale, two members of the Committee,

together with the Secretary attended, at the Chambers of Mr. Justice Rooke to state the objections to his admission, when Mr. Justice Rooke desired the attendance of all parties on the following Monday in the Treasury Chamber at Westminster. Mr. Lowten and the Secretary accordingly attended at Westminster (Gardner and Mr. Wild, to whom he had been articled, being also present), and stated to the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas the following reasons against Gardner's admission :—

That the said Richd Gardner had formerly served an apprenticeship to a grocer; was afterwards and for several years Serjeant at Mace for the City of London, which office he had ceased to hold, but continued to receive an annual allowance out of the profits from his successor; and that during the time he had been an articled clerk to Mr. Wild he had been much in the habit of discounting bills and notes for necessitous persons, and bringing actions upon such bills and notes agst the parties thereto, in which actions the said Gardner was Plt and Wild the atty. Whereupon the Court ordered an enquiry to be made into the number of actions so brought, and reserved the further consideration of the matter until after that enquiry had been made.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 3rd of March, 1802. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Robt. Smith.	Mr. Brace.	Mr. Foss.
in the Chair.	„ James.	„ Rashleigh.	„ Meggison.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, includg £83, balance of last account, amounted to £303 1s. 0d., and his disbursements, includg the expences of the last Feast, to £137 14s. 6d., leaving in his hands a balance of £165 6s. 6d.

The Committee nominated 24 persons to form the Committee for the present year, viz.

Mr. Aldridge, John, of Lincoln's Inn, New Square, No. 7.
 „ Tennant, George, Gray's Inn.
 „ Bleasdale, Giles, New Inn, No. 11.
 „ Brace, Herbert, Essex Court, Temple, No. 4.
 „ Estcourt, Edmund, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn.
 „ Foss, Edward, Essex Street, No. 36.
 „ Hamilton, Wm., Holborn Row, Lincoln's Inn Fields, No. 25.
 „ Kinderley, John, Symond's Inn.
 „ Lane, Thomas, Red Lion Square.
 „ Lowndes, Richard, Red Lion Square, No. 18.
 „ Lowten, Thomas, Peck's Buildgs, Temple, No. 15.
 „ Manley, John, Bloomsbury Square, No. 27.
 „ Meggison, Thos., Hatton Garden, No. 96.
 „ Cooper, Samuel, Southampton Buildgs.
 „ Jones, Gilbert, Salisbury Square, Fleet Street.

- Mr. Rashleigh, Thos., Hatton Garden, No. 48.
 „ Blake, Robert, Essex Street, Strand.
 „ Smith, Robert, Basinghall Street, No. 36.
 „ Still, Peter, Lincoln's Inn, New Square, No. 5.
 „ Sudlow, John, Monument Yard.
 „ James, Charles, New Inn.
 „ Teasdale, Richard, Chancery Lane, No. 47.
 „ White, James, Chancery Lane, No. 6.
 „ Sandys, Hannibal, Crane Court, Fleet Street.

At a Genl Meetg of the Society held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand, on Friday, the 5th March, 1802. Present :—

Mr. Manley, Prolocutor, in the Chair.

- | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| „ Tarrant. | | |
| „ McDougal. | } Stewards. | |
| „ Richardson. | | |
| „ Seymour. | | |
| „ Jortin. | | Mr. J. Lowten. |
| „ Setree. | „ Simpson. | „ Gale. |
| „ Jas. Richardson. | „ Hunter. | „ Horton. |
| „ Tennant. | „ Forster. | „ Parry. |
| „ Lane, R. L. S. | „ Leigh. | „ Meggison. |
| „ Alexander, B. R. | „ Palmer. | „ John Barber |
| „ Chippendale. | „ Inge. | „ T. Lowten. |
| „ Sauter. | „ Kirkley. | „ Swale. |
| „ J. D. Blake. | „ Pearson. | „ Geldard. |
| „ Sermon. | „ Brace. | „ Bramwell. |
| „ B. C. Williams. | „ John Pearson. | „ Chilton. |
| „ Hall. | „ Wright. | „ James, Grays' Inn. |
| „ Still. | „ C. Smart. | „ R. Smith. |
| „ Hyde. | „ Holloway. | „ Ballar. |
| „ Edmunds, Geo. | „ Hodgson. | „ Bolton. |
| „ Foss. | „ Hamilton. | „ Lowe. |
| „ Wimbolt. | „ Townley Ward. | „ Debary. |
| „ John Wilson. | „ Sudlow. | „ Bleasdale. |
| „ Rashleigh. | „ James. | „ Blandford. |
| „ Wimburn. | „ Smith, Ch. H. | „ Cooper. |
| „ Loggen. | „ Windus. | „ J. Smith. |
| „ Parnell. | „ Sandys. | „ Aldridge. |
| „ Street. | | |

A vote of thanks was passed, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee, to Mr. Chas. Barton for the remarks contained in his "Elements

of Conveyancing," deprecating the practice of Conveyancers assimilating with their own business that of solicitors, and a copy of this resolution was ordered to be sent to the members of the profession residing in the Metropolis. It was resolved to instruct the Committee to inquire into the existence and extent of the practice alluded to, and give their opinion on the best mode (adapted to the powers of the Society) to counteract the practice, for the consideration of the next Genl Meeting.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 28th April, 1802. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Bleasdale.	Mr. Lane.	Mr. T. Lowton.
in the Chr.	„ Tennant.	„ Still.	„ R. Blake.
„ James, New Inn.	„ Aldridge.		

The foregoing instruction of the Genl Meeting to the Committee was taken into consideratn; and it was resolved to print the resolution referred to, and send it to the members of the Law Socy, with an invitation to each of them to communicate to the Secretary any information in his power tending to assist the Committee in the enquiry directed, or to attend the Committee in person if he shd think proper.

With the papers is a print of the resolution, and also one of the Secretary's circular.

The Secretary reported that he had communicated the thanks of the Society to Mr. Barton, from whom he had recd a letter of which the following is a copy :—

“SIR,

“I this morning recd through your obliging communication the resolution of thanks voted by the ‘Society of Practisers in the several Courts of Law and Equity,’ for sentiments contained in the Introduction to my Book upon Conveyancing—and I beg you will do me the favor, at the very earliest opportunity, to make known to them my real acknowledgments for so honorable a testimony of their good opinion.

“Some of our best men have expressed themselves content with the satisfaction resulting solely from a consciousness of having acted to the best of their power, but with me I confess it is otherwise, for great as that satisfaction undoubtedly is, yet it appears to me that the social nature of man is capable of a much higher gratification—I mean the appreciation of others. To me, therefore, the manner in which my feeble endeavours in the present instance have been recd by so truly respectable a body of men is inestimably valuable. At the same time I entreat the Society will do me the justice to believe that I feel myself totally undeserving of this mark of their distinction, as I am wholly unable to conceive that the sentiments alluded to can be at all peculiar to myself, but believe them to be equally recognized by every other practitioner.

Under the full conviction of this impression, I have the honor to subscribe myself,

“Sir,

“Your much obliged and very obedt hble servt,

“C. BARTON.

“In. Temp., 20th May, 1802.

“W. B. Flexney, Esqre.
&c., &c.”

The Committee having inspected the list of persons applying for admission in Easter Term, ordered enquiries to be made respecting Richd. Cranch, Scudamore, Dacie, Frame, Hardwicke, Markeney, Stevens, and Hobbs.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 2nd June, 1802. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Sudlow.	Mr. Still.
in the Chair.	„ Lane, R. L. S.	„ Kinderley.

The Secy reported that he had made the enquiries directed respectg the persons mentd at the last meeting, and that the objections agst them had been satisfactorily explained. The Committee directed a caveat to be entered agst the admission of Thos. Stratton Fallows of Birmingham, on the ground that the Court of Common Pleas had already refused to admit him as an atty on account of improper conduct.

The Secretary reported that he had sent to each member of the Society and to the profession in general a copy of the resolutions of the General Meetg as to Barristers and others transacting business witht the intervention of attys or solicitors, but that no person had afforded him any light on the subject, or expressed a wish to attend the Committee, and in many instances the letters addressed to persons not members of the Society had been returned in the most unhandsome manner.

The following gentn were proposed by Mr. Chas. James of New Inn as members of the Society :—

Henry Harpur, Cannon Row, Westminster.
Wm. Jackson, Temple.
Ed. Rogers, Frith St., Soho.
Wm. Nettleship, Queen St., Cheapside.
Richd. Loxham, New Inn.

The Prolocutor reported that he and the Secretary had made frequent applications as to Memorial for the increase of fees, and that he had been assured that the affair wd undergo the Lord Chancellor's early consideration.

Mem. by the Secretary : “Fine the Rota who did not attend.”

At a meetg of the Committee on the 19th July, 1802. Present :—

Mr. Manley.	Mr. Rashleigh.	Mr. Lane, R. L. S.
„ Smith.	„ Foss.	„ Jones.
„ James.		

The Sec.'s accounts were audited. His receipts, includg £165 6s. 6d., balance of last accounts, amounted to £211 10s. 6d., and his disbursements, includg the expenses of the last feast, to £85 3s. 0d., leav in his hands £126 7s. 6d. It was also found that there was an arrear of subscriptions due from several members.

Messrs. Harpur, Rogers, Nettleship, and Rogers were elected. The following were proposed as members of the Socy :—

Wm. Lowe, Temple.

Geo. Hen. Browne, Lin. Inn, and

John Rose, Gray's Inn, proposed by Mr. Manley.

Wm. Cuppage of Essex St., by Mr. Wright, Paper Bldgs.

John Ellis, Abingdon St., Westminster, by Mr. Wimburn of Chancery Lane.

At a General meetg of the Society held on the 23rd July, 1802.
Present :—

Mr. Manley, Prolocutor, in the Chair.

„ J. Simpson.	} Stewards.		
„ Rashleigh.			
„ Simpson.			
„ Vanderzee.			
„ Geldard.		Mr. J. D. Blake.	Mr. Blandford.
„ Geo. Edmunds.		„ Harvey.	„ Barrow.
„ Jas. Richardson.		„ Alexander.	„ Street.
„ Chippendale.		„ Lane, R. L. S.	„ Harper.
„ Townley Ward.		„ Lowten, Thos.	„ Long.
„ Thos. Rashleigh.		„ J. Smith.	„ Grogan.
„ Wimbolt.		„ Meggison.	„ Vizard.
„ Swale.		„ Forster.	„ Gregson.
„ Jas. Smith.		„ John Windus.	„ G. Hodgson.
„ Burgh.		„ Berry.	„ Kirkby.
„ Appleyard.		„ J. Pearson.	„ Foss.
„ Palmer.		„ H. Wright.	„ Chas. Smart.
„ C. James, N. I.		„ Dunn.	„ Sykes.
„ Chas. James.		„ Horton.	„ Tarrant.
„ Gale.		„ Dennett.	„ Battye.
„ Sudlow.		„ Sandys.	„ C. B. Williams.
„ Geo. Pearson.		„ Maltby.	„ Debary.
„ J. Barber.		„ Wimburn.	„ Brace.
„ Holloway.		„ John Leigh.	„ Edmunds.
„ Rogers.		„ G. Jones.	„ Loxham.
„ Hodgson.		„ Inge.	„ Grubb.
„ Setree.		„ Loggen.	„ McDougal.
„ Seymour.		„ Jas. White.	„ Jas. Alexander.

Mr. Richd. Wilson.	Mr. Meredith.	Mr. Hyde.
„ Saxon.	„ John Windus.	„ Dickson.
„ Sauter.		

Only formal business appears to have been done.

A Committee meetg was held on the 4th Novr., 1802, three members, Mr. Manley, Mr. Gilbert Jones, and Mr. Lowten, attendg, but no business of importance was done. The next Committee meeting was summoned for the 19th Jany., 1803, but as only two members (Mr. Lane, R. L. S., and Mr. Aldridge) attended, no business could be done.

At a meetg of the Committee on Wed., the 9th Feb., 1803. Present :—

Mr. Manley, Prolocutor.	Mr. Sudlow.	Mr. Teasdale.
„ Robt. Smith.	„ White.	„ Kinderley.
„ Rashleigh.		

The gentlemen proposed at former meetings were elected, and the following were proposed as members :—

Geo. Hardisty, Gt. Marlboro St., by Mr. Chas. Smart of Norfolk St.
 Richd. Edwards, Castle St., Holborn, by Mr. Wimburn.
 Thos. Ince, Symond's Inn, by Mr. Kinderly, same place.
 Rd. Ed. Nat. Lee, of Hatton Garden, by Mr. Rashleigh.
 Chas. Hilleard, Clement's Inn, by Mr. Teasdale, Chancery Lane.

At a meeting of the Committee at the Crown and Anchor Tavern on Monday, the 21st Feb., 1803. Present :—

Mr. Manley.	Mr. Bleasdale.	Mr. Teasdale.
„ 'Aldridge.	„ Smith,	„ James, New Inn.
„ Foss.	Basinghall St.	„ Still.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including £126 7s. 6d. balance of last account, amounted to £280 11s. 6d., and his disbursements, including the expenses of the last feast, to £135 15s. 0d., leaving in his hands £144 16s. 6d.

The gentlemen proposed as members at the last meetg were elected, and the Committee nominated 24 persons as Committee for the present year. The Sec. reported the resignation of four members, they being unable to attend the meetgs in consequence of having removed to the country.

The Prolocutor reported that he had recd satisfactory assurances that in the present Vacation the memorial for an increase of fees wd be taken into consideration, and that some effective measures would be adopted respecting the same.

Committee of the Law Society for 1803.

Aldridge, John, Lincoln's Inn, New Square. Attended.
 Brace, Herbert, Essex Court, Temple.

Foss, Edward, Essex Street, Strand.
 Kinderley, John, Symond's Inn.
 Lane, Thomas, Red Lion Square. Attended.
 Lowten, Thomas, Peck's Buildings, Temple. Attended.
 Tennant, George, Gray's Inn.
 Jones, Gilbert, Salisbury Square, Fleet Street.
 Blake, Robert, Essex Street, Strand.
 James, Charles, New Inn.
 Hamilton, Wm., Holborn Row, Lincoln's Inn fields.
 Lowndes, Richard, Red Lion Square.
 Meggison, Thomas, Hatton Garden.
 Rashleigh, Thomas, Hatton Garden.
 Smith, Robert, Basinghall Street.
 Bleasdale, Giles, Threadneedle Street.
 Estcourt, Edmund, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn.
 Manley, John, Bloomsbury Square.
 Still, Peter, Lincoln's Inn, New Square.
 Sudlow, John, Monument Yard.
 Sandys, Hannibal, Crane Court, Fleet Street.
 Teasdale, Richard, Chancery Lane.
 Cooper, Samuel, Southampton Buildings.
 White, James, Chancery Lane.

At the General Meeting of the Society on Friday, the 25th Feb., 1803.
 Present:—

Mr. Manley in the Chair.

„ Hall.	Mr. Sermon.	} Stewards.
„ Gale.	„ Appleyard.	
„ Townley Ward.	„ Smith.	
„ Long.	„ Alexander.	
„ Hodgson.	for	
	„ Miller.	
„ G. H. Browne.	„ Rashleigh.	Mr. Santer.
„ Harper.	„ Jno. Lee.	„ Burgh.
„ Jno. Wilson.	„ G. Edmunds.	„ Cs. James, N. I.
„ Lowndes.	„ Dickson.	„ Philpot.
„ Cooper.	„ Jas. Smith.	„ Geldard.
„ Setree.	„ Robt. Smith.	„ Robinson.
„ Atkinson.	„ Leigh.	„ Harvey.
„ Thos. Smith.	„ Geo. Pearson.	„ Foss.
„ Fothergill.	„ Hamilton.	„ Inge.
„ Horton.	„ John Windus.	„ J. Pearson.
„ Rd. Edmunds.	„ Simpson.	„ Barrow.

Mr. J. Alexander.	Mr. Wimburn.	Mr. Bleasdale.
„ Dennett.	„ Palmer.	„ Vanderzee.
„ Batty.	„ Lonham.	„ Hilliard.
„ Thos. Lane.	„ Rogers.	„ Rd. Edwards.
„ Lowe.	„ Seymour.	„ Teasdale.
„ Maltby.	„ Street.	„ Loggen.
„ Forster.	„ J. D. Blake.	„ C. Smart.
„ Chippendale.	„ Still.	„ Grubb.
„ Rose.	„ Lowe.	„ Vizard.
„ John Windus.	„ McDougal.	„ C. James,
„ Jas. Richardson.	„ Ince.	Gray's Inn.
„ R. E. N. Lee.		

No business appears to have been done beyond the confirmation of the Minutes.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 25th April, 1803. Present :—

Mr. Aldridge. Mr. Blake. Mr. Brace. Mr. Lane, Secretary.

Enquiries were ordered as to persons applying for admission, and the Sec. reported that he had renewed the caveat agst R. O. Gill.

The following were proposed as members : Robt. Dyneley, Junr., Gray's Inn, by Mr. Appleyard, and John Dyneley, same place, by the same.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 3rd June, 1803. Present :—

Mr. Manley. Mr. Bleasdale. Mr. Still. Mr. Aldridge.

The Secretary reported that he had made the enquiries ordered at the last meetg, and that there appeared to be no objection to the persons referred to.

Mr. Willoughby Rackham, of Lin. Inn, was proposed by Mr. Still, of the same place, as a member.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 11th July, 1803. Present :—

Mr. Smith, Mr. Sandys. Mr. Foss.
in the Chair. „ Rashleigh. „ Brace.

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, includg £144 16s. 6d., balance of last account, amounted to £244 11s. 6d., and his disbursements, includg the expenses of the last dinner, to £82 18s. 6d., leavg in his hands £161 13s. 0d. The Committe found that besides the above balance the Society was possessed of £300 3 per cent. Consols. standing in the names of Messrs. Manley, Estcourt, and Smith, and that half a year's dividend was due thereon the 5th of July inst.

Gentlemen proposed at previous meetgs were elected, and the following were proposed as members of the Society :—

Mr. Aspinall, Quality Court, by Mr. Lowten.
Mr. Redit, of Cook's Court, by Mr. Wimburn.

The Genl Meetg was directed to be held on July the 15th at 5 o'clock, dinner being ordered for 80 persons at 6s. a head.

At the Genl Meeting of the Socy on the 15th July, 1803. Present :—

Mr. Manley, Prolocutor, in the Chair.

Mr. Palmer, Steward.	Mr. Debary.	Mr. Jno. Lowe.
„ Rackham.	„ Rd. Lorsham.	„ Wm. Harvey.
„ Wimburn.	„ Hen. Wright.	„ Robinson.
„ Meggison.	„ Jas. Richardson.	„ Leigh, Jno.
„ Harper.	„ Ince.	„ Bruce.
No Tickett, left it	„ Townley Ward.	„ John Ellis.
at home.	„ Geo. Edmunds.	„ W. Lowe.
„ Hall.	„ Rd. White.	„ R. E. N. Lee.
„ Smith.	„ Greenwoller.	„ Cuppage.
„ Jas. Smith.	„ Hyde.	„ Edwards.
„ Bingley, Steward.	„ Berry.	„ Loggen.
„ Barber.	„ Fothergill.	„ Geldard.
„ Appleyard.	„ Forster.	„ Jas. Alexander.
„ Geo. Pearson.	„ Jno. Wilson.	„ G. Jones.
„ Lane.	„ Ben. Price.	„ Windus, Senr.
„ McDougall.	„ J. Blake.	„ Rogers.
No Tickett, left it	„ Wimbolt.	„ Street.
at home.	„ Alexander.	„ John Lee.
„ G. H. Brown.	„ Battye.	„ Hilliard.
„ Parnell.	„ Tarrant.	„ Chilton.
„ Hodgson.	„ Maltby.	„ Philpot.
„ J. Dennett.	„ Lowndes.	„ Aldridge.
„ Jno. Simpson.	„ J. Pearson.	„ Chas. James,
„ Burgh.	„ Chas. Santer.	Gray's Inn.
„ Hardisty.	„ Kirkby.	„ Geo. Hodgson.
„ Jno. Windus.	„ Estcourt.	„ Grubb.
„ C. Smart.		

Mr. Brace of the Temple (a member of the Society) communicated the Minutes of the proceedings of the Law Association at a Genl Meeting held on the 14th July instant, in the Inner Temple Hall, containing a plan for the formation of a Corps to be called "The Law Association," to serve at their own expense in case of an invasion of this country by the enemy, together with the resolutions of the Genl Meeting thereon: and it was resolved that the thanks of this Society be given to the Committee of the Law Association for their obliging communication, and that the Society assured the Committee

that every exertion in their power wd be most cheerfully made to second the wishes of the Law Assocn and render them effective.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 9th Decr., 1803. Present :—

Mr. Manley,	Mr. Ch. James,	Mr. Teasdale.
in the Chair.	New Inn.	„ Lane, R. L. S.
„ Bleasdale.	„ Hamilton.	

Mr. Barrows, of Threadneedle St., a member of the Society, stated to the Committee his case in not having obtained his certificate in due time, and it appearing to the Committee that many others of the profession were liable to actions for similar omissions, It was resolved that it was highly proper that application should be made to Parliament for an Act of Indemnity under the advice, and with the approbation of the Atty and Solr. Genl.; and the Secretary was ordered to prepare a Bill accordingly.

The following Statutes, apparently having reference to this subject, appear on the margin of the draft Minutes: 25 Geo. III. ch. 80; 37 Geo. III. ch. 90; 37 Geo. III. ch. 93; 40 Geo. III. 19 (only a general Indemty Act); 42 Geo. III. ch. 23.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 13th Jany., 1804. Present :—

Mr. Manley.	Mr. James, New Inn.
„ Meggison.	The Secretary.
„ Lane, Rd. Lion Square.	

The Secretary reported that he had prepared the draft of a Bill of Indemnity agreeable to the resolutn of the last meeting, and laid the same before Mr. Harrison to settle.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 21st Feb., 1804. Present :—

Mr. Sudlow.	Mr. White, Chy. Lane.	Mr. Brace.
„ Lane, R. L. S.	„ Peter Still.	„ Kinderley.
„ Lowndes, in the Chr.	„ Teasdale.	„ Aldridge.
„ Hamilton.		

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts, including £161 13s. 0d. balance of last account, amounted to £290 7s. 0d., and his disbursements, including the purchase of £100 3 per cent. Consols, and the expense of the last dinner, to £174 4s. 0d., leaving in his hands a balance of £116 3s. 0d. In addition to this balance, the Society was possessed of £400 3 per cent. Consols, standing in the names of Messrs. Manley, Estcourt, and Smith, all dividends due thereon up to the 5th Jany. having been recd.

Gentlemen proposed at previous meetings were elected, and the following were proposed as Members of the Society :—

John Davis, Essex St., by Mr. White, Chancery Lane; John Nosworthy Michell, Union Court, Broad St., by Mr. Blandford, Temple; and Alex. Hale Strong, Lincoln's Inn, by Mr. Still of same place.

“Shd any notice be taken of Mr. Redit and Mr. Spottiswoode they being black-balled.” “No.”

The Secretary laid before the Committee the draft of a Bill to indemnify persons who had omitted to obtain and enter their certificates in due time, as settled by Mr. Harrison (who on this, as on a former occasion, contributed his services witht receiving any remuneration for the same). The Committee having read the Bill, approved of it, and resolved that application shd be made to have it passed into law, and that the Attorney or Solicitor-General be requested to bring in the Bill.

The Secretary reported that he had entered a caveat against the admisssn as an attorney of one Laver, that he had attended before the Judge, and stated his objections, and that the matter stood adjourned to a future term. The Committee directed the caveat to be continued.

The Annual meeting was arranged to be held on the 24th Feb., 1804, dinner being ordered for 90 persons at 6s. a head.

At the Genl Meeting of the Law Society held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern on Friday, July 19, 1805, at which 105 members were present, the only business done appears to have been the reading and confirming of the Minutes of the preceding Genl. Meeting, and of the meetings of the Committee, and passing votes of thanks to Mr. Abbott and to the Committee for their care and attentn to the interests of the Society.

The Secretary, Mr. W. B. Flexney, summoned a meeting of the Committee to be held on Friday, the 1st Novr., 1805, at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand, to inspect the list of persons who had given notice of their intention to apply in the follow'g Michaelmas Term to be admitted attorneys, but as only one member, Mr. Battye, attended with the Secretary no business was done. With the circular summoning this meeting and the Minutes is the following bill :

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
"Use of room	10	6
Wax lights	6	0
Port	5	0
	1	16
		0
Nov. 1, 1805.	1	26"

A meeting was summoned by the Secretary to be held on the 20th Jany. 1806, at 7 o'clock in the even'g to inspect the list of persons who intended to apply in the next Hilary Term to be admitted attorneys, but as only Mr. Seymour and Mr. Battye attended in addition to the Secretary, no business cd be done. There is with the papers connected with this meeting the follow'g suggestion for the Prolocutor. "To call a meeting of the Committee to consider of the propriety of addressing the Judges for their determination upon the Memorial for the increase of fees." At this meeting Mr. Thos. Evans of Kennington Cross was proposed as a member.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the

Strand, on the 31st Jany., 1806, at which four members and the Secy were present, the Committee being summoned to consider of the propriety of addressing the Judges for their determinatn upon the Memorial for an increase of fees; they considered that such a measure was highly expedient, but were of opinion that in the present conjuncture it wd be proper to postpone the subject until the 6th Feb. next, by which time it was presumed the arrangements in the higher departments of the law would have taken place. There is also the following note, crossed out: "Mem. As to sending a letter to the King's Counsel and Sergeants upon the subject. Seymour."

In a circular by the Secretary, summoning a meeting of the Committee to be held on the 6th Feb., 1806, to take into further conson the necessity of a further applicatn to the Judges previous to the last day of the Term for their report on a Memorial for the increase of fees, there is a footnote which was to be added to all the copies of the circular, with the exception of six, to the followg effect: "I am directed by the Committee to add, that you have not attended one of their meetings since the last Genl. Meeting of the Socy." The Committee so summoned met at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand on the day named. Present:—

Mr. Meggison,	Mr. Lane.	Mr. Sandys.
in the Chair.	„ White.	„ Sudlow.
„ Rashleigh.	„ Battye.	„ Wright.
„ Foss.	„ Brace.	„ Debary.
„ Aldridge.	„ James.	

The Chairman (Mr. Meggison) stated that he had received a letter on the 4th inst. from the Lord Chancellor, in which his Lordship mentioned his intention to communicate to his successor what he proposed to do, both in substance and form, concerning the costs of Solicitors. It was resolved to request the Prolocutor to wait on the Judges on the Monday following, and in case of his absence from London to request Mr. Meggison and Mr. Sandys to officiate for him to solicit the Judges to give an answer to the Memorial presented to them on the subject of costs, in order that the same may be laid before the Society at the next Genl. Meeting; and the Secy was ordered to make the necy arrangements with the Chief Justices' Clerk for obtaining an interview.

At the same meeting it was also resolved to hold a Dinner at the Crown and Anchor on the 25th Feb., 1806, for auditing the accounts, and settling all business previous to the Genl. Meeting, instead of a meeting on the evening as theretofore, and to receive the reports of the Prolocutor or Deputation of the Committee on the Monday. The Dinner was to be held at 5 o'cl, and the whole of the Committee was to be summoned a week before, and to send an answer three days before whether they intended to dine or not, the Secretary then to order Dinner for as many as wd attend.

The following letter was read :

"Gentlemen,

It is now several years since the misfortunes that have hapned to me compelled me by necessity to apply to you, Gentlemen, collectively for Assistance to relieve me from some of my distresses which arose from my being visited in the year 1788 with a melancholy which rendered me incapable of continuing my business in partnership with the late Mr. Charlton Palmer.

"Thus situated, I have for years experienced much hardship, and altho by the mercy of God I, in the month of October, 1804, recovered from a four years' continuance of the above complaint, yet the return of it has been so frequent as to make me fearfull of resuming my practice least a revisitation of my complaint should injure those who should be so kind as to employ me, otherwise I would scorn to hurt your Feelings and my own by applications of the present nature, which necessity has compelled me since my late recovery too fréquently to make to several of you Gentlemen individually from whom I have with thanks and gratitude, I acknowledge I have recd kind and humane relief. But the wants of the necessaries of life are continually recurring, and to whom can I so properly apply as to those of my Profession, who by the Blessing of God having had their Health and Abilities continued to them, have with Honor to themselves and benefit to their Fellow-creatures been raised to states of independance and Affluence, to such my present applicatn is, that they wd collectively contribute something to the relief of my necessities, which Bounty as well as what I have before received individually and collectively, will be ever, Gentlemen, most gratefully acknowledged by a feeling heart which has the honor to subscribe itself,

"Gentlemen,

"Your much obliged and obedient humble servant,

"T. SEARLE.

"1st Novr., 1805."

Resolved that the Secretary inquire into the circumstances and situation of the writer, and to consider at the next Genl. Meeting whether he was a proper object to be recommended to the Society.

Mr. Thomas Evans of Kennington Cross was ballotted for, and elected a member. Mr. Wm. Green of Salisbury Square was proposed by Mr. Meggison, and seconded by Mr. Foss. Mr. Saml. White Sweet was proposed by Mr. Debary, and seconded by Mr. Wright. Mr. John Darby of Gray's Inn was proposed by Mr. Aldridge.

With the draft Minutes of this meeting is the following apology from one of the Members of the Come for having been obliged to leave :

"Mr. Flexney,

"Sir,

"I have attended this Evening with a full intention to stay, but an order is just come to me to prepare a Royal assent Comicon this Eving to pass Mr.

o

Fox's Bill relative to the Auditor of the Exchr to-morrow at 11 o'clock, and the Comicon must go to the Seal this night, for probably the last Act that will be done by the present Chancellor. I beg you to assure the Gents of the Committee that nothing but absolute necessity should have prevented my being with them this evening.

"Yours truly,

"THOS. RASHLEIGH.

"Feb. 6, 1806."

At a meeting of the Committee at the Crown and Anchor on Tuesday the 25th Feb., 1806. Present:—

Mr. Estcourt, Prolocutor, in the Chair.	Mr. Seymour.	Mr. Rashleigh.
„ Blake.	„ Debary.	„ Sudlow.
„ Lowe.	„ Rackham.	„ Aldridge.
„ Wright.	„ Ince.	„ White.
„ Meredith.	„ Lane.	„ Mitchell.
„ Sandys.	„ Foss.	„ James.
	„ Still.	

Mr. Estcourt, the Prolocutor, took the Chair. The Secretary laid before the Committee a letter from Mr. M. Hodgson, expressing his regret that ill health occasioned him to withdraw from the Society. Mr. Henry Lang of America Square was proposed by Mr. Parnell to become a member of the Society. Messrs. Wm. Green, Saml. W. Sweet, John Darby, and Ambrose Humphreys were elected members of the Society.

Mr. Sandys reported that Mr. Meggison and he (in the absence of the Prolocutor) had waited upon the Judges to request their Lordship's answer to the Memorial for an increase of fees, and that the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench intimated to them that the subject of the Memorial had been taken into consōn by their Lordships, but they did not come to any determination upon it, as it appeared to them one of very considerable importance to the public, and they entertained great doubt not only of their power to grant the relief prayed for, but also as to the expediency of such a measure, but wd consult with the Judges of the other Courts, and that a comcōn should be made when they had come to a decision. A similar answer was given by the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and the Chief Baron of the Exchequer. It was resolved to recommend to the Genl. Meeting the case of Mr. Searle. The Secretary reported for the satisfaction of the Committee that he had made enquiries as to the persons who had given notice of their intention to apply for admission as attorneys and solicitors in Michaelmas and Hilary Term last, and that he did not find any who were objectionable. The following notes appear on the rough draft of the Minutes of this meeting: "That Mr. James be ordered at the next Genl. Meeting to attend in his place." "Three days' notice

to Mr. James to Come to meeting to pay his Doz. of Claret." "Mem. : The Committee will in future dine togr at their own expense previous to the Genl. Meetg." At this meetng it was intended apparently to audit the Secrety's accounts, but from the following paper, in which the amounts are omitted, it wd seem that this was not done : "The Committee took into consõn the Secretery's accounts, and found that his receipts since the last accounts amounted to £ , that his receipts amount to £ , that there are £400 Three p. c. Consols standing in the names of Messrs. Manley, Estcourt, and Smith." "A genl. statement of the Secrety's accounts, and the probable balance after deducting the sum voted for plate." "The old Committee to remain except Mr. Bleasdale, who desires to retire, and in his room Mr. Kaye."

At the Genl. Meeting of the Socy on Friday, the 28th Feb., 1806. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt, Prolocutor, in the Chair.

„ T. Ward.	Mr. Richardson.	Mr. Aspinall.
„ Hall.	„ Rose.	„ Tarrant.
„ B. Price.	„ Trevenen.	„ Rich. Smith.
„ Simpson.	„ Chippendale.	„ Fothergill.
„ Harper.	„ Lowndes.	„ J. D. Blake.
„ Still.	„ Palmer.	„ Thomas.
„ Shepheard.	„ Hyde.	„ Loxham.
„ Windus, Senr.	„ Smith, Rt.	„ Beckett.
„ Kinderley.	„ Smith, Jas.	„ Hilyard.
„ Hamilton.	„ J. Rashleigh.	„ McDougal.
„ Lowe, Senr.	„ Chs. James.	„ C. V. Hunter.
„ Meggison.	„ Barber.	„ J. Leigh.
„ Alexander.	„ Vizard.	„ Chilton.
„ Sermon.	„ Loggen.	„ Wimburn.
„ Alexander, Jr.	„ Edmunds, Geo.	„ Blandford.
„ Bleasdale.	„ Rogers.	„ James, N. J.
„ Geo. Pearson.	„ Hardisty.	„ Estcourt.
„ Seymour.	„ Wright, P. B.	„ Humphreys.
„ R. Dyneley.	„ Sudlow.	„ G. Hodgson.
„ Murray.	„ Aldridge.	„ Parnell.
„ G. Barron.	„ Kirkley.	„ Grubb.
„ J. Pearson.	„ T. Lane.	„ Philpot.
„ Evans, Thos.	„ Cook.	„ Holloway.
„ Darley.	„ Long.	„ J. Smith.
„ Go. Law.	„ Edmunds, Sen.	„ Windus, Jr.
„ Dennett.	„ Harvey.	„ Sandys.
„ Wright.	„ H. H. Strong.	„ Edwards.
„ White,	„ Robinson, G. J.	„ Moule.
„ Chy. Lane.	„ J. Wilson.	„ Ellis.
„ Inge.		

The Prolocutor proposed to the meeting that it should be left to the consōn of every member to contribute or not to Mr. Searle as he should think proper, and that the Secry be requested to receive any contributions which may be offered for the purpose in question, and apply it from time to time to Mr. Searle's account in such proportion as the Committee should think best.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern on Friday, the 18th April, 1806. Present:—

Mr. Meggison, in the Chair.	Mr. Seymour. ,, Battye.	Mr. Lane, R. L. Sq. ,, White.
--------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------

The list of persons applying for admission as attorneys being read, the Secy was directed to enquire whether there was any objection to their admission. Immediately under the above Minute are the following notes: "No. 6. Thos. N. Williams, of Craven Bldgs, articed to Richd. Williams of Kingsland Road." "N.B. He is one of the Attorneys of the Lord Mayor's Court, and a man of respectability." "No. 12. W. A. Portal, of Great St. Helen's, to Thos. Poole, of Sergeant's Inn. Enquire of Forbes, Ely Place. No other persons objectionable." Mr. Wharton of the Temple, and Mr. Dyke of the same place, were proposed by the Secretary as Members of the Society. It was moved that the manner of conduct'g the business at the Alienation Office in regard to compoundg fines be considd at the next meeting, and that notice of this subject be given in the summons, Mr. Long in the meantime to be so good as to make enquiry in the matter. The Committee requested the under-mentioned gentlemen to meet at Well's Coffee House on Tuesday, the 22nd, at 9 o'cl in the morning, to wait upon the Chancr upon the subject of the Memorial for an increase of fees:

The Prolocutor, Mr. Kaye.
Mr. Meggison. Mr. Richard Wilson.
and Mr. Sandys.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday the 25th April, 1806. Present:—

Mr. Rashleigh, in the Chair.	Mr. Battye. ,, Foss.	Mr. Go. Jones. ,, Meggison.
,, Aldridge.	,, Long.	,, Wright.

Mr. T. C. Ellis, of Brick Court, by Mr. Thos. Lowten, and Mr. Wharton, and Mr. Dyke were elected. The Secretary reported the result of the interview with the Chancellor. The Secretary was directed to write Mr. Barber informing him of what passed at the Chancellor's, and the wish expressed by his Lordship to see Mr Barber on the subject. The Committee therefore

requested he would be so good as to wait on the Chancellor. Mr. Long attended, and reported that so much of the practice as was objectionable in regard to the Receiver acting as Examiner was obviated by the appointment of an additional clerk in the Alienation Office, but that it did not appear upon what general principle the fines at this office were taken, and several instances were mentioned of different fines being taken for the same premises under the same description, and within a very short time of each other. Resolved that the Secretary apply to the Alienation Office for information as to the rule laid down for computing fines at the said Office, and report the same at the next Meeting. The following notes appear on the draft Minutes of this meeting: "Who appoints the Commissioners for compound'g fines? The port fines are paid to the Sheriff for the year he serves." "In the No. of Engd woods and commons were not charged in fines."

At the meeting of the Committee of the Law Society held on Monday, the 2nd June, 1806. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes,	Mr. Lowten.	Mr. Rashleigh.	Mr. Battye.
in the Chair.	„ Aldridge.	„ Foss.	„ Blake.

The Committee inspected the list of applicants for admission as attorneys in the following Trinity Term. Mr. Thos. Chas. Ellis and Mr. John Eley were balloted for and elected.

The Secretary reported that he had made the enquiry directed at the Alienation Office, but the Committee did not come to any resolution upon the subject. The Committee requested the Prolocutor, Mr. Lowten, and Mr. Kinderley to wait upon the Lord Chancellor respecting the Memorial presented to Lord Eldon, and to solicit his attention thereto, and that Mr. Baker and the Six Clerks' Office be requested to accompany them. A copy of the Memorial was to be prepared to be delivered to his Lordship if necessary, and previously to be sent to Mr. Lowten.

At a meeting of the Committee on Friday, the 14th July, 1806. Present:—

Mr. Rashleigh,	Mr. Lane.	Mr. Blake.	Mr. Long.
in the Chair.	„ Seymour.	„ Meggison.	„ Lowndes.
„ White.	„ Brace.	„ Kinderley.	„ Foss.
„ Battye.			

The Secretary having read the draft of a Bill to enable the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Keeper, or the Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal, together with the Master of the Rolls for the time being, to regulate the fees of the Sworn Clerks and Solicitors of the Court of Chancery, and it was resolved that in the opinion of the Committee the Bill was a proper Bill to be presented to Parliament, and that the Prolocutor, the Chairman, Mr. Meggison, and Mr. Wilson present the same to the Master of the Rolls for his consent.

At the meeting of the Committee on Monday the 7th July, 1806.
Present:—

Mr. Estcourt,	Mr. Rashleigh.	Mr. G. Jones.	Mr. Debary.
in the Chair.	„ Long.	„ White.	„ Foss.

Mr. Rashleigh reported that in the absence of the Prolocutor and Mr. Wilson, Mr. Meggison and himself had attended the Master of the Rolls on the 5th inst., and submitted to his consōn the Bill which had been settled and approved of by the Committee, and that his Honor, after having read the Bill, expressed his full approbation thereof, and said he wd move for leave to bring in the same on the following Monday. The Committee directed the Secretary to attend to this Bill in its progress through Parliament.

At a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday the 9th July, 1806.
Present:—

Mr. Estcourt,	Mr. Jones.	Mr. Rashleigh.	Mr. Thomas.	} Stewards.
in the Chair.	„ Long.	„ Aldridge.	„ Rose.	
„ Meredith.	„ Foss.	„ James.	„ Law.	
			„ Dyneley.	

The meeting was summoned for the purpose of auditing the Secretary's accounts, balloting for certn proposed new members, of receiv'g the report of the deputation to the Lord Chancr respecting the Memorial for the increase of fees, and to give directions for the Dinner at the Genl. Meeting, but in the Minutes of the meeting the only refce to the Secretary's accounts is: "The Committee inspected the Sec's accounts, and found——" and there is no mention of the report of the deputn to the Lord Chancr. Mr. Alexander, of Bedford Row, was proposed by Mr. John Singleton Taylor, of Harpur St., Bedford Row, and Mr. Eyre, of Gray's Inn, was proposed by Mr. Dyneley. Mr. Henry Lang of America Square was elected. It was arranged to order a dinner for 90 at six shillings a head, besides six haunches of venison.

At the Genl. Meeting of the Society on Friday, July 11, 1806. Present:—

Mr. Estcourt in the Chair.

„ Thomas.	Mr. Meggison.	Mr. Jno. Lowe.
„ Law.	„ Lowndes.	„ Sweet.
„ Dyneley.	„ Green.	„ B. Price.
„ Rose.	„ Horton.	„ Edmunds.
„ Hall.	„ Jno. Barber.	„ W. Cook.
„ Wimburn.	„ White, Jas.	„ James.
„ Gaskell.	„ Smart.	„ Chilton.
„ Kinderley.	„ Manley.	„ Hilyard.
„ J. Alexander.	„ Lane.	„ Trevenen.
„ Windus.	„ Lee.	„ Seymour.

Mr. Brown.	Mr. Maltby.	Mr. Parnell.
„ Long.	„ R. E. Lee.	„ Strong.
„ Harper.	„ Foss.	„ Edmunds, J.
„ Ward.	„ Philpot.	„ Debary.
„ Barber.	„ Street.	„ Blandford.
„ Loxham.	„ Palmer.	„ Sauter.
„ Richardson.	„ Simpson.	„ Edwards.
„ Chippendale.	„ Battye.	„ Humphreys.
„ Ald. Hunter.	„ Wilson.	„ Inge.
„ Sermon.	„ Windus.	„ Rogers.
„ Strong.	„ Dennell.	„ Loggen.
„ Sudlow.	„ Blandford.	„ Sandys.
„ C. Hunter.	„ J. Rashleigh.	„ Aspinall.
„ Gordon.	„ Wharton.	„ Aldridge.
„ Young.	„ Meredith.	„ Appleyard.
„ C. Ellis.	„ Dyke.	„ Evans.
„ Rackham.	„ Kirkby.	„ Smith.
„ Dixon.	„ Hyde.	„ Tarrant.
„ J. Smith.	„ Wright.	„ Grubb.
„ G. Pearson.	„ Tarrant.	„ Alexander.
„ Harvey.	„ Jno. Pearson.	„ Mitchell.
„ J. D. Blake.		

The Minutes of the last Genl. Meetg and the subseqt meetings of the Committee were read and confirmed. It was moved by Mr. Michell, seconded by Mr. Seymour, and resolved unanimously to refer it to the Committee to consider of a proper house for the Society to meet at in future.

At a meetg of the Committee held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand, on Thurs., the 24th July, 1806. Present:—

Mr. Rashleigh,	Mr. Long.	Mr. Jones.	Mr. Wright.
in the Chair.	„ Aldridge.	„ Still.	„ Debary.
„ Kaye.	„ Battye.		

The Committee took into consōn the propriety of a fur comcōn to the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls upon the subject of the increase of the fees of Solicitors, and it was resolved to request the following Gentn to wait on the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls to solicit their attentn to the applōns which had been made to them for an increase of the fees of the Solicitors of the Court of Chancery, viz. : Mr. Prolocutor, Mr. Rashleigh, Mr. Kaye, and Mr. Lowten, or any two of them.

At a meeting of the Committee of the Law Society held at the Freemason's Tavern in Gt. Queen St., on Tuesday, the 24th Feb., 1807. Present:—

Mr. Aldridge,	Mr. Still.	Mr. White.	The Secretary.
in the Chair.	„ Long.	„ Battye.	

The Secretary read Mr. Rashleigh's letter, and the minutes of the meetings with the Lord Chancr, respectg the increase of Solicitors' fees in Chancery, and it was resolved to submit the same to the next Genl. Meetg. The Secretary was directed to use his best endeavors to obtain the signature of the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls to the List of fees before the Genl. Meetg. The following gentn were proposed as fit persons to become members of the Society, and were duly elected :

Mr. J. S. Taylor, Harpur St., and Mr. Edw. Eyre, Gray's Inn. The following gentn notified to the Secretary their intention to withdraw from the Society : Messrs. Thos. Graham, Bramwell, John Wilson, Setree, Gale, Bunton and Smith (Chapter House). The followg gentn were proposed as members : Mr. Hodgson, of Surrey St., by Mr. Battye ; Mr. James Hall, of Boswell Court, and Mr. John Humphreys of Clement's Inn, by Mr. Smart. The same persons as last year were nominated to constitute the Committee, subject to the approbatn of the Genl. Meetg. The Committee took into consōn the Secrety's accounts, and found that the Society was possessed of £400 Three Per Cent. Consols standing in the names of Messrs. Manley, Estcourt, and Smith, and that all the dividends due thereon had been recd. The Committee also found that the Secretary's receipts, includg the sum of £98 15s. 1d., the balance of the last account, amounted to £ , and that his disbursements since the last Genl. Meetg, includg the expense of the dinner on that day, amounted to £ , leaving a balance in his hands of £ . The Committee took into consōn the reference made to them at the last Genl. Meetg to consider of a proper house for the Society to dine at, and being of opōn that the Socy wd be well accommodated at the Freemason's Tavern, they gave directions for the next dinner at that place for 90 persons, at six shillings a head.

At the Genl. Meeting of the Society held at the Freemasons' Tavern on Friday the 27th Feb., 1807. Present :—

Mr. Lowndes,	Mr. J. Richardson.	Mr. Wright.
in the Chair.	„ Cuppage.	„ Jas. Smith.
„ Gaskill.	„ Windus.	„ Jere. Simson.
„ Rashleigh, Jr.	„ Rose.	„ Barber.
„ Meggison.	„ Aspinall.	„ Hyde.
„ B. Price.	„ Young.	„ J. White.
„ C. L. Lee.	„ Palmer.	„ E. J. Robinson.
„ Carr.	„ J. D. Blake.	„ John Barber.
„ Parnell.	„ Beckett.	„ Edwards.
„ J. Evans.	„ Sandys.	„ Loggen.
„ Wimburn.	„ Smart.	„ Appleyard.
„ Taylor.	„ Sermon.	„ Battye.
„ Alexander.	„ Hillyard.	„ Street.
„ Aldridge.	„ Sudlow.	„ Rackham.

Mr. Dennett.	Mr. T. Evans.	Mr. R. Smith.
„ Inge.	„ Gregson.	„ Norton.
„ Kinderley.	„ Lane, R. L. S.	„ Dickson.

The following resohn was passed: “That so soon as the Order is passed and entered, the Secretary do get them printed at the expense of the Society, and circulated to the members of the Society.” It was moved and seconded, that in the opōn of the Society it wd be expedient to establish a Society of the articulated clerks to the Members of the Society for the purpose of discussing legal questions under the patronage and directn of the Society, and it was refd to the Committee to consider the best mode of carrying the above resohn into execution.

At a meetg of the Committee at the Baptist Head Coffee House in Chancery Lane on Friday the 6th March, 1807. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Sandys.	Mr. Brace.
„ Sudlow.	„ G. Jones.	„ Long.
„ Aldridge.	„ Lane.	„ Kinderley.

It was resolved that, in the opōn of the Committee, an Address of thanks from the Society shd be presented to the Lord Chancr, and the Master of the Rolls for their early attention to the Memorial of the Socy. The Committee accordgly resolved to meet on the followg Tuesday at 2 o'clock precisely, to settle the draft of the proposed Address, and to summon a Genl. Meetg of the Society to be held at the Freemasons' Tavern on Wed., the 11th March, at 2 o'cl to consider the same. The Committee accordgly met at the time and place named, seven members attendg, and settled the draft of the proposed Address, and directed copies thereof to be made, and laid before the Genl. Meetg.

At the Genl. Meeting of the Society at the Freemasons' Tavern on Wed., the 11th March, 1807. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes, in the Chair.	Mr. Hyde.	Mr. Smart.
„ Long.	„ Windus.	„ Humphreys.
„ Browne.	„ Dickson.	„ Battye.
„ Wright.	„ Foss.	„ Sweet.
„ Hardisty.	„ Aspinall.	„ Geo. Hodgson.
„ Sermon.	„ Inge.	„ Windus, Senr.
„ Gregg.	„ Sykes.	„ Sandys, Norton.
„ Simpson.	„ Aldridge.	„ Dyke.

The Proposal of the Committee as to the Address of thanks to be presented to the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls for their early attention to the

Memorial of the Society was confirmed, and it was moved that such members of the Committee as were then present be requested to withdraw and prepare the same. The following addresses were read and adopted by the meeting, and the Prolocutor was requested to sign the same, and to attend with a deputation of the Come and present them.

“To the Right Honble The Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain.

“The Society of Practisers in the sevl Courts of Law and Equity, impressed with a high sense of obligation to your Lordship for the promptitude with which you had the goodness to take their Memorial into consideration, for the liberal spirit manifested by the Order your Lordship has been pleased to make on the occasion, and for the kind condescension with which your Lordship at all times recd their Committee; beg leave to offer to your Lordship their unfeigned thanks for these marks of your considerate attentn.”

“To the Right Honble The Master of the Rolls.

“The Society of Practisers in the sevl Courts of Law and Equity, impressed with a high sense of obligation to your Honor for the kind attention which your Honor has invariably shown to their Memorial, for your ready concurrence in the Order which has been made on the occasion, and for the condescensn with which your Honor at all times received their Committee, beg leave to offer to your Honor their unfeigned thanks for these marks of your considerate attention.”

The Meeting ordered that the list of fees of the Clerks in Court should be printed at the expense of the Society, and one copy delivered to each Member of the Society. The following gentlemen were proposed as members of the Society: Mr. George Watkins and Mr. Wm. Cooper of Lin. Inn by Mr. Evans of Thavies Inn, and Mr. Jas. Aubrey of Tooke's Court by Mr. Battye.

A meetg was called for the 10th April, 1807, to inspect the list of persons applying to be admitted as attorneys, but as only Mr. Rashleigh and the Sec attended, no business was done.

At a meetg of the Committee of the Law Society held at the Baptist's Head Coffee House in Chancery Lane on Thursday the 30th April, 1807. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes,	Mr. Lane, R. L. S.	Mr. Meggison.
in the Chair.	„ Rashleigh.	„ Debary.
„ Kaye.	„ Battye.	

The Committee consid the propriety of applying again to the Judges for their determinatn upon the Memorial for an increase of the fees of attorneys, and it was resolved to present the following Address to thier Lordships:

“To the Right Honble Ed. Lord Ellenborough, Lord Chief Justice of His Majesty’s Court of King’s Bench, and to the rest of the Judges of that Honble Court.

“The Humble Memorial of the Socy of Attorneys and Solicitors resident in and near the Metropolis, commonly called the Law Society, Sheweth

“That your Memorialists in the month of May, 1805, took the liberty to submit to your Lordships a representation of the inadequacy of the Common Law costs in a variety of instances, and to solicit yr Lordships to authorize an increase thereof.

“That during the time that your Lordships have had the said Memorl under yr consōn yr Memorialists have, upon a similar representation to the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls with respect to the costs allowed in the Court of Chancery, obtd an order for the increase of their fees in that Court.

“Your Memorialists therefore humbly pray that yr Lordships will be pleased to take the said representation of your Memorialists into yr early consideration, and to grant such relief as to your Lordships shall seem just and reasonable.”

The Committee also directed the Secretary to pay Mr. Rashleigh the sum of ten guineas which he was so good as to pay to Mr. Humphreys as a compensation for his trouble respectg the Memorial to Lord Erskine for an increase of the fees of Solicitors. The following gentlemen were proposed as fit persons to become members of the Society: Mr. E. C. Bryant of Lin. Inn by Mr. Evans, Mr. W. Day of Gerrard St., Soho, by Mr. Rashleigh, and Mr. Chas. Martin, Vintner’s Hall, by Mr. Parnell. The Secretary reported that the deputation of the Committee had waited on the Lord Chancr and the Master of the Rolls with the Address to each of them, and that his Lordship and his Honor both expressed the satisfactn they derived from having rendered to the profession an act of justice to which they considd them so fully entitled.

At a meeting of the Committee of the Law Socy held at Alice’s Coffee House, Westminster Hall, on Monday the 11th May, 1807. Present:—

Mr. Kaye.	Mr. Meggison.	Mr. Lowndes.
„ Aldridge.	„ Battye.	

The Committee waited upon the Judges of the Sevl Courts to request their determinatn upon the Memorial of the Society for an increase of fees, presented to them in May, 1805, when their Lordships intimated their intention to consult togr upon the subject on the eveng of that day when they should all meet at Sergeant’s Inn Hall.

A meetg of the Committee was summoned for Wed., the 26th May, 1805, to inspect the list of persons applying to be admitted as Attorneys, but as only the Secretary and Mr. Robert Smith attended nothing was done.

A meeting of the Committee was summoned to be held on Tuesday, the 23rd June, 1807, to consider the best mode of carrying into effect the resoln passed at the Genl. Meetg to establish a Society of articulated clerks for the p'pose of discussg legal questions, but only Mr. Seymour and the Secretary attended. Mr. Thos. Lys, of Took's Court, was proposed as a member by Mr. Sykes.

At a meetg of the Committee of the Law Society on Monday, the 29th June, 1807. Present :—

Mr. Prolocutor, in the Chair.	Mr. Aldridge. ,, Long.	Mr. Seymour. ,, Murray.	Mr. Law. ,, Windus.
,, Brace.	,, Battye.	,, Lee.	,, Dyke.
,, Lane.			

The Stewards ordered a dinner for one hundred persons, at six shillings per head, exclusive of venison, and ordered seven haunches of venison to be provided by the Master of the Tavern. The followg gentlemen were balloted for and elected members of the Society : Messrs. Cowper, Bryant, W. Day, Martin, Hodgson, Hall, Humphreys, Watkins and Aubrey. The Committee took into consōn the Sec's accounts, and found that his receipts, includg the sum of £133 11s. 9d., the balance of the last account, amounted to £298 8s. 9d., and that his disbursements since the last Genl. Meeting, includg the expense of the dinner on that day, amounted to £121 2s. 6d., leaving a balance in his hands of £177 6s. 9d. The Committee also found that the Socy was possessed of £400 Three Per Cent. Consols, stand'g in the names of Messrs. Manley, Estcourt and Smith, and that half a year's dividend wd be due thereon on the 5th July followg. A plan for carryg into effect the resoln of the Society at the last Genl. Meetg respectg the formatn of a Society of articulated clerks for the discussn of legal subjects having been submitted by Mr. Seymour to the Committee, the Committee ordered the same to be copied and sent to each member of the Committee for his consōn, and that a meetg of the Come be had thereon soon after the Genl. Meetg.

At the Genl. Meetg of the Society on Friday, the 3rd July, 1807. Present :—

Mr. Rashleigh.	Mr. B. C. Williams.	Mr. Harvey.
,, Beckett.	,, Jno. Pearson.	,, Leigh.
,, Taylor.	,, Santer.	,, Rogers.
,, Estcourt.	,, Ince.	,, John Humphries.
,, Hillyard.	,, Cook.	,, Gordon.
,, S. N. Meredith.	,, Young.	,, Evans.
,, W. Chippendale.	,, Foss.	,, Horton.
,, R. Wimburn.	,, Aldridge.	,, Dennett.
,, W. Vizard.	,, Ellis.	,, J. D. Blake.
,, G. Chilton.	,, Gaskell.	,, Kirkby.
,, A. Humphries.	,, Price.	,, Atkinson.
,, T. Hall.	,, Ward.	,, Palmer.

Mr. John Windus.	Mr. McDougal.	Mr. Rackham.
„ Jas. White.	„ Philpot.	„ Fothergill.
„ Jno. Dyke.	„ Barber.	„ Eyre.
„ John Windus, Jr.	„ Dickson.	„ Wharton.
„ Jno. Tarrant.	„ Corfield.	„ Law.
„ I. M. Michell.	„ Day.	„ Green.
„ T. Street.	„ Sandys.	„ Meggison.
„ J. Rose.	„ R. Wilson.	„ Loggen.
„ J. Richardson.	„ Moule.	„ Lane.
„ Thos. Bolton.	„ Thomas.	„ Hardesty.
„ T. Sermon.	„ Batty.	„ Geo. Pearson.
„ Seymour.	„ Martin.	„ Lowndes.
„ Long.	„ A. H. Strong.	„ Aubrey.
„ Murray.	„ Appleyard.	„ Edwards.
„ Jas. Hall.	„ Simpson.	„ Smart.
„ Sudlow.	„ Jas. Smith.	„ Jno. Alexander.
„ Aspinall.	„ Wright.	„ Lee.
„ Loxham.	„ Richd. Smith.	„ Strong.
„ Parnell.	„ Inge.	„ Sheppard.
„ Geo. Hodgson.	„ Bryant.	„ John Smith.

It was resolved that "Lord Erskine" be a standg toast at the Society's dinners, and that his health be drunk at the Genl. Meetings. It was moved by Mr. Vizard, seconded and resolved, that the Committee wait on the Judges of the Courts at the request of the Society expressed at the Genl. Meetg, to know what steps they had been pleased to take upon the Memorial of the Society. It was moved by Mr. Rd. Wilson, and resolved to refer it to the Committee to consider the expediency of setting on foot a subscription for the purpose of establishing a fund for the relief of decayed members of the professn, their widows and children, and to report thereon at the next Genl. Meetg. Mr. Murray was ordered to be added to the Committee of the Socy.

A meet'g of the Committee was summoned to be held on the 13th July, 1807, to resume the consõn of the proposed Society of articed clerks, but only Mr. Seymour and Mr. Debary attended. Mr. Charles Hodgson, of Bartlett's Bldgs, and Mr. Wm. Bovill, of Bridge St., were proposed as members by Mr. Debary. A meetg was again called for the 17th July, 1807, but only Mr. Seymour and Mr. Debary again attended. The Secretary summoned a meetg to be held on Monday, the 2nd Novr., 1807, to inspect the list of persons standg for admission as attorneys in the next Michaelmas Term, but only Mr. Jas. White and Mr. Peter Still attended. A meetg was called for the 20th Jany., 1808, the purpose of which is not mentioned, but as only Mr. White and the Secretary attended no business was done.

At a meetg of the Committee held at the Baptist's Head Coffee House in Chancery Lane on Tuesday, Feb. 9, 1808. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes,	Mr. Sandys.	Mr. Seymour.	Mr. Battye.
in the Chair.	„ Brace.	„ White.	„ Kinderley.
„ Still.	„ Hillyard.	„ Aldridge.	„ Debary.

The following gentlemen were proposed as members of the Society: Saml. Weyman Wadeson, of Austin Friars, by Mr. Meggison, at the request of Mr. Corfield, Mr. Chrstr. Hodgson of Bartlett's Bldgs, and Mr. Wm. Bovill of New Bridge St., by Mr. Debary, at the request of Mr. Green, Salisbury Sq., Mr. Thos. Lys of Took's Court, by Mr. Sykes, Mr. John Fletcher of Cecil St., Mr. Richd. Rudd of Great Queen St., Lin. Inn Flds., and Mr. Wm. Doidge Taunton of Essex St., Strand, by Mr. Battye, at the request of Mr. Chippendale, Mr. John Gilbert Meymott of Charlotte Street, Blackfriars Rd., by Mr. White, Old Buildings, at the request of Mr. Winburne, Mr. Saml. White of Lincoln's Inn, by Mr. White of Old Bldgs, Mr. Robt. Gatty of Angel Court, Throgmorton St., and Kennett Dixon of same by Mr. Hillyard, Mr. John Hughes of King's Bench Walk, by Mr. Long, Mr. Henry Day and Mr. Jesse Hamerton of Cullum St., Fenchurch, proposed by Mr. Hillyard, and Mr. Cobbett Derby of Tanfield Court, by Mr. Debary. The foregoing gentlemen were elected at the meetg of the Committee on the 24th Feb., with the exception of Messrs. Lys, Fletcher, Rudd, Meymott, Day, and Hamerton, who are marked "postponed." The Committee resumed the consideratn of the proposal for a Society of articulated Clerks, and resolved to send a printed copy of the proposed plan to every member of the Law Socy inclosed in a letter from the Secretary, requesting such member to inform the Secretary by letter before the 23rd Feb., inst, whether he approved of the plan, and intended proposing a member, and also whether it wd be agreeable to him that his name should be put on the ballot for one of the Committee, and to favor the Committee with such observations on the plan as may occur to him. Mr. Wilson's motion for a fund for decayed members was adjourned as he was absent. The following Committee was nominated for 1808:

Messrs. Aldridge.	Kinderly.	Wright.	
Brace.	Teasdale.	Murray.	
G. Jones.	White.	New {	
Chas. James.	Wilson.		Appleyard.
Lowndes.	Battye.		Bray.
Meggison.	Debary.		Jos. Blunt.
Kaye.	Hillyard.		Donnett, Jon.
Estcourt.	Long.		Logger.
Still.	Meredith.		Law.
Sudlow.	Seymour.		Lee, Hatton Garden.
Sandys.	Lane.		James Smith.
Foss.	Lowten.		John Nott, Lin. Inn.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 24th Feb., 1808. Present:—

Mr. Seymour.	Mr. Wright.	Mr. Brace.
„ Battye.	„ Long.	The Secretary.

The following gentlemen were proposed as Memos of the Society: Mr. John Boswell of the Boro., by Mr. Debary, Mr. H. Jennerett of Vine Street, Piccadilly, by Mr. Seymour, Mr. Joseph Knowles of Boswell Court, and Mr. John Barker of Pump Court, Temple, by Mr. Battye, and Mr. Thomas Hughes of Essex St., Strand, by the Secretary, at the request of Mr. Young. At this meeting the Sec. was ordered to mention in the summons to the Committee the names of the persons to be balloted for. Altho' in the circular calling the meeting, it was mentioned that the Committee was to resume the consideration of the plan for a Society of articulated clerks, and to peruse the letters from the members of the Society thereon, there is no mention in the Minutes of anything having been done.

At a meetg of the Committee held at the Freemasons' Tavern on Wed., the 2nd March, 1808. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Foss.	Mr. Hillyard.
„ Lane, Rd. Lion Sq.		

The Secretary's accounts were audited. His receipts amounted to £400 4s. 9d., and his disbursements to £154 6s. 0d., leaving a balance in his hands of £245 18s. 9d. Mr. Andrew Edge of Essex St. was proposed as a member by Mr. Inge, and Mr. Robt. Henry Bartholomew of New Inn by Mr. Loggen, but the ballot was postponed, as a sufficient number of members was not present.

At the Genl. Meeting of the Society on the 4th March, 1808. Present:—

Mr. Aspinall.	Mr. Rogers.	Mr. Kaye.
„ Crippage.	„ Aubrey.	„ Darley.
„ Chippendall.	„ Ince.	„ Chitton.
„ Wadson.	„ Thos. Hall.	„ C. S. Ellis.
„ Bleasdale.	„ Ward.	„ A. Humphreys.
„ Street.	„ Kirkley.	„ Corfield.
„ Seymour.	„ Beckett.	„ Law.
„ Gaskell.	„ Thomas.	„ Sweet.
„ Rackham.	„ Hen. Wright.	„ Edwards.
„ Battye.	„ Jno. Smith.	„ Maltby.
„ Smart.	„ Lee.	„ Geldard.
„ Lane.	„ Cooke.	„ Horton.
„ Robinson.	„ Jas. Hall.	„ Taunton.
„ Barber.	„ Blandford.	„ Windus, Jn.
„ Harper.	„ Tarrant.	„ Moule.
„ Evans.	„ Leigh.	„ Rd. White.

Mr. Long.	Mr. Humphreys.	Mr. Michell.
„ Hardisty.	„ Debarry.	„ Barrow.
„ Appleyard.	„ Palmer.	„ Greenwell.
„ Hughes.	„ Wimburn.	„ J. D. Blake.
„ Loggen.	„ Vizard.	„ Sandys.
„ Jno. Pearson.	„ Holloway.	„ Dennett.
„ Still.	„ Williams.	„ J. Richardson.
„ Sermon.	„ Chas. Hodgson.	„ Jas. Smith.
„ Evans, Hen.	„ Estcourt.	„ Loxham.
„ Aldridge.	„ Taylor.	„ Gatty.
„ Jno. Alexander.	„ Sudlow.	„ Dixon.
„ Hunter.	„ A. Browne.	„ Philpot.
„ Young.	„ Hodgson.	

No bus appears to have been done, with the exception of reading and confirming the Minutes of the last Genl. Meeting, and the subsequent meetings of the Committee.

At a meetg of the Committee at the Baptist's Head Coffee House, on Thursday the 7th of April, 1808. Present :—

Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Smith.	Mr. Loggen.
„ Aspinall,	at the request of the Committee.	

The meeting was summoned at the request of Mr. Seymour, to consider a Bill pending in Parl, authorising attorneys to act as notaries ; but as Mr. Seymour did not attend to explain the objects of the summons, the Sec. was directed to write to him, to state his reasons for wishing the Committee to meet before the next meeting of the Committee, which was to be summoned as soon as necessary.

At a meeting of the Committee at the same place on Friday the 22nd April, 1808. Present :—

Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Meggison.	Mr. Loggen.
„ Sudlow.	„ White.	„ Kaye.
„ Gilbert Jones.	„ Murray.	„ Debary.

No resolutions appear to have been come to, but the following notes show what the matters before the Committee were : “ The Sec. to provide schedules of the proposed Stamp duties for the Committee, and to apply to Mr. Neyle to learn when the subject is likely to be brought forward in the House. Summon the Committee Tuesday next at 7 o'clock.” “ Mem. the case of a surviving or sole trustee who dies, and his personal representatives apply to transfer his own stock, they are required to obtain a Probate ad valorem, the trust money to enable them to receive the Testator's stock.” “ A Probate accord-

ing to the value of the testator's estate, altho' he shall die insolvent." "Auction duty, Mr. Debary." "In the case of a mortgagor joining in the transfer of a mortgage, it becomes a new mortgage, and liable to the Mortgage duty, but where the Mortgagor does not join in the transfer the deed duty is only payable." The following note is crossed thro: "To communicate to the officer of the signing of Writs and Sealers, that if any application is made for an alteration of the office hours, it will be opposed by the Society."

At a meeting of the Committee on the 26th April, 1808. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Lane.	Mr. Murray.
„ Still.	„ Kaye.	„ Jones.
„ Aldridge.	„ Long.	„ Sudlow.

Enquiries were directed to be made as to the re-admission of Jon. Dobson, Isaac Isaacs, John Deacon, and Howard of Gordon Square. The following gentn. were balloted for and elected: Messrs. Boswell, Jennerett, Knowles, Edge, Bartholomew, Winter, and Hancock. Mr. Kaye reported that he had conferred with Mr. Neyle on the hardship experienced by requiring an Administration or Probate sufficient in value, not only to cover the testator's property, but also all such property as he might be a trustee of, and that Mr. Neyle has expressed his intention to consider by what means it could be prevented in future. It was resolved that a representn be made to Mr. Neyle of the extreme hardship of the case, that upon the transfer of a mortgage to which the Mortgagor was a party, ad valorem, duty was again payable as if it were a new mortgage, although no für sum of money was advanced.

At a meeting of the Committee on the 14th June, 1808. Present:—

Mr. Dennett.	Mr. Still.	Mr. White.
„ Batty.	„ Long.	„ Loggen.

A caveat was ordered to be entered against Peter Fry of Compton Bishop, Somersetshire, by desire of Mr. Alexander of New Inn. The Sec. was directed to enquire of Mr. Alexander the objections against Mr. Fry, and also to enquire about Winslow, Clerk to Doo, No. 61 in the list of persons applying for admission as attorneys. Mr. Thos. Dawes of Angel Court, Throgmorton Street, was proposed as a member by Mr. Hillyard, and Mr. Charles Few of Gt. James St., Bedford Row, by Mr. J. S. Taylor of Harper St. The Sec. was directed to enquire as to Roger Dawson, Robt. Kay, and John Munn and Lambert of Lazenby, applying to be admitted as Attorneys.

The Committee resolved to recommend the Stewards in future to discontinue the use of spruce beer, soda water, cider, and perry at the dinners at the Genl. Meetings.

At the Genl. Meeting of the Socy on the 22nd July, 1808. Present:—

Mr. Price.	Mr. Ward.	Mr. Rackham.
„ Kinderley.	„ Edwards.	„ R. Smith.

P

Mr. Smart.	Mr. Loggen.	Mr. Blandford.
„ Burgh.	„ Robinson.	„ Hancock.
„ Moule.	„ Bartholomew.	„ Geldard.
„ G. Hodgson.	„ Cook.	„ Seymour.
„ Lane.	„ Pearson.	„ W. Lowe.
„ R. White.	„ Aldridge.	„ J. Lowe.
„ J. D. Blake.	„ Dasley.	„ Sandys.
„ Strong.	„ Sermon.	„ Hall.
„ Jas. Smith.	„ Hen. Wright.	„ Wharton.
„ Harper.	„ Estcourt,	„ Windus.
„ Corfield.	in the Chair.	„ Thomas.
„ Crippage.	„ Strong.	„ Dennett.
„ F. Rashleigh.	„ Derby.	„ Sweet.
„ Leigh.	„ Kaye.	„ Wadeson.
„ Alexander.	„ Lee.	„ Boswell.
„ Teasdale.	„ Green.	„ Chas. James.
„ Hillyard.	„ Taylor.	„ Chas. Murray.
„ Dixon.	„ Appleyard.	„ Thos. Hall.
„ Inge.	„ Day.	„ J. Humphries.
„ Loxham.	„ MacDonald.	„ Philpot.
„ Palmer.	„ Humphreys.	„ Chitton.
„ Grey.	„ W. D. Tainten.	„ Edge.
„ Richardson.	„ Kirkby.	„ Davis.
„ Martin.	„ Michell.	

The Minutes of the preceding Genl. Meetg and the subseqt Committees were read and confirmed, but there is no note of any other business having been done.

At the meetg of the Committee on the 3rd Nov., 1808, only Mr. Batty and Mr. White of Chancery Lane attended. They inspected the list of persons applying for admission as attorneys in Michaelmas Term, and directed the Secretary to make enquiries about Isaac Isaacs, Wm. Huddle, John Legrea, Roarke, Josias Lambert, Whiting of Swaffham, and Richardson of Harley St.

At a meeting of the Committee at the Baptist's Head Coffee House, Chancery Lane, on Monday the 21st Novr., 1808. Present —

Mr. Batty.	Mr. Loggen.	Mr. Aldridge.
„ Seymour.	„ Lane.	„ Hillyard.

Mr. Batty informed the Committee, that in consequence of a comcōn from one of his friends, he had reason to expect that in case another applōn should be made to Lord Ellenborough for an increase of the fees in the Court of King's Bench it wd be attended to. Beyond receiving this comcōn no būs appears to have been done.

At a meetg of the Committee on Saturday the 14th Jany., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Meggison,	Mr. Lane.	Mr. Brace.
in the Chair.	„ Smith.	„ Battye.
„ Aldridge.	„ Sandys.	

The Committee inspected the list of persons applying to be admitted as attorneys. The Sec. read a letter from Mr. Hooper of Ringwood, relative to a person who advertized in the *Salisbury Journal*, offering his services to the public as a conveyancer, and it was resolved to lay such letter and advertisement before the Society at their next Genl. Meeting. The following gentlemen were requested to wait on Lord Ellenborough, agreeably to his Lordship's appointment, on the following Monday at 12, upon the subject of the Memorl for an increase of fees, and to meet at the Baptist's Head Coffee House at 11 precisely: The Prolocutor, Mr. Meggison, Mr. Battye, Mr. Sandys and Mr. Kinderley. On the 16th Jany. this Deputation attended Lord Ellenborough, but there is no note of what passed at the interview. On the 27th Jany., 1809, the Members composing the Deputation from the Committee met to prepare a comparative statement of the fees in the Exchequer of Pleas and in the King's Bench by Lord Ellenborough's desire, and they prepared the same accordingly, and forwarded it to his Lordship.

At a meetg of the Committee on Monday the 27th Feb., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Still.	Mr. Murray.	Mr. Bovill.	} Stewards.
„ White.	„ Law.	„ Wadeson.	
„ Long.	„ Lowndes.	„ Browne.	
„ Lane.	„ Sandys.	„ Palmer.	

The Stewards ordered dinner for 100 persons at the Genl. Meetg on Friday the 3rd March, at 7 shillings a head. The following note is crossed thro: "Dessert at 1/6 a head in addition." The following gentlemen proposed as members of the Society at a former meeting were elected: Mr. Thos. Hughes, Mr. Chas. Few, and Mr. John Wood. Mr. Theodore Wratismaw of Gordon Sq. was "postponed." The following gentlemen were proposed as members: Mr. Jas. Tomlinson of Copthall Court, by Mr. Long of Gray's Inn, Mr. Arthur Moore Barlow, by Mr. Sandys, and Mr. James Boardman of Friday St., by Mr. Murray. The Committee took into consõn the Secretary's accounts, but no particulars of them are given. The Sec. was ordered to purchase £600 Three per cent. Consols in the names of Messrs. Manley, Estcourt, and Smith, Trustees for the Society. It was resolved to make an alphabetical list of the Members of the Society, with their places of abode, for the use of the Society, commencing on the 1st Jany., 1809, and to send a printed copy of same to each member. The Sec. reported that Mr. Meggison, Mr. Sandys, and Mr. Battye, the Deputation from the Committee, had waited upon Lord

Ellenborough, who informed them that he had given the Meml much consōn, and thought it very deserving of attention, and that redress should be given, as in many instances attorneys were very inadequately paid; but as an individual judge, he could do no more upon the subject than give it his recommendatn and support as far as he could consistently with a due regard to the public, upon whom law proceedgs bore very severely on account of heavy stamp duties.

In the Minutes of the Genl. Meetg held at the Freemasons' Tavern, on the 3rd March, 1809, there is no list of Members who attended, nor is there any mention of the number present. A letter from a Mr. Hooper was read, and it was moved by Mr. Foss, and resolved to refer it to the Committee to make proper enquiries upon the subject, and to take such measures thereupon as they should think proper. The followgⁿ note referrg to this matter is crossed through: "Mr. Mitchell moves that enquiry be made in what Inn of Court and by what means he obtained admission as Master Extra in Chancery, and who is the Agent of Mr. Horwood."

At a meetg of the Committee on Sat. the 25th March, 1809. Present:—

Mr. Meggison,	Mr. Smith.	Mr. Lee.	Mr. Lowten.
in the Chair.	„ Lane.	„ Battye.	„ Brace.
„ Debary.	„ Aldridge.		

The Committee took into consōn a Bill dependg in Parliament, to enable the Clerks of the King's Cōrner and Attorney, in the Court of King's Bench, to be admitted as Attorneys, but having considered the provisions of the Bill, they were of opōn that no effectual objection could be made to it.

The Committee was summoned to meet on the 14th April, 1809, to inspect the list for Easter Term of persons applying to be admitted as attorneys, and to consider the complaint respecting Horwood of Ringwood, but no member attended. The Sec. also was absent, but left a letter excusing himself, in which the following passage occurs: The Sec. has made enquiry respecting Mr. Harwood, and finds he was admitted a member of Gray's Inn on the 2nd Decr., 1808, upon the recommendn of Mr. Wm. Kittier of Ringwood, and some others whose names the Steward of Gray's Inn has promised him this evening. He was admitted a Master Extra on the 10th Decr., '08, but it does not appear at the Petty Bag who were the Counsel or Six Clerk who signed the certē, the same not having been filed there. The Sec. has searched for Harwood's certē, which was taken out for him (as a Conveyancer) the 1st of Decr. last, by Mr. Wm. Pulley of Doctor's Commons, Notary. He has not thought it proper to extend his enquiries to Mr. Pulley until the sense of the Committee is known on that head."

At a meetg of the Committee on the 31st May, 1809, summoned to inspect the list of persons applying for admission as attorneys in Trinity Term, but as only three members attended (Mr. Geldard, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Battye) no būs was done.

At a meetg of the Committee on Tuesday the 4th July, 1809. Present:—

Mr. Long.	Mr. White.	Mr. Estcourt,
„ Loggen.	„ Lowndes.	in the Chair.
	Mr. Dyke.	
	„ Davis.	} Stewards.
	„ Hancock.	
	„ Humphreys.	

Directions were given for dinner for 120 persons at 6s. 8d. per. head, exclusive of venison and dessert. “Dessert and ice at 2s. a head. Seven haunches of venison and two necks.” In the margin is the following note “The Great Room for Friday, 7 July.” The Committee taking into consôn the flourishing state of the Finances of the Society, were of opinion that it was no longer necy to receive a subscription of two guineas every year, but that each alternate year one guinea wd be fully sufficient, and they therefore recomended the Society to order that in the year 1810 the subscription be one guinea, the following year two guineas, and so on, until further order. The following gentlemen were elected as Members of the Society: Messrs. Robt. Gatty, Jr., James Tomlinson, A. M. Barlow, and Thomas Dawes. Messrs. Bourdillon and Kearsy were “postponed.” Mr. Benjamin Brooks of Lin. Inn was proposed as a member of the Society by Mr. Long, Mr. John Henry of St. Swithin’s Lane, by Mr. Corfield, and Mr. Crozus Raine, of King’s Bench Walk, by Mr. Warton. The Sec. reported that he had made searches in connection with Harwood’s case, and that fûr enquiries were thought necy before any resolution was come to. The following notes appear on the draft Minutes: “Secretary’s Accounts. Six hundred pounds Three per cents. purchased. Cost £408.”

At the Genl. Meeting of the Society at the Freemasons’ Tavern on Friday, the 7th July, 1809. Present:—

Mr. J. Alexander.	Mr. James, Cha.	Mr. Horton.
„ R. Smith.	„ James, Thos.	„ Street.
„ Sermon.	„ Kirkley.	„ White, Jas.
„ Lowndes.	„ Smith, Jno.	„ Law.
„ Jas. Smith.	„ Hunter, C. V.	„ Edge.
„ Grey.	„ Corfield.	„ Sandys.
„ T. Lane.	„ Leigh.	„ Richardson.
„ Day.	„ Palmer.	„ Wood.
„ Geo. Hodgson.	„ Tomlinson.	„ Rose.
„ R. Gatty, Junr.	„ Ellis, C. T.	„ Davis.
„ Appleyard.	„ Humphreys, Jno.	„ Bovill, Wm.
„ R. Long.	„ Foss.	„ Rashleigh, Jno.
„ Bartholomew.	„ Hughes, Jno.	„ Aldridge.

Mr. Battye.	Mr. Humphreys, Amb.	Mr. Thomas.
„ Pearson.	„ Taylor, S. S.	„ Chitton.
„ Wimburn.	„ Few.	„ Vizard.
„ Dyke.	„ Bryant.	„ White, Richd.
„ Ward.	„ Loxham.	„ Galloway.
„ Hardisty.	„ Smith, Richd.	„ Edmunds, Geo.
„ Rackham.	„ Green.	„ Crippage.
„ Inge.	„ Brace.	„ Cook.
„ Still.	„ Derby.	„ Tarrant.
„ Blake.	„ Simpson.	„ Pearson, Jno.
„ Price.	„ Aubrey.	„ Windus, Jno.
„ Evans, J. L. C.	„ Edwards.	„ Philpot.
„ Henry Wright.	„ Loggen.	„ Barlow.
„ Gordon.	„ Kaye.	„ Michell.
„ Winter, Jas.	„ Gaskell.	

It was moved by Mr. Lowndes, and resolved that the Committee shd represent in such manner as they should think proper to the Hon. Society of Gray's Inn, the mischiefs that had arisen from the admission into that Society of persons not duly qualified to act as Solicitors, and to adopt such measures as may be most advisable to prevent such admissions in future. The Sec. was directed to write Mr. Hooper of Ringwood in answer to his letters respecting the admission of Wm. Harwood of Ringwood as a member of Gray's Inn.

At a meeting of the Committee on Thurs. the 2nd Novr., 1809. Present:—

Mr. Still,	Mr. Lee.	Mr. Loggen.
in the Chair.	„ Battye.	„ Murray.
„ Sykes.	„ Wright.	„ Foss.
„ Aldridge.		

The Committee took into consideration the list of persons applying to be admitted as attorneys and directed certn enquiries to be made. The Secretary laid before the Committee the following notice :

*“ House of Commons,
“ 15th June, 1809.*

“ Notice has been given, that it will be proposed in the next session of Parlt, To limit the Time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills, to the First Fourteen Days next after the day of the commencement of the Session;— allowing as usual one month further for Presenting Private Bills; whereby the Parties in the country may have the printed Bills in their hands at an earlier Period of the Session.

“ Also, that some one of the Clerks attending The House, should be employed by the Parties having business before The House, as a Parliamentary Agent or Solicitor; who may be ready to answer any questions and give any explanations which may be required, in the course of the business depending.”

The Committee resolved to have the above notice printed and a copy sent to each member of the Society, and to call a Genl. Meeting of the Society, to be held at the Freemasons' Tavern, on Friday the 17th Nov., 1809, to take the same into consōn. The Sec. reported that he had written to Mr. Hooper of Ringwood, in pursuance of the directions of the Genl. Meeting, a letter of which the following is a copy :

“ *To MR. HOOPER.*

“ *Chancery Lane, London.*

“ SIR,

“ The Committee of the Law Socy desire me to acquaint you that they have directed inquiries to be made into the circumstances under which Mr. Horwood of Ringwood was admitted a member of Gray's Inn, and they find that on the 2nd Decr., 1808 he was inrolled by the recommendn of Wm. Kitter of Ringwood and others—that he was appointed a Master Extraordinary on the 10th of the same month, and that his certificate as a Conveyancer was taken out on the 1st of Decr. in the same year by Mr. Wm. Pulley of Doctor's Commons, Notary. The Committee deem it necy to make some fūr enquiries before they take any measures upon the subject, and they request the favor of the Professional Gent of Hampshire to give them such information respecting Horwood as they may possess.

“ I am, Sir, &c.,

“ W. B. FLEXNEY, Sec.”

At a Genl. Meetg of the Society at the Freemasons' Tavern on Friday the 17th Novr., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Aldridge, in the Chair.	Mr. Appleyard. „ Lane.	Mr. Wright, Temple.
„ White, Lin. Inn.	„ Knowles.	„ Leigh.
„ Alexander, Bedford Row.	„ Hall, Bonnet Court.	„ Inge.

The Secretary read the notice which had been given in the House of Commons relative to the proposed regulation for the employment of Clerks of the House in private Bills, but in consequence of the meeting being so thinly attended, the gentlemen present adjourned the consōn of the matter to anōr Genl. Meetg, to be held on the 30th Nov. at 7 in the evg.

At a meetg of the Committee on the 29th Novr., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt.	Mr. Aldridge.	Mr. Lane.	Mr. Long.
---------------	---------------	-----------	-----------

The Committee took into consideration the notice referred to in the last paragraph, with the view of putting the Genl. Meeting into possession of the sentiments of the Committee as to the proper steps to be taken on the occasion.

At the Adjourned Genl. Meetg of the Society on the 30th Novr., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt, in the Chair.	Mr. Cook. ,, Chippendale.	Mr. Inge. ,, Aldridge.
,, W. Lowe.	,, Foss.	,, Vizard.

The meetg was further adjourned to Thurs., the 14th Decr., at 8 o'cl. in the evg. At the Adj'd Genl. Meetg on the 14th Decr. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt, in the Chair.	Mr. Chippendale. ,, White, Jas.	Mr. Aubrey. ,, Rashleigh.
,, Aldridge.	,, Forster.	,, Kaye.
,, White, Rd. Saml.	,, Evans.	,, Inge.
,, Brace.	,, Few.	,, Lowndes.
,, Appleyard.	,, Hunter.	,, Rose.
,, Philpot.	,, Barber.	,, Stone.
,, Scott.	,, McDougall.	,, Gilbert Jones.
,, Lowe.	,, Vizard.	,, Wm. Lowe.
,, Humphreys.	,, Debary.	

It was resolved, that in the opōn of the Meeting the interests of the public as well as the justice due to the professn called upon the Society to resist by every means in its power the resoln to be submitted to the House of Commons, that some one of the Clerks attending the House should be employed by the Parties having business before the House as a Party Agent or Solicitor ; who may be ready to answer any questions and give any explanations which may be required in the course of the business dependig, and that in the opōn of the meeting it wd be expedient in the first place to submit a representatn to the Chancr of the Excheqr, stating the injustice and impolicy of the proposed measure, and the inconveniences which wd probably result from it. That a Select Committee be appointed to prepare such representn, and submit the same to a future meeting for its consōn, the followig gentn being appointed to such Committee: Mr. Prolocutor, Mr. Lowndes, Mr. Kaye, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Forster.

At a meeting of the Select Committee held at the White Hart Tavern, in Holborn, on Tuesday the 19th Decr., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Lowndes, in the Chair.	Mr. Jones. ,, Kaye.	Mr. Forster.
-------------------------------	------------------------	--------------

Mr. Kaye produced to the Committee a draft of a representation to the Chancr of the Exchequer, which the Committee took into consideration, and at 11 o'clock adjourned the further consōn of it to the following Thursday, the 21st, at the same place. The Secretary was directed to call a General Meeting of the Society for Thursday the 28th Decr., at 2 o'clock, at the Freemasons' Tavern, to take the same into consideration. On the margin of this Minute, crossed thro', are the following notes: "Mr. Barbor of Gray's Inn. Ask him

for the printed Act of Oystermouth Railway." "44 Geo. III. ch. 98, s. 14."
 "Get some of the Bills of the Clerks."

At a meetg of the Select Committee at the White Hart Tavern in Holborn on the 21st Decr., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Prolocutor,	Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Forster.	Mr. Sandys.
in the Chair.	„ Kay.	„ Jones.	

Mr. Sandys having been added to the Committee, they considered the draft of the representatn to the Chancr of the Exchr to be submitted to the Genl. Meetg, and they resolved to recommend to the Genl. Meeting, that copies of the representation shd likewise be sent to the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Attorney-Genl., the Solr-Genl., and other members of the profession in Parl. They also recommended that a Committee be appointed at the next meetg to sign the recommendn to the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker of the House of Commons, and to request an audience with both or either of them, as the Committee may deem expedient, and also to communicate with members of the profession in Parl.

At the Genl. Meetg of the Socy held at the Freemasons' Tavern, on Thurs. the 28th Decr., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt,	Mr. Hall.	Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Alexander.
in the Chair.	„ Sermon.	„ Kaye.	„ Forster.

The Secretary read the draft of the representation to the Chancr of the Excheqr, and it was resolved that the representn met with the perfect concurrence of the meetg, and that the recommendns of the Select Committee be adopted. Mr. Sandys was added to the Committee. The thanks of the meetg were returned to Mr. Kaye for his great care and attention in connection with the representn, and also to the Committee for the pains they had bestowed in investigating the subject, and the trouble they had taken in furthering the views and wishes of the Society.

At a meetg of the Select Committee on Sat. the 30th Decr., 1809. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt.	Mr. Lowndes.	Mr. Kaye.	Mr. Forster.
---------------	--------------	-----------	--------------

The fair copies of the representation to the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker of the House of Commons were examd and signed, and the Committee prepared and signed letters to accompany each copy. The Committee also prepared a list of 25 gentlemen at the Bar in Parl, to whom copies were also directed to be sent. The following is a copy of the draft letter sent with the "representations," and a list of the gentlemen to whom copies of the "representation" were sent.

"SIR, We take the liberty to request you will have the goodness to favor us with a conference on the subject of the enclosed Letter as soon as your

convenience will permit, and that you will inform Mr. Estcourt (No. 2, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn) of the time when we may be permitted to attend you.

"We have the honour to be, sir,

"Yr mt obedt servants,

"Signed by MR. ESTCOURT, MR. KAYE, MR. LOWNDES,
MR. FORSTER, and MR. SANDYS.

"*Lincoln's Inn,*
30 Decr., 1809."

Two Copies to

The Right Honble The Speaker, and

The Right Honble The Chancr of the Excheqr.

"Send to those whose names *.

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| * Abercromby, Hon. Jas. | * Morris, Edwd. |
| * Adam, Wm. | Nicholl, S. John. |
| Austruther, Right Hon. John. | ? Owen, John Lord. |
| Bathurst, Chas. | * Pigott, S. Arthur. |
| * Burton, Francis. | * Plumer, S. Thos. |
| Brand, Hon. Thos. | ? Ponsonby, Hon. George. |
| * Coke, Daniel P. | * Romilly, S. Samuel. |
| Barne, Snowden. | Ryder, Richd. |
| Croker, John Wilson. | Stephen, Saml. |
| Creevey, Thos. | ? Scott, S. Wm. |
| Dickinson, Wm. | * Simeon, John. |
| * Foulkes, Evan. | Stanhope, Walter Spencer. |
| Farquhar, James. | * Smith, Henry. |
| * Gibbs, S. Vicary. | Shaw Lefevre, Chas. |
| * Giles, Daniel. | Sturges, Rowene Wm. |
| Greenhill, Robt. | Sutton, Chas. Manners. |
| * Graham, S. James. | Tyrwhitt, Thos. |
| * Grant, G. William. | Taylor, Michl. Angelo. |
| Holford, George. | Taylor, Wm. |
| Hobhouse, Benjn. | * Twiton, S. Thos. |
| * Horner, Fras. | Tudway, Clement. |
| Henderson, Hartley. | Ward, Robt. |
| * Jekyll, Josh. | * Wilson, Griffin. |
| * Jones, Gilbert. | Wharton, Richd. |
| Joddrell, Henry. | ? Yorke, Honble Chas. |
| * Leach, John. | Vansittart, Nichs. |
| * Leycester, Hugh. | Cricket, Alexander. |
| * Martin, Henry. | Bernard Scrope. |
| Macdonald, Jas. | Hurst, Robt. |
| Moore, Chas. | * Hall, Benjamin. |
| Montgomery, Sir Jas. | * Kenrick, Wm." |

At a meeting of the Select Committee on the 17th Jany., 1810. Present:—

Mr. Kaye. Mr. Lowndes. Mr. Sandys. Mr. Forster.

The Secry laid before the Committee the answers recd by Mr. Estcourt from the Speaker and the Chancr of the Excheqr, to the letters of the Select Committee accompanyg the representations of the Society, of which the following are copies :

“Kedbrooke, 31st Decr., 1809.

“SIR,

“I received this day a Letter and Statement signed by yourself and four other Gentlemen, which shall certainly have the fullest consideration ; it is not my intention to be in London until within two or three days before the Meeting of Parliament, but I will not fail to appoint an early day after my arrival for my seeing you upon the subject according to your request.

“I have the Honor to be, sir,

“Your obedt servt,

“CHAS. ABBOTT.

“Edmd. Estcourt, Esqr.”

“Downing Street, Janry. 3, 1810.

“DEAR SIR,

“I have recd the representations of yourself and others against the proposed regulations for requiring the employment of one of the Clerks of the House of Commons as an agent for conducting business before the House, and I write to answer you that I will take care to have the benefit of a conference with you before anything further is done upon the subject.

“I have the honor to be, Sir,

“Your most obedt humble servt,

“S. PERCEVAL.

“Edmund Estcourt, Esqr.”

Mr. Kaye laid before the Committee a correspce which had passed betn the Attorney-Genl. and himself, of which the following is a copy :

“Linc. Inn, Jany. 11, 1810.

“DEAR SIR,

“Upon talking with the Solr-Genl. upon the subject which you mentioned to me, I agree with him in thinking that it is not advisable that we should see you until you have had your communication with the Speaker and Mr. Perceval, and that an earlier meeting wd be far from useful. We will therefore consider it to stand postponed for the present.

“Yours sincerely,

“V. GIBBS.

“J. Kaye, Esqr.”

“Dear Sir,—I am sorry that you and the Solicitor-Genl. shd decline to communicate with the Select Committee of the Law Society until after their conferences with the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker. I plainly perceive that if those conferences should prove unsatisfactory to the Committee, they will then be told that you cannot oppose a measure proposed by the Chancr of the Excheqr sanctioned by the Speaker; and if the conferences should prove satisfactory that your interference will not be requisite. The delay you have interposed is therefore, in substance and effect, a rejection of the application. What reception are the Committee to expect from the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker, when neither the merits of their case nor their personal characters could even obtain them an audience of the two leading Members of their own Profession? Until the receipt of your Letter the Committee entertained a confident opinion that you and the Solr-Genl. would have afforded them your best advice and your most cordial support, so far as you shd consider their resistance to the proposed measure founded on Justice and Public Policy, and that they wd have bn authorized to state your decided opinion on the subject to the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker. I need not observe to you what a mortifying disappointment it must be to the Committee to find themselves in such a case abandoned (I had almost said treated with contempt) by the Gentlemen placed at the head of their profession. I confess I did not expect that a mere application for an interview from the Gentlemen composing this Committee wd have experienced such a reception from you, as, with one exception, I believe there could not have been a more respectable selection of a Committee for the purposes entrusted to their management.

“I am, dear Sir,

“Your very obedient servt,

“JOSEPH KAYE.

“11th Jany., 1810.”

“The Attorney-Genl. and Solr-Genl. have not the slightest objection on their own account to seeing and communicating with the Select Committee of the Law Socy on Wednesday next, and hearing the reasons which they have to urge agst the regulation proposed by Mr. Perceval, but they are satisfied that the Committee will upon reflection feel how very improper it wd be for the Attorney and Solr-Genl., on an ex parte representation, to give a decided opinion upon a question which it may afterwards become their duty as Members of the House of Commons to examine and determine upon in Parl.

“They have felt no small degree of surprize that their motive for proposing to defer this meeting should have been so misconceived and so commented upon.

“The Solicitor-Genl. has another attendce on Wednesday, which obliges him to desire that this may stand for half after one.

“Russell Square.

“Jany. 12, 1810.”

The Committee prepared and sent to the Attorney-Genl. and Solr-Genl. the following letter :

“ TO THE ATTORNEY AND SOLR-GENL.

“ GENTLEMEN,

“ We have considered your communications to Mr. Kaye of the 11th and 12th inst., on the subject of our representation to the Chancr of the Excheqr and the Speaker, and as you think that it is not advisable that you should see us until after our communication with the Speaker and the Chancr of the Excheqr, we acquiesce in your judgment, trusting, however, that you will have the goodness to communicate with those gentlemen on the subject to promote the object we have in view.

“ We have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

“ Your obedt servants,

(Signed by the Committee.)

“ 17th Jany., 1810.”

The Secretary was directed to call another meeting of the Select Committee and to invite Messrs. Oddie, Arnold, and Frere, to attend the same, those gentlemen having prepared a memorial to the Chancr of the Excheqr on the foregoing subject, on behalf of themselves and other gentlemen not members of the Law Society.

At a meeting of the Select Committee at Wills' Coffee House, Serle St., on Friday the 19th January, 1810. Present:—

Mr. Kaye.	Mr. Frere (by invitation).	Mr. Sandys.
„ Forster.	„ Oddie. (do.)	„ Arnold (by invitation).

The manner of conducting the conference to be had with the Speaker and the Chancr of the Excheqr was discussed. Messrs. Oddie, Arnold, and Frere furnished the Committee with copies of the Memorial on the same subject, presented to the Chancr of the Excheqr by gentlemen who were not members of the Law Socy.

At a meeting of the Select Come at Alice's Coffee House, Westminster Hall, on Friday the 26th Jany., 1810, Mr. Kaye, Mr. Forster, and the Secretary attending, the following correspondence was read :

“ DEAR SIR,—I have seen the Speaker to-day, and he assures me that the duty which is intended to be imposed on the Clerks of the House is merely that which at present lies upon no one to perform, that it will be no more than what is deemed necessary for the security of those whom the Bills may affect, that it will not exclude the usual Parliamentary Agents from any part of their employment, that they may name what clerk they please for this

particular duty, and that the fees of such Clerk will be regulated. I take the earliest opportunity of sending you this information.

“Yours sincerely,
“V. GIBBS.

“*Sunday ev'g, Jany. 21st, 1810.*

“JOSH KAYE, ESQRE.”

“DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged by your communication of the result of your conversation with the Speaker, and I am extremely glad to hear that he is so favourably disposed towards our branch of the Profession. I, however, hope and trust it is his intention to see us on the subject, and to give us a copy of the proposed amended regulation, and allow us time to consider it before it is submitted to the House. May I entreat the favour of you to take an early opportunity of mentioning this expectation to the Speaker, and that you will inform me of his determination.

“Unless our rights are defined and protected by the words of the proposed Resolution, the intentions of the Mover (however favourable) will be of no service to us, and the inconvenience and injustice we have anticipated will certainly result from it. We also rely upon Mr. Perceval favouring us with an Interview before the measure in its amended state is submitted to the House. Will you have the goodness to inform him of this the first opportunity.

“I am, dear sir,

“Your faithful and obedient servant,

“JOSEPH KAYE.

“*Tokenhouse Yard, 22nd Jany., 1810.*

“MR. ATTORNEY-GENL.”

“*Russell Square,*

“*Wed. morng, Jany. 24th.*

“DEAR SIR,—The Speaker will certainly see you before the business of this regulation comes on. Mr. Perceval told me before that he intended doing it. I apprehend from the Speaker that the matter will be referred to a Committee, and that the form of the Resoln must be settled there. You will of course take measures for getting an appointment made with each of them.

“Yours sincerely,
(Signed) “V. GIBBS.”

“*Palace Yard, Wednesday,*

“*24th Jany., 1810.*

“SIR,

“I am directed by the Speaker of the House of Commons to acquaint you, that on Friday morning next, at 11 o'clock, he will be at liberty

to receive you and the other gentlemen named in the enclosed letter of Mr. Estcourt upon the subject of which that letter relates.

“ I have the honour to be, sir,

“ Your most obedient servant,

“ JNO. RICKMAN,

(Secy to the Speaker.)

“ To MR. JOSH KAYE.”

The Committee attended the Speaker accordingly.

At a meeting of the Select Committee held after their conference with the Chancr of the Exchequer on the 29th Jany, 1810, at which Mr. Sandys, Mr. Forster, and Mr. Kaye were present, it was resolved to make a report to the Society of the result of their conference with the Speaker and the Chancr of the Excheqr upon the matters referred to their management at the Genl. Meetings held on the 14th and 28th of Decr., and that the Secry be requested to convene a Genl. Meetg of the Society for Friday the 2nd Feb., at two o'clock, for the purpose of taking such report into consōn. The Secry was also requested to apply to Sir A. Piggott to appoint an hour for the following day for a conference with the under-mentd gentlemen and the Committee, namely :

Sir J. Romilly.

Mr. Adam.

Mr. Martin.

Mr. Leicester.

„ Leach.

„ Jekyll.

At a conference held at Sir Arthur Pigott's Chambers, on Tuesday the 30th Jany., at which the following gentlemen, in addition to the Committee, were present, namely, Sir A. Piggott, M.P., Mr. Henry Martin, M.P., Mr. Horner, M.P., and Mr. Leach, M.P., the Committee related the substance of their interviews with the Speaker and the Chancr of the Excheqr, and requested the assistance of those gentlemen in furthering the objects of the Society's representation.

At a Genl. Meeting of the Society held at the Freemasons' Tavern on Friday the 2nd Feb., 1810. Present :—

Mr. Sykes,

Mr. Alexander.

Mr. Vizard.

Mr. Humphreys.

in the Chair.

„ Williams.

„ Forster.

„ Sandys.

„ Kaye.

„ Hall.

„ Wharton.

„ Inge.

After the Minutes of the Genl. Meetings of the 14th and 28th Decr. were read, the report of the Select Committee was read and approved of, and it was resolved that it be referred to a Committee to consider and determine upon the best mode of establishing the regulations as proposed by the Speaker, without interfering in any degree with the Solicitors in the conduct of the business before the House, and to take such measures as they should think right for having the same submitted to the consideratn of the Committee of the House of Commons, to whom the subject was referred, and that this Committee consist of the same members as the last Select Committee.

At a meeting of the Select Committee held at Wells' Coffee House, on Sat. the 3rd Feb., 1810. Present :—

Mr. Kaye. Mr. Forster. Mr. Sandys. Mr. Lowndes.

The Committee prepared observations on the regulations proposed by the Speaker, and they directed a copy thereof, together with copies of the representn to the Speaker, and the Address submitted by Solicitors who were not members of the Society to the Chancr of the Excheqr, to be sent to fifteen members of the Committee of the House of Commons, accompanied by a letter offering to attend the Committee if required. These papers and letters the Committee divided and undertook to deliver to the members of the Committee of the House of Commons.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Freemasons' Tavern on Tuesday the 27th Feb., 1810. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt, Prolocutor, Mr. Loggen. Mr. Lee. Mr. Long.
in the Chair. ,, Kaye. ,, Brace. ,, Lowndes.

Dinner was ordered for one hundred gentlemen on Friday the 2nd March, at 7s. a head, and 1s. 6d. a head for dessert. The following gentn having been proposed at former meetings of the Committee as fit persons to become members of the Society were ballotted for and elected :

Mr. Crozus Raine, of King's Bench Walk.
,, Ralph Ellis, of Chancery Lane.
,, Jno. Winter, Jr., of Swithin's Lane.
,, Wm. Wightman, of Inner Temple Lane.
,, George Frere, of Lin. Inn.
,, Bryan Holme, of New Inn.
,, Wm. Wasbrough, of Warnford Court.
,, Benj. Brooks, of Lin. Inn.

The Committee took into consōn the Secry's accounts, and found that the Socy was possessed of £1000 Three per cent. Consols, Bank Annuities standing in the names of Messrs. Manley, Estcourt, and Smith, and that all dividends due thereon had been received. The Committee also found that the Secretary's receipts, including £22 13s. 11d., balance in his hands at the last account, amounted to £169 13s. 11d., and that his disbursements since the last Genl. Meetg, including the expense of the dinner on that day, amounted to £181 10s. 6d., leaving due to the Secretary a balance of £11 16s. 7d. The Committee then proceeded to nominate the Committee for the following year, and proposed the continuance of the same members as constituted the Committee for the last year, subject to the approbation of the Genl. Meeting.

At a General Meeting of the Society held at the Freemasons' Tavern on Friday the 2nd March, 1810. Present :—

Mr. Estcourt,	Mr. Foss.	Mr. Horton.
Prolocutor, in	„ Alexander.	„ Loxham.
the Chair.	„ Smith.	„ Rose.
„ Edge (Stewd).	„ Loggen.	„ Taunton.
„ Ellis (Stewd).	„ Chippendale.	„ Meredith.
„ Appleyard.	„ Edwards.	„ Battye.
„ Janneret (Stewd).	„ Seymour.	„ Sermon.
„ Taylor.	„ Hughes.	„ Raine.
„ Sweet.	„ Taylor.	„ Dyke.
„ Smith (Stewd).	„ Lowndes.	„ Windus.
„ Derby.	„ Lane.	„ Wharton.
„ Young (Stewd).	„ Blake.	„ Philpot.
„ Long.	„ Evans.	„ Aldridge.
„ Lee.	„ Atkinson.	„ Kaye.
„ Green.	„ Bartholomew.	„ Gatty, Junr.
„ Sandys.	„ Blandford.	„ Geldard.
„ Rashleigh.	„ Gaskell.	„ Chilton.
„ Crippage.	„ Hardisty.	„ Hodgson.
„ Richardson.	„ Ald. Hunter.	„ Thomas.
„ Jellis.	„ Kirkley.	„ Few.
„ Wright.	„ Smith.	„ Humphries.
„ Warburgh.	„ Murray.	„ McDougal.
„ Richardson.	„ Leigh.	„ Hughes.
„ Street.	„ Wood.	„ Smith.
„ Meggison.		

After the minutes of the former General Meeting and subseqt Committee meetings were read and confirmed, the thanks of the Society were ordered to be given to the Select Committee for the manner in which they had conducted the matters committed to their care, and it was resolved that the recomn of the Select Committee to the Speaker of the House of Commons and the Chancr of the Excheqr, the Report of the Committee to the Society, and the observations of the Committee upon the proposed regulations of the Speaker, be printed, and a copy sent to each of the Members of the Society.

At a meeting of the Committee held at Wills' Coffee House on Monday the 2nd April, 1810, Mr. Battye, Mr. Meggison, and Mr. Lane being present, the Committee being informed that the Master of the King's Bench had made a report to the Judges upon the subject of the Society's Memorial for an increase of the fees of Attorneys, it was resolved that the Secretary attend the Right Honble Lord Ellenborough, as Lord Chief Justice, to request that his Lordship would favour the Committee with an interview on the subject of the

Q

said report, and name a day for that purpose, and the Secy was ordered to report the day so named to the Committee accordingly.

At a meeting of the Committee at the same place on Friday the 4th May, 1810, the Committee being informed that Mr. Henry Poole Williams, of Warwick Court, Holborn, late clerk to Mr. Thomas Allan of London St., Fenchurch St., had during his clerkship practised as and sued in the name of an admitted Attorney, and had received the debt and costs recovered in the action so brought, it was resolved that a caveat be lodged agst his admission. The Committee did not find any other objectionable person in the list of those who had given notice of their intention to apply to be admitted in the followg Easter Term.

At a meeting of the Select Committee held in the Lobby of the House of Commons on the 28th May, 1810. Present:—

Mr. Kaye. Mr. Lowndes. Mr. Sandys. Mr. Forster.

The Committee received an intimation from a Member that the Committee of the House to whom the Private Bill Regulations were referred wd sit that day at two o'clock; the Committee met in order that if they should conceive the interests of the Profession affected by the proposed Regulations, they might suggest their objections before the Report was made to the House. They inspected a paper laid before them, entitled "Propositions for Private Bills, classed under six heads, viz. 1st, Regularity and notoriety of proceeding; 2, Examn of Bills and Breviates; 3, Committee proceedings; 4, Reports; 5, Ingrossments and passing; 6, Fee fund of Private Bill Office. The Select Committee offered some suggestions and alterations to the Committee of the House, which were adopted, and the Report was carried up the same day.

At a meetg of the Committee held at Wills' Coffee House on Wed. the 20th June, 1810. Present:—

Mr. Battye. Mr. Loggen. Mr. Jas. White.

The following gentlemen were proposed to become members of the Society: Mr. Chas. Jennings of 4 Elm Court, by Mr. Bolton. Mr. H. K. Swinford, Jno. St., America Square, by Mr. Wright, Paper Buildings, Temple. Mr. Geo. Palmer of Doughty St., by Mr. James White of Lincoln's Inn.

The Committee inspected the list of persons applying for admission in Trinity Term, and did not find any one objectionable except Mr. Chas. Pember of the Inner Temple, agst whose admission they directed a caveat to be lodged.

At a meetg of the Committee held at the same place on Friday, the 6th July, 1810. Present:—

Mr. Lowndes, in the Chair.	Mr. Hillyard.
„ Sykes (by invitation).	„ Meggison.
„ Alexander (do.)	„ Aldridge.
„ Lowe, William.	„ Battye.

The Committee took into consideration a list of fees which had been put up in the Master's Office, purporting to be the alterations in costs in the King's Bench, and the propriety of addressing the Judges upon the inadequacy of the proposed increase therein, but in consequence of the meeting being so thinly attended (8 members only being present), the Committee were of opinion that another meeting shd be held on the followg Thursday, the 12th July, to take the subject into further consōn. It was resolved to send a copy of the alterations to each member of the Committee, and to particularly request his attendance at the next meeting. The Secretary reported that he had made sevl applications for a copy of the Master's Report to the Judges, but had not been able to obtain the same, and that he wrote Mr. Justice Bayley askg for such copy, or that he wd receive a deputation from the Committee on the subject; and that on the 22nd June he had an interview with Mr. Justice Bayley, who informed him that the Memorial was not under his special consideration, nor had he the report in his hands.

At a meeting of the Committee of the Law Society held at Wills' Coffee House on Thursday, the 12th July, 1810. Present:—

Mr. Prolocutor,	Mr. Foss.	Mr. Lowe.
in the Chair.	„ Geldard.	„ Lee.
„ Lowndes.	„ Aldridge.	„ Wright.
„ Lane.		

The Committee resumed the consōn of the alterations in costs as authorised by the Court of King's Bench, but being informed that the Master had made a calculation of the fees upon a common enquiry, the Committee directed the Secretary to request the favor of the Master to allow the Society a copy of the particulars and amount of such increased fees, and the Committee accordingly postponed the consōn of future proceedings to Friday the 20th inst., at the Freemason's Tavern, at 8 o'clock in the eveng.

The Secretary reported that he had attended Lord Ellenborough at the time appointed to hear the objections to the admission of Mr. H. P. Williams, when his Lordship was pleased to suspend the fiat for his admission until he answered the matters of the affidavit made by the Plaintiff in the action which Mr. Williams had commenced and prosecuted during his clerkship. The Secretary also reported that he had lodged a caveat against the admission of Mr. Chas. Pember, who had not up to that time given any notice of his intention to apply for a Judge's fiat.

At a meeting of the Committee held at the Freemasons' Tavern, Friday the 20th day of July, 1810. Present:—

Mr. Kaye.	Mr. Lane.	Mr. Geldard.
„ Foss.	„ Lowe.	

The Committee proceeded to ballot for new members, when the following gentlemen were elected, viz. Mr. Chas. Jennings of Elm Court, in the Temple, Mr. George Palmer of Doughty Street. The ballot for Mr. Swinford was postponed on account of Mr. Wright (a member of the Committee) who proposed him being absent, Mr. Swinford not being personally known to any gentleman attending the Committee.

The Secretary reported that he had written to and attended the Master agreeably to the directions of the Committee, when the Master informed him that he had calculated the amount of the increase of the fees upon a common enquiry and postea; that the increase upon the enquiry amounted to about 8s., and upon the postea to about 14s., but that he intended to extend the one to 10s. and the other to £1. The Committee therefore repeated their former opinion, that the above increase of 10s. and £1 was totally inadequate to the just expectations of the profession, and referred it to the consideration of the next General Meeting, whether it would not be advisable to make a further representation to the Judges on the subject immediately after their return from the circuits, and to endeavour to obtain their determination previous to the meeting of Parliament, in order that if no adequate relief was granted by the Courts, the Society may submit their claims on behalf of themselves and of the profession generally to the consideration of Parliament.

The Committee took into consideration the Secretary's accounts, and found that his receipts since the last Genl. Meeting amounted to the sum of £155 5s. *od.*, and that his disbursements, including a sum of £11 16s. 7*d.* due to him upon the balance of the last account, and the expense of the dinner at the last Genl. Meeting, amounted to £ , leaving a balance due to the Secretary of the sum of £

The Committee also found that the Society was possessed of £1000 3 per Cent. Consols, and that all dividends due thereon had been received.

The Committee submitted to the Genl. Meeting, that in order to support the credit and respectability of the Society, and to defray the contingent expenses lately incurred in protecting and supporting the general interests of the profession, and to make provision for similar expenses in future, it wd be advisable to continue the subscription of the members at 2 guineas per annum, instead of one guinea each alternate year.

That the state of the arrears of the following gentlemen be submitted to the Genl. Meeting, with a recommendation from the Committee that the Secretary be directed to acquaint them, that unless the arrears are paid on or before the first day of next Michaelmas term, they wd be considered as no longer members of the Society:—

			£	s.	d.
Mr. Luttley, 6 years	10	10	0
„ Laing, 5 yrs and his admission fee	14	14	0
„ Ware, 5 years	9	9	0

The Secretary was requested to write to the gentlemen whose subscriptions were not pd up to the current year for payment of their arrears, intimating to them that unless they were immediately pd it wd be his indispensable duty to report them to the Genl. Meeting.

The Committee ordered dinner to be provided for 120 gentlemen at *7s. 6d.* each, exclusive of venison, and *2s.* each for dessert, and the stewards attending gave the necessary directions for the same.

APPENDIX.

THE Secretaries from 1740 to 1767.

The following paper found with the draft Minutes gives the names of and other particulars respecting the gentlemen who held the office of Secretary between the 11th July, 1740, and the 17th July, 1767.

		“ Secretary.	
1740, July 11.	Genl. Meetg.		Robert Barber, Esqre, appointed Secretary.
1741, June 18.	“ ”		Secretary to summon the Committee at the request of any one of the members thereof.
			Mr. Richard Wishaw acted as Deputy Secretary from that day to the 10th July, 1745.
1745, July 10.	“ ”		Mr. Prolocutor having acquainted the Society that Mr. Barber was desirous of resigning the office of Secretary, it was ordered that Mr. Richard Wishaw, the Deputy Secretary, do succeed him in the said office. Thanks returned to Mr. Barber for his care, in the Execution of his office.
1748, 22 Feb.	“ ”		Mr. Edward Bowman first acted as Assistant Secretary to Mr. Wishaw, and on that day recd many contributions from the Members.
1753, 20 July.	“ ”		Ordered that Mr. Richard Wishaw the Secretary do pay the Deputy Secretary £14 15s. 6d., ballance in his hands.
1754, 19 July.	“ ”		Mr. Attwood acquainting the Society that Mr. Wishaw desired to resign his office of Secretary, his resignation was accepted.
			Ordered unanimously that Mr. Edwd. Bowman, the present Deputy Secretary, do succeed him in that office, and be the Secretary of this Society. Ordered unanimously that the thanks of this Society be returned to Mr. Wishaw for his care in the faithful discharge of the Execution of his office, and that a copy of this order be forthwith sent to Mr. Wishaw.

1767, 17 July. Genl. Meetg. Mr. Edward Bowman, Junr., ordered to be Assistant Secretary.

Stewards from 1759 to 1772.

The following list gives the names of the gentlemen who attended to the arrangements for the Society's Dinners, selling the tickets, &c., from the year 1759 to 1775.

Members to be elected Stewards.

London.

	Francis Duroure	1759
	Thos. Bonnett	1760
	Wm. Jacomb	"
	John Edison	1761
	Abraham Winterbottom	1764
	Robt. Winbolt	"
	Saville Read	1767
	Wm. Bolton	1775
	Joseph Gibbs	"
23rd Feb., 1781	James Farrer	1766
	Gregory Geering	1769
	John Philpot	"
	Saml. Goodman	"
	Saml. Smith	1770
	John Hill Winbolt	1774

Middlesex.

	Thos. Goostry	1756
	Edwd. Inge	1758
	John Dagge	1763
	John Lane	"
	Nathaniel Geo. Petre	1764
	Antony Pye	1765
	Bateman Robson	1766
	Wm. Brown	"
	Saml. Cooper	1767
23 Feb., 1781	John Allen	1771
	Allatson Burgh	1772
23 Feb., 1781	Wm. Strong	1773
	John Buckle	1767
	Meredith Price	1770
	John Smith, Cha. Lane	"
	Robt. Smith, Castle Yd.	1772

In a rough draft of the foregoing list the following names appear struck out :

Thomas Constable, Jams. Hutchinson, Richd. Brown, Wm. Finch, John Irving, Joseph Hodges, and George Lowden or Lawden. Appended to this rough draft is the following list of names :

London.	Middlesex.
Messrs.	Messrs.
Lough Carlton.	John Kinderley.
Charles Higden.	John Claridge.
Joseph Newton.	John Elliott.
Thomas Potts.	Richard Edmunds.
Danl. Sill.	Christopher Norris.
Robt. Tudman.	Wallwyn Shepheard.

With the papers is a rough draft of a Memorial to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury about the Distribution of Irish Stamps, the Minutes relating to which are missing. The Memorial is in the name of the Society. The greater part of it is illegible, but it ends as follows :

"Your Memorialists beg leave to represent to your Lordships, that if such stamps were distributed by proper officers in this kingdom to be appointed for that purpose, it wd not only be of great utility to His Majesty's subjects, but would facilitate the business necessary to be transacted here concerning estates in Ireland, and they therefore hope that your Lordships will be pleased to take the same into consideration, and give such directions in relation thereto as to your Lordships shall seem meet."

There is also the following copy of a letter from Mr. John Robinson to Mr. Richd. Heron on the same subject :

"SIR,

"The Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have directed me to transmit for his Excellency, the Lord Lieutenant's informn, the Memorial of the Society of Practisers in the several Courts of Law and Equity, stating the inconveniences which arise from want of a place in England where stamps impressed pursuant to the laws of Ireland can be procured, and therefore desiring that directions may be given for the distribution of such stamps by proper persons in this kingdom.

"I am, &c.,

"JOHN RICHARDSON.

"*Treasury Chambers, 26 March, 1778.*"

The following letter addressed to the "Society of Practisers in the Courts of Law and Equity" gives the result of the action of the Society :

"GENTLEMEN,

"The Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have directed me to acquaint you, that they are informed by a letter from Mr. Heron, the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, dated the 8th inst., that, pursuant to your request contained in your Memorial, which was transmitted in my letter of the 26th March last, the Lord Lieutenant had directed the Commissioners of Stamps in Ireland to appoint Mr. John Hughes, Stationer, in Chancery Lane, to distribute Irish stamps.

"I am, Gentlemen, your most humble servant,

"JOHN ROBINSON.

"*Treasury Chambers, 28 May, 1778.*"

List of Members of the Society not upon the Committee.

The following list, which is endorsed "Members not upon the Committee," is undated, but was found with the draft Minutes for the years 1770 to 1780.

<p>A.</p> <p>John Allen. T. F. Abbott. Wm. Allen. Edwd. Allen.</p>	<p>D.</p> <p>Wm. Devon. H. Douce. Jonathan Dennett.</p>
<p>B.</p> <p>Thos. Bennett. Thos. Brooke. Fleetwood Bury. Allatson Burgh. Wm. Bolton. Jno. Berry of Meard Str., Soho. Thos. Bolton. Wm. Bullock. Herbert Brace. Giles Bleasedale. Geo. Buggin. Wm. Bardon. Jno. Berry, Southwark.</p>	<p>E.</p> <p>John Ellis. Richard Edmunds. Thos. Eames. Edmund Estcourt.</p>
<p>C.</p> <p>Chamberlayne, Wm. Saml. Cooper. Richd. Clark. John Clarridge. Henry Chalcraft. Richd. Collett. Crowder, Henry.</p>	<p>F.</p> <p>James Farrer, Bread Str. Hill. Francis Fairbank. Edwd. Smith Foss.</p>
	<p>G.</p> <p>Gregg, Francis, Senr. Gregory Geering. Francis Grogan. George Griffin. Abraham Greenwood. John Grubb. Wm. Gapper. Nathl. Green. Chas. Garland Greenwollers. Thos. Graham. Jas. Graham. Edwd. Grubb. Jesse Gregson.</p>

H.

Henry Holt.
 Michl. Hodgson.
 Chas. Hegden.
~~Wm. Hamilton.~~
 Thos. Hall.
 Jas. Hyde.
 John Hardcastle.
 Thos. Holloway.

I.

John Irving.
 Abel Jenkins.
 Jno. Jackson.
 Roger Jortum.
 David James.
 J. O. Jones.
 Gilbert Jones.
 Wm. Jones.
 John Inge.

K.

John Kinderley.
 Wm. Kirkby.

L.

Thos. Lloyd.
 Thos. Lowten.
 Thos. Land.
 Joseph Lyon.
 Richd. Lowndes.
 Wm. Loveridge.
 Thos. Liddington.
 Wm. Lawson.
 Robt. Long.
 John Leigh.

M.

Thos. Maberley.
 Thos. Meggison.
 Saml. Malbon.
 Rowland Maltby.
 Thos. Martin.
 Mayow Mayow.

John Millar.
 James Medowcroft.

N.

Nathl. Nicholson.
~~Christn. Norris.~~

O.

P.

Phillip Parry.
 George Petre.
 John Pardon.
 Antony Pye.
 Meredith Price.
 John Philpot.
 Antony Parkin.
 George Pearson.
 John Parker.
 Robt. Parnter.
 Benjn. Price.

R.

~~Wateman Robson.~~
 Thos. Rashleigh.

S.

~~Smith, John.~~
 James Winbolt.
 Thos. Wildman.
~~Skirrow, Jas.~~
 Danl. Sill.
 John Sauter.
 Wallwyn Shephard.
 Chas. Shephard.
 R. Shawe.
 Chas. Smart.
 Thos. Smith.
 Peter Still.
 Hannibal Sandys.

T.

Wm. Townsend.
 John Townshend.

V. John Vernon. U. W. Albany Wallis. Henry Wilmott. Wm. Welby. John Walton. Abraham Winterbottom.	Henry Townley Ward. John Watson. John Windus. Hugh White. Wm. Willey. Theo. Walford. John Winter. Thos. White. Jas. White. Edward Walter.
--	--

New Members.

The first of the following lists is dated July 1781, the second bears no date, but was found with the Minutes of about the same period.

"New Members proposed.

- Mr. James Winbolt of Tokenhouse Yard.
 Recomd by Mr. J. H. Winbolt.
 Mr. Wm. Bullock, Copthall Court.
 Recomd by Mr. Paruther.
 Mr. Joseph Lyon, No. 3 Coney Cot., Gray's Inn.
 Recomd by Mr. Fothergill."

"New Members proposed.

- Mr. Crowder, Pump Court, Temple, By Mr. Abbott.
 Mr. White, No. 8 Chancery Lane. Do.
 Mr. T. Smith, No. 9 Lincoln's Inn, New Sqr., By Mr. Wildman.
 Mr. T. Graham }
 Mr. J. Graham } No. 10 Lincoln's Inn, New Sqr. Do.
 Mr. Thos. Blofeld, Tookes Court, Castle Yd., By Mr. Windus.
 Mr. Still, Hare Court, Temple, By Mr. Abbott.
 Mr. Henry Chalcraft, Paul's Grave, Place, Temple, By Mr. Fothergill.
 Mr. Chas. Gwilt of Pump Court, Temple—Jno. Vernon, Junr."

The following drafts and copies of letters relating to meetings of the Committee in 1785-6, showing what matters were considered by the Committee in those years, have been found with the papers pinned togr in the order in which they are given here :

"Mr. Pardoe presents his compliments to Mr. Bowman, and thinks that the Committee should be summoned to meet on the business of the Society.

Feb 3."

This letter is endorsed : "Recd the above note the 6th Feb abt 10 in the morning.

W. B."

"Mr. Bowman again submits it to Mr. Pardoe if it wd not be proper to call a Committee of the Law Society forthwith, pursuant to the order made at the last Genl. Meeting, as the time for the Society's next meeting is now near at hand.

Jan. 31, 1786."

Under the above is written: "Feb. 1st. Left the original with Mr. Greenly to be given to Mr. Pardoe."

The following appears to be the rough draft of a letter, as it contains sevl alterations and erasures :

"SIR,

At the last Genl Meetg of the Law Society the Trunk containing the books and papers belonging to the Society were directed to be left in Mr. Greenly's custody, where they now remain. Mr. Windus has the money collected on that day. The Secretary recd the following direction: 'The Committee with the late Stewards to be summoned for the 18th July at 2 in the afternoon at Mr. Greenly's, the Comitte to be an open Committee.' The Secretary accordingly summoned the whole Committee and the late Stewards, when Messrs. Hodges & Skirrow of the Committee & Messrs. Windus (one of the late Stewards) and Estcourt only attendg, they adjourned the business of the Meeting sine die till there was an opportunity of a more full attendance. I am therefore requested to know when it will be proper to summon another Committee as it is now the time of making out the books &c. previous to the next Genl Meetg.

"I am, &c.

E. B. Secretary.

"Monday, Decr. 5, 1785.

Mr. Pardoe.

Left a copy hereof under seal at Mr. Greenly's, die dat. W. B.
12 Dec. Left a like copy for Mr. Fothergill with his servant. W. B."

"At a meeting of the Comitte at Mr. Greenly's, the Crown and Rolls Tavern in Chancery Lane, on Monday the 18th day of July, 1785. Present :—

Mr. Hodges, } of the Committee.
Mr. Skirrow, }
Mr. Windus, one of the Stewards.
Mr. Estcourt, a member,

and after waiting a considerable time and there not being a sufficient number present, they adjourned the Committee sine die next Term. Mr. Greenly is to keep the box in the meantime.

After the breaking up of the meetg I called on Mr. Cecil, he not being at home left word of the Adjournment. W. B."

*Loss of Minute Books, Minutes and Documents belonging to the Society.
A Statement by the Secretary.*

“ 1791, Monday.

July 11. Rose at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock, and going to look for the Law Society Trunk found to my great astonishment that the same was not in my apartment. Mrs. Brightwell coming up I Interrogated her whether she knew anything about it. She said she did not. I then asked abt it, she sayed she did not know anything about it, but remembered it was there on the Friday preceding when she cleaned my appartments. I then made the like enquiries in the House but without success. I searched everywhere that I cod think of. The trunk usually stood upon a little mahogany stand in the dining room. I had the keys lockd up in my Beaufet. Directly after I had breakfasted I drew up the annexed advertizement, which I carried to the printer of the DAILY Advertiser, and also of the Herald, who promised to insert it in to-morrow's papers.”

The contents of the Trunk are as follows :

- Three Quarto Green Books were in are entd the Minetts of the Society.
- A Book of the Names of the Members Alphabetically &c.
- A Bundle of Genl Minitts from Feb. 9, 1781, to the 25 Feb. 1791.
- A Copper plate for the Ticketts, and some Ticketts not filled up.
- A Copper plate for the Committee Lres, and some blank letters.
- A Copy book of my accounts as settled by the Committee, the ballance in my hands at the last settlement was £50 17s. 7d.
- A Bundlé of Stewards' Returns from the year 1776.
- A Copy book containing the Members' names from whom I had received Contributions.
- A smaller Do.
- A small bundle of Acts of Parliament.

The following is a copy of the advertisement referred to :

“ Lost, on Saturday last, out of the first floor of No. 22, Great Portland Street, Oxford Street, a Leather Trunk containing books and papers, which can be of no use to any one but the owner, whoever will bring the Trunk and its contents to Mr. Wm. Bowman, No. 22, Great Portland Street, Oxford Street, shall receive one Guinea reward.”

On the back of this advertisement is the following endorsement :

	£	s.	d.
“ 11 July 1791.			
Incerted this Advertizement in the <i>Herald</i>	6	0	
Do. in the <i>Daily</i>	4	0	
Paid the reward	1	1	0
Coucher	2	6	
	1	13	6 ¹¹

The Society's Accounts.

"An Account of the money raised by the Subscriptions, and how the same has been applied.

Receipts.

						£	s.	d.
By the 1st Subscription, 1752	323	8	0
By the 2nd " 1758	224	14	0
By the 3rd " 1760	422	2	0
						<u>970</u>	4	0

Dividends received.

						£	s.	d.
1754, 14 Feb. half a yr. on £150	2	5	0
" 19 Sep. " "	2	5	0
1755, 17 Feb. " "	2	5	0
" 30 July " on £200	3	0	0
1756, 28 Jan. " "	3	0	0
" 31 July " "	3	0	0
1757, 29 Jan. " "	3	0	0
" 31 July " "	3	0	0
1758, 3 Feb. " "	3	0	0
" 31 July " "	3	0	0
1759, 8 Feb. " "	3	0	0
" 1st Aug. " "	3	0	0
1760, 28 Jan. " "	3	0	0
" 25 July " "	3	0	0
1761, 24 Jan. " "	3	0	0
						<u>42</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>
						Total reced	1012	19 0
						Total paid	1003	11 8
							<u>9</u>	<u>7 4</u>

Balance in the Secretary's hands

Besides £200 3 per Cent. Bank Annuities."

Payments

For Bank Annuities.

						£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1753, 7th Aug. for £150	do.	156	11	6			
1655, 17 Feb. for £50	do.	50	4	6	206	16	0

To Mr. Mason.

1755, 1st March	40	0	0			
1757, 6 May	30	0	0			
1759, 19 Feb.	50	0	0			

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1760, 22 March	20	0	0			
„ 10 May	30	0	0			
„ 17 Decr.	126	0	0			
„ 22 „	42	0	0			
1761, Jan. 13	32	0	0	370	0	0

Other payments on the Scriveners' account per Mr. Bowman.

1752, May 27, Copy of the Scriveners' Charter	3	6	8			
1753, 31st Mar., Pd. Mr. Alexander	6	3	10			
1756, 31st Dec., Copy Lds. Journal	3	6	8			
1758, 11 Nov., Paid Mr. Cooke	21	0	0			
1759, 25 June, Paid Debt and Costs Alexander's cause	64	7	6			
1760, 4 June, Bill at Paul's Head	13	16	6			
„ 4 Nov., „	18	8	0			
„ „ at King's Arms	1	11	6			
„ 17 Decr., Do. Devil Tavern	6	12	6			
1761, 22 Jan., Do. at the Paul's Head	45	8	6			
„ Gave Counsels' Clerks	3	13	6			
„ Printg and Advertizmts	2	12	6			
„ Letters of Attorney, &c.	13	0		191	0	8
For plate, &c., presented to the Society's Council				157	10	0
To the Secretary collecting Subscriptions at 6d. in the pound on £970				24	5	0
To Do. for his trouble attending Special General Meetings, Committees, Tryals, &c., on the business with the Scriveners' Compy, receiving dividends and petty expenses allowed him for 9 years, at per year £6						
Total				54	0	0
				£1003	11	8

With the papers were also found the following notes apparently written by the Secretary with reference to the Accounts.

“ 19 Jany., 1754.

(23 Feb., 1770.) The Secretary acquainting the Society that Mr. Hen. Barnes (in whose names jointly with Mr. Southouse and Mr. Fothergill the £200 3 per Cent. Annuities belonging to the Society now stand) is dead.

Ordered that Mr. be added as a trustee in the room of the said Mr. Henry Barnes.

Ordered that after the sale of the said sum of £ 3 per Cent. Anns., that the said Secrety do procure the remainder of the said £200 3 per Cent. Bank Annuities to be transferred in the joint names of the said Mr. William Southouse, Mr. Henry Fothergill, and Mr. , and that they accept the same, and execute a Declaration of Trust that such annuities standg in their names are for the use of the Society.

Ordered that the sd Bank Annuities when transferred and accepted, and the Dividends to arise therefrom be from time to time subject to the orders and resolutions of the Society at their General Meetings.

Ordered that the said Wm. Southouse, Henry Fothergill, and do execute a Letter of Attorney to empower the Secretary in their names to accept the said Bank Annuities, and from time to time to receive the Dividends which shall arise and become payable on account thereof.

It appearing to the Committee on auditing the Secretary's accounts that there is due to him a ballance of .

C: 18 Feb., 1771. Resolved that it is the opinion of this Committee, That to discharge that ballance and to defray the future expenses of the Society the sum of part of the £200 3 per Cent. Bank Annuities now standing in the names of Messrs. Wm. Southouse, Henry Barnes, and Henry Fothergill, in the Books of the Govr. and Company of the Bank of England, be forthwith sold, and the money arising by such sale paid into the hands of Mr. Edwd. Bowman the Secretary.

22 Feb. 1771. It appearing by the minits of the Committee of the 22nd inst., that the sum of is due to the Secretary on the ballance of his accounts, and that for the purpose of defraying the future expenses of the Society, the Committee are of opinion the sum of part of the said £200 3 per Cent. Bank Annuities belonging to the Society be forthwith sold.

Resolved and ordered that for the purpose of discharging the said ballance due to the Secretary, and for raising a present Fund for defraying the future expences of the Society, the sum of , part of the said £200 3 per Cent. Bank Annuities, now standing in the names of Messrs. Wm. Southouse, Henry Barnes, and Hy. Fothergill, in the Books of the Govr. & Co. of the Bank of England, be forthwith sold, and that the money arising by such sale be paid into the hands of Mr. Edw. Bowman the Secretary.

Ordered that Mr. Edw. Bowman the Secretary do procure a proper Letter of Attorney to be executed by Messrs. Southouse and Fothergill, who have survived the said Hy. Barnes, empowering him to sell and transfer the said sum of £ 3 per Cent. Bank Annuities."

In a book kept by the Secretary givg an account of subscriptions recd by him in pursuances of the orders of the Society, appears the following copy of a resolution passed at the Genl. Meeting on the 22nd Feb., 1771, the Minutes of which meeting are missing.

“At a Genl. Meeting of the Society of Practicers in the Courts of Law and Equity, at the Devill Tavern at Temple Barr, on Friday the 22nd Febr., 1771

Ordered that (agreeable to the resolution of the Committee at their last meeting) the respective members of this Society do forthwith pay into the hands of Mr. Edwd. Bowman the Secry half a guinea each to discharge the debts mentioned in the Committee's Minutes of that day, and to defray the future expenses of the Society.

The Secretary received the respective half guineas from the Members then present.

Ordered that the Secretary do wait on the absent members for payment of their respective half guineas.”

From the same book it appears that a similar order to the above was made at the General Meeting of the Society on the 25th Feb., 1778, the Minutes of which meeting are also missing. The Secretary in accordance with this resolution recd their half guineas from fifty-three members then present, and he was ordered to wait on the absent members for payment of their respective half guineas, and report to the Society at their next Genl. Meeting the names of those members who had not paid, or refused or declined to pay.

At the Genl. Meeting of the Society on the 24th July, 1778, laid before the Society a list of the Members who had not paid up to that time, and he was ordered to wait on such Members, and report to the next Genl. Meeting the names of those who refused or declined to pay.

The following list is, in all probability, that referred to in the Minutes above quoted. This list, however, bears no date.

Members' Names.	Places of Abode.	What Answers Given.
Raincock, John.	Old Jewry.	Retired.
Eyre, Joseph.	Christ's Hospital.	Will have nothing to do with the Subscription.
Edison, John.	Cooper's Hall, Basinghall St.	} Will not subscribe.
Goodman, Saml.	Ely Place, Hol- bourne.	
Jemmett, George.	Pudding Lane, by the Monument.	} Lives at Ashford in Kent.
Nash, Wm.	Lord Mayor's Cot. Office.	
Cecil, James.	Norfolk St., Strand.	Says that being lame, and not going out, he had declared off being a Member this 4 or 5 years, therefore declines pay the subscription.

R

Bliss, James.	Tooley St., Southwark.	} Not as yet admitted a Member.
Maberly, Thos.	Christ's Hospital.	Called sevl times, but was allways told he was ill.
Heathcote, Robt.	Radcliff Highway.	Called at Peale's Coffee House, but as yet have not mett with him.
Higdon, Chas.	Currier's Hall, London Wall.	Declines giving an Answer till he has spoke to Mr. Edison abt it. Pd at ye ffeast.
Le Briton, Thos.	St. Martin's Lane, Cannon St.	} Called sevl times, but cod not see him.
Lee, George.	Queen St., Cheap- side.	} Is very ill or dead.
Mainwaring, Thos.	Bartlett's Bldg.	Pd.
Newton, Joseph.	Aldermanbury.	13 Feb., 1782, Said he was going out of town for a fort- night, and desired I wd call again.
Venables, Lazarus.	Threadneedle Strt.	Called, but have not yet mett with him.
Winbolt, Robt.	Tokenhouse Yd.	Will consider of it. Son pd for at ye ffeast.
Wright, Major.	Welleclose Sqr.	Called at Brown's Coffee House, but as yet have not met with him.
Grubb, John.		Don't know where he is to be found.
Inge, John.	Brook Str., Hanover Sq.	} Sald he wod consider of it.
Jackson, John.	Fludyer St., West- minster, but his office in Stan- hope Str., Clare Market.	} Have not yet been able to see him, altho I have called sevl times.
Kaye, Willm.	Hanover St.	Do.
Lane, John.	King St., Covent Garden.	} Qy the son.
Morgan, John.	Bedford Sqr.	Called sevl times, but never cod find him at home.
Petre, Nath. G.	Serle Str., Lincoln's Inn.	} Called sevl times, but have not yet seen him, being, as I am informed, out of town.

Partington, Thos. Whalley.	Brook Strt., Gros- venor Sqr.	} Do.
Partis, Fletcher.	Thrift St., Soho.	
Reynolds, John.	Adelphi Bldgs.	Do.
Wilmott, Henry.	Bloomsbury Sq.	Desired I wd call again.
Walker, Jas.	Bream's Bldgs., Cha. Lane.	} Called several times, but have not as yet seen him. Paid by Mr. Skirrow.
Adams, Thos. Patience.	Pump Cot., Temple.	
Hunt, Chas.	Gray's Inn.	} Do.
Baxter, Stafford, Senr.	Furnival's Inn.	
Bury, Fleetwood.	Clifford's Inn.	Called sevl times, but have not as yet seen him.
Hobson, Chrstr.	Clifford's Inn.	Do., is in Huntingdonshire.
Bayley, Carey.	New Inn.	
Sauter, John.	Do.	Said he wod send if he chose to subscribe.
Cowper, Thos.	Symond's Inn.	
Peal, Joshua.	Do.	
Watson, Geo.	Do.	
Ellers, Geo.	Do.	Will consider of it.
Vernon, John, Jr.	No. 10, Lincoln's Inn, New Sqr.	} Called sevl times, but as yet have not seen him. Pd at ye ffeast.

The following letter addressed to Mr. Fothergill, is from one of the members mentioned in the foregoing list, and refers to the non-payment of his subscription :

" SIR,

"I received a letter last post from Mr. Bowman, the Secretary to the Law Society, inclosing me copies of four resolutions all made since I left London respecting a subscription of 1 Ga. by each member of the Society, and in the last of them mentioning the Secretary's report of answers received from the several members who had not paid their subscriptions, & a direction to the Secretary to write (among others) to me to know my final Determination about the subscription, and also about my continuing any longer as a member of the Society no application has been ever made to me, nor have I ever heard of the proposed Subscription, save by the above letter, therefore Mr. Secretary must be under some mistake if he has reported any answer as from me I shall very cheerfully contribute my Guinea, and will order my Agent, Mr. Pickering, to pay it, but as I am now resident too far from the Metropolis to have it in my power to attend the several meetings of the Society, I request that my name be discontinued, & I trust that at the next

meeting of the Society an Order will be made that my Name be erased from the Minutes of the 28th of Feb., where it undeservedly stands in a Light equally unfavourable & unpleasant to me.

“ I conclude with my best wishes for the prosperity of the Law Society, and

“ I am wh great Esteem, Sir,

“ Yr most obedt servt,

“ GEO. JEMMETT.

“ *Ashford, 27 May, '83.*”

“ A STATE OF THE DEBT TO THE LAW SOCIETY.”

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
To ballance remaing in the Secretary's hands						
the 21st Feb., 1785				32	1	8
25 Feb., 1785, Recd by the Ticketts dispd of ...	40	10	0	} 66	2	6
„ Recd by 2 Collection (50) ...	12	10	0			
„ Recd by 5 New Members ...	13	2	6			
				98	4	2
pd the Porter of Clifford's Inn	10	6				
pd the Butler of „ „	10	6				
pd the Kitchen Maid	5	0				
pd Coachire to and from the Hall, &c.	3	0				
pd for a New book to enter the Accounts in			6			
Paid for 200 Ticketts for the next Feast		6	0			
paid for 200 Letters for „		7	0			
4 Lists of the Members in Books for the Stewards		12	0			
paid for 4 books for the Lists		1	0			
4 Lres to the Stewards for their first meeting and Messenger		4	6			
Directing the Lres, filling up the Ticketts and Numbering them	2	2	0			
4 Lists for the Stewards to whom to send Letters and Ticketts		10	0			
4 Lres to the Stewards for their 2d meeting and Messenger		4	6			
2 Lists for the Stewards to collect by at the Feast 1785, 24 June, 24 Letters to the Committee and Messenger		4	0			
4 Letters to the Stewards for their 3d Meeting and Messenger		4	6			
Entering the Minitts of the last Genl. Meeting		7	0			
Petty expenses		8	0			

General Business.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1785, 25 Feb., Attendg the Genl. Meet'g ...	13		4			
Drawing up the Minitts and attendg the Pro- locutor therewith	10		0			
June 1st, Attendg the Steward's 1st Meeting ...	6		8			
„ 15, Attendg the Steward's second Meeting	6		8			
„ 27, Attend'g the Committee	6		8			
„ 29, Attend'g the Steward's third Meeting	6		8			
Extra trouble in the Society's affairs since the last General Meeting	2	2	0	12	0	0
Total due to the Society, 1st July, 1785	...			<u>£86</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>

A TRIAL
BEFORE THE HONOURABLE
SIR WILLIAM MORETON, Kt.,
RECORDER OF THE CITY OF LONDON,
AT
THE GUILDHALL OF LONDON
BETWEEN
SIR THOMAS HARRISON, Kt.,
CHAMBERLAIN OF THE CITY, PLAINTIFF,
AND
WILLIAM SMITH, ESQ., DEFENDANT,
ON AN ACTION BROUGHT BY THE
COMPANY OF SCRIVENERS,
AGAINST
THE ATTORNIES,
December 11th, 1760.

JURY.—SWORN.

Thomas Gyles, St. Martin's Lane, Merchant.
William Sheldon, Bishop's Gate Street, Merchant.
George Prescott, Coleman Street.
Thomas Boheme.
Peter Deschamps.
Matthew Gale.
John Dorien.
George Udney.
Silvanus Grove.
Thomas Thomas.
John Wombwell.
William Devismer.

MR. ROUND :—

May it please you, Mr. Recorder, and you, Gentlemen of the Jury.— This action is brought against Mr. Smith for exercising the art and mystery of a Scrivener, not being free of the City of London, and it is founded on a By-law of the said City made by the Court of Common Council, wherein amongst other things It is enacted, that no person not being free of the City of London by himself, or any other employ'd by him, is to exercise any art or mystery whatsoever within the said city—

Gentlemen, the Plaintiff states that the Defendant knowing the said act of Common Council, and not being free of the City of London, did use the Art or Mystery of a Scrivener in the said City, and thereby becomes liable to the Penalty : and, Gentlemen, he has refused to pay it.

MR. SERJEANT HEWITT :—

Gentlemen of the Jury, I am of Council in this Cause for the Plaintiff ; and this Action is brought against Mr. Smith in order to recover a penalty of Five pounds for his following the trade of a Scrivener.

The intention of this Action is to try whether this Gentleman is allowed to follow the mystery of a Scrivener within the City of London not being free thereof.

Sir Thomas Harrison is the Plaintiff, in whose name by the By-law the Action is brought, and as to the Defendant Mr. Smith, nothing is brought in particular with respect to him, he is only singled out as a person proper to try the Cause with.

Gentlemen, the foundation of this Action is a By-law of the City of London, of which we have heard a great deal ; it is an ancient By-Law, founded on an ancient Custom of the City, it was made on the 4th July, 1712, founded by an ancient Custom of the City by which Foreigners were hindered from following any Art or Mystery within the City.

Gentlemen, there are three things upon which the Cause will absolutely depend.

1. The By-Law itself.
2. Whether there is such an Art and Mystery as this of a Scrivener within the City of London, and what that Art and Mystery is. And that second point will be *the great Point of the Cause*. And what that Art and Mystery is I shall endeavour to prove by giving you a certain, clear and manifest definition of it, about which there can be no doubt at all.
3. Which will be a matter of course, and that is whether the Defendant has done that Act which we say is the property of a Scrivener to do, if he has then most certainly he has forfeited the five pounds.

1. With respect to the By-Law itself there can be no objection to it. The validity of it can't be questioned; there can be no legal objection to it, nor can there be any objection to it in reason ; but if there is no legal objection to it, that is enough to warrant it a good By-law. It is "dated the fourth of July,

“1712, & it enacts that no person after the feast of the Arch-angel shall by any colour, device or means, whatever directly, or indirectly, use or exercise any handicraft whatsoever, on pain of forfeiture of the sum of five pounds for every such offence,” and then it says that the forfeiture shall be recovered by the Chamberlain, so that, Gentlemen, you see upon contents of the By-Law the material Points are, the Person that incurs the fine must not be free of the City; it must be the following, the Trade of some Art and Mystery in the City; and if this be the case it is a matter of course, he incurs the penalty of five pounds.

Gentlemen, I don't wonder that the City of London should make such a By-Law as this, it is the Guardian and Bulwark of this great City; the City of London has ever been in the greatest and highest esteem and consequence, the greatest and the highest Compliments are paid to it; it is call'd *the Epitome of the Kingdom*, and the Law-Books abound with Compliments that were paid to it, and at the time when she did not so signally ride Mistress of the World as she does a present, and her Franchises were such as will ever be regarded.

I say, Gentlemen, that with respect to the By-Law there can be no doubt in the world but what it is a good and equitable By-Law; the Question will be whether the present Defendant has offended against this By-Law.—That brings me to the second particular—

2. Whether there is in the City of London such an Art and Mystery as a Scrivener, and what that Art and Mystery is.

Gentlemen, with respect to that matter it can I should think hardly be made question of on the other side. Books are full of it; Records are full of it; One can hardly turn one's eyes anywhere but one sees the name of Scrivener. The Company of them has been honourable in the City, however that there has been such an Art and Mystery is no doubt, and this second matter of evidence we shall lay before you will not only shew that there has always been Scriveners, or writers of the Court Letter, but likewise what that art and mystery is. The name of Scrivener or Writer of the Court Letter has subsisted time out of mind, the Evidence we shall show you will not only prove to you that there has been such persons, but likewise what that Art and Mystery is, and the Art and Mystery consists in making and preparing all deeds and instruments to be sealed, that I say is the definition, and it will be supported by the Evidence we shall lay before you.

Gentlemen, to prove this matter, which we shall lay before you, we shall go a little in antiquity, and bring it up to present times. And the first Evidence will be in the 47 year of Edw: 3. 1375; we shall shew you there that upon a Bill put up to the Lord Mayor by the writers of the Court Letter (Scriveners were so called at that time), and it will there appear that they were call'd by the name of *Common Scriveners or Writers of the Court Letter of the City of London*—And this Bill thus put up to the Corporation of the City of London is after this manner—“To the honorable Sirs The Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London Prayen the Scriveners of the Court Letter within the

“said City—That where their Mystery is very necessary within the said City
 “especially if it be uprightly and sagely by men expert in the same Mystery
 “ruled and used. And for default of good rule many mischiefs be and often
 “do arise in the said mystery by them that come out of diverse Countries
 “into the said City as well Chaplains as others that have no knowledge of
 “the Customs, Franchises and usages of the said City

“and cause themselves to be called Scriveners, and take upon them to make
 “Charters and deeds to be sealed.” It says that Chaplains and others did
 this. Learning at that time was very much among the Clergy, well these
 persons took upon them to do what broke in upon the sd Scriveners. They
 caused themselves to be call’d Scriveners, and took upon them to make
 Testaments, Charters, and all other things belonging to the said Scriveners.
 Why then it shews that the Mystery consisted in making Charters at that time
 and other things, these things are all other Deeds or Instruments to be sealed.
 In another part of this it says, Item, that all Scriveners shall put their names
 to the writings which they make, that they may be known as their Deeds. In
 another place it says that they be received into the same franchises and found
 able, for what? why to make and prepare deeds and instruments; to make
 Charters and Deeds of that kind, to which points and articles aforesaid, the
 aforesaid Scriveners used to put their names, and date it at London, which
 ought not to be used to Lands laying out of London, and a while after it was
 Counciled by the sages of the Realm, &c.

Now, Gentlemen, by this very evidence it appears that Scriveners were
 employed in making and preparing testaments, charters, deeds or instruments
 to be sealed. The persons are to be examined, they are to put their names to
 them, they are to be dated in London if they lay in London, if not they are to
 be dated out of London, there cannot be a more certain evidence than what
 this is; and this evidence speaks with more certainty and precision than ten
 thousand Witnesses.

The next evidence we shall lay before you is an Ordinance of 1390, and the
 oath of a Scrivener as used at that time of day, and likewise the oath of other
 Persons that were free of the City of London that were not free of the
 Scriveners’ Company, and these oaths will also speak with more certainty and
 precision than the piece of Evidence I have opened to you. Gentlemen, it is
 in this manner that every one that shall be duly infranchised in the Art and
 Mystery of a Scrivener, shall make especially this Oath following, charging
 himself therewith in the presence of the Wardens of the same Company, and
 whosoever shall not do the same, he shall be presented to the Mayor as
 a Rebel—

“I, A. B., do swear of my own voluntary will upon the holy Evangelists by
 “my bodily hand touch’d to be true in my Office of Scrivenship, or writer of
 “the Court Letter, and that all the Writings which I shall make to be sealed,

“shall be well and lawfully made, and moreover that I shall not suffer any writing bearing date long before the making thereof or *close letter* bearing date any long time after, whereby any untruth may be felt of my conscience, but word for word by good examination; and I shall not take upon me to make any feat touching great charge without advice first obtained of Council; and all the good Rules and Ordinances of the said ordination I hereby promise to observe, so help me God, and all the Saints, and holy contents of this book.”

Now, Gentlemen, please to observe that the person is to do his utmost that the writings shall be lawfully made; that he shall not suffer any manner of writing bearing date at a far distant place or anything of that sort.

It is the best guard to prevent any deceit or fraud, sometimes things are dated at a different place than where they were made or a different period of time, Fraud has generally one of these characters; for my own part, I never saw a thing more calculated to prevent fraud and deceit, it is the best guard upon the properties of the People.

What does the Oath import besides? but that the person is to make the deed, it is to be made according to his best reason and cunning, and where he has any reason of doubt it is to be made by Advice of Counsel, where there may be many difficulties, and he not sufficient and equal to them.

Now, Gentlemen, this Oath does as clearly as words can express, declare explicitly and with precision what the business of a Scrivener was at that time of day, for to be sure the Oath must be adapted to it, why this Oath is adapted to the carrying on that business, and does in so many words say that *the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener is preparing Writings & deeds to be sealed—*

The next piece of evidence I shall mention to you is another Oath, which is of those persons who were not free of the Scriveners' Company, but were free of other Companies, and that is in fo. 4 of the same * Commen-paper.

The oath of those who are enfranchised in other Companies, & at the same time use the Art & Mystery of Scriveners or Court letter writers.

“You shall swear that all the deeds you shall make, shall be well and faithfully done, and especially you shall not write or suffer to be written by any belonging to you Deeds bearing date long before the making thereof, or any blank Charters, Deeds or Writings sealed bearing date after the making thereof, &c.”

Now this, and much to the same purpose, shews, that he is to be the maker & former of them, and in all doubtful matters he is to do it by advice of Council.

These two pieces of evidence not only shew you that Scrivenership was an Art and Mystery existing in those ancient times, but it shews with certainty what that is.

We shall then read to you 15 Richard 2; 19 Richard 2; 18 Henry 6, and

* An Ancient Book so called belonging to the Scriveners' Co.

13 Henry 7. These are entries in the Books belonging to the City of London, or the Books belonging to the Scriveners' Company, speaking of them as an Art and Mystery, still calling them Scriveners or profession of the art and mystery of the Court Letter, and this I do only to bring them down to more modern times, and shew that this is the same as a Scrivener in the year 1557.

There is an Ordinance by which it is provided that no person shall, unless they have served one year apprentice, witness deeds, because it is very well known, that persons whose deeds are witnessed by such as cannot be found again are liable to great trouble.

Gentlemen, when we have laid before you these pieces of evidence we shall then come to the present Charter of the City of London, which is in the 14th year of K. James 1st.

It has been a Company time out of mind, but as most Corporations have Charters given them and a new Corporate Name; so the present Scriveners' Company who were I think called by another name before, they are composed of a Master, two Wardens, together with the Court of Assistants, and they are there incorporated by the name of Master Wardens and Assistants of the Society of Scriveners of the City of London, and that recounts that whereas the freemen of the City of London using the Art and Mystery of Scriveners, commonly called Writers of the Court Letter, for times past and for time out of mind have been an ancient Company and fraternity.

Why then these persons that we call Scriveners, these persons who you see in 47 Edw. 3 were those very persons who we see are now the Scriveners of the City of London, and this Charter is very remarkable for another Clause in it which I beg leave particularly to recommend to your attention, fo. 38 it says

.

and moreover of our abundant grace and favour we will and grant unto the said Master Wardens and Assistants full and whole power and authority of search, survey, examination, correction, punishment and government, as well and principally within the City of London as three miles round the same, using and frequenting the said science, or publickly and openly making or writing any evidence, Charter, deed or writing to be sealed within the said City, Liberties, or suburbs aforesaid.

Now, Gentlemen, you see by this in words as precise and declaratory of the definition as can possibly be that the Art and Mystery of a Scrivener consists in the making and writing any evidence, charter, deed, or writing to be sealed.

Gentlemen, this too will fully prove, when we look into the Oath that has been established in consequence of this Charter, and the Oath at present taken by the Scriveners.

“I, A. B., do swear to be truly faithful to the Kings of England, and to do

“my diligence that all my deeds shall be well and truly done, and shall be
 “duely and advisedly wrote upon before the sealing of the same, and that I
 “will not suffer any deed or writing to be sealed wherein any deceit or falshood
 “shall be conceal’d, nor bearing any date of long time past, or of long time to
 “come, and neither for haste or covetousness I shall take upon me to make
 “any deed touching inheritance of Lands or estate of Life or any deed of
 “great charge whereof I have not knowledge, and all Rules and Statutes of
 “the City of London I shall and truly observe and keep.

Now, Gentlemen, from this Charter and this Oath I think this clearly and manifestly appears, that those persons who in the 47th year Edw. 3 were call’d writers of the Court Letter, and existed as a known distinct set of People, are the same identical persons (except the natural changes which such a length of time makes in Bodies and Men) as are incorporated in this Charter. And this also I think appears as clearly, that these persons so incorporated, are the same persons as it were that now act under this Charter, and take the Oath which I have just now read to you this very day. They were the persons who by their business and oath made properly deeds and writings to be sealed, they were the persons that from time to time prepared and put these guards upon the members of the Society, and it wou’d be well and it is really for the benefit of the community, that these persons shou’d be under some regulation. In this manner Men every day trust their fortunes in the hands of people that make Deeds of Conveyancing, that these persons that every Man trust his all with shou’d be continually under this check ; so many deeds would not have appeared false and wrong if this method was always followed.

These were Writers of the Court Letter anciently so call’d, a name taken up by them, this several instruments and orders which I have mentioned rising out of the depth of antiquity, which one can but just see the dead of. Why Writers of the Court Letter but because they are writers of that set hand which is established by the wisdom of this Country, and appointed to be continued for ever ; and a thing that is to endure for ever till Society itself dissolves shou’d be written in a character to last for ever ; look into the records at the Tower, they are just as legible as if written but yesterday : thus it is with writing a certain known invariable character, it will always remain so ; look into the ancient pieces of evidence five hundred years ago, just as legible as if they were wrote but yesterday by a Man, once inform’d of the Character ; it will never alter.

Now there are as many different hands as there are writers, that in all human probability the writings of the present times will not be legible, therefore you see the name itself imports the utility of it, and has sprung out of the deepest antiquity, the writers of the Court Letter had their name when that Court Letter was first established, and tho’ indeed there has been even in our memory a difference in writing the Records, yet every man holds his Estate in that hand, which is intended to last as long as the land itself. Therefore I say, Gentlemen, when you compare this with everything that appears in

the Cause, it will appear evident that there has been such a Society existing.

My Lord Cooke says, "It is no question but that the business of a Scrivener "is an Art, Mystery or manual occupation." In short, the Books of the Law are full of the same thing ; begin where you will, you will still find this. And this great Sage of the Law has declared, "that without question it is an Art, "Mystery or manual occupation."

Gentlemen, having laid this case before you, we will give you an account how this Business has been employed. They have always been employed about making Deeds and Writings to be sealed, & I think upon the whole there will be the clearest and closest evidence that can possibly be laid before a Jury to prove that there ever has been an Art and Mystery of the Scriveners in the City of London, & that the preparing Deeds to be sealed is that Art & Mystery.

Gentlemen, that is the second point I mentioned, & if that is established I think there will be very little remaining. The third is:—

Whether the Defendant, Mr. Smith, has done that Act which we say is the property of a Scrivener.

I know the Gentlemen will make no doubt about that, it is a conclusion not to be avoided Granted.

He has then followed the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener & has incurred the penalty, it will follow as a certain consequence. It is not laid down that Mr. Smith nor any person is not to follow the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener, but they are not to do it in the City of London; it is the law of the place, & binds as much as an Act of Parliament. Any man that comes into the City or into any Society, the moment he enters it he submits to put himself under that constitution. There is no hardship in it, they having nothing to do but to make themselves free of the City; many worthy Gentlemen who I have seen, & know many of them, whom it would be an honour to see introduced into the honours of the City.

We have now made this clearly out, that the Art and Trade has for ever existed; the consequence will be that Mr. Smith has been guilty of this offence, & consequently has incurred the Penalty.

EVIDENCES

ON THE SIDE OF THE PLAINTIFF.

The Petition to the Lord Mayor, 1375, is certainly as Mr. Sargeant Hewett opened it.

New Ordinance read 8th & 6th articles.

The Oath for those who are enfranchised in other Companies. Read.

15th Richard 2.

18th Henry 6.

14th Harry 7.

32nd Elizab.

The Ordinance made by the Company of Scriveners relating to apprentices,
7 Jany, 1497.

The Charter 14th James 1st.

8th & 9th Clause. Read.

The Companies By-Law, 16th Yr James 1st.

The Oath read.

WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFF.

MR. ELLIS.

Com. Sarg. Mr. Ellis, you are acquainted with the business (*sic*) of a Scrivener?

Witn. Yes, Sir.

C. S. How long may you have been acquainted with it?

W. Ever since the year 1714.

C. S. You are a Scrivener. Then I presume you have known a great number of Scriveners?

W. Throgmorton Street was almost full of Scriveners.

C. S. Well, Sir, I suppose you remember some of them that were very considerable in the City?

W. There was Mr. Bedle, Mr. Knight, Mr. Hopkins, Deputy Stamper, Sir John Blount, Mr. J. Colbroke, Mr. John Taverner, who was my Master, Mr. Perceval Pott, Mr. Willm. Fashion, Mr. Dan Chandler, all these lived in Threadneedle Street. Mr. Bishop lived in Throgmorton Street.

C. S. Do you remember Sir George Newland?

W. I did not know him personally, but he was a Scrivener.

RECORDER. Did you know Sir Robert Clayton?

W. I did not know him personally but many things have come through my hands witnessed by him. And Col. Robertson, who was Chamberlain of London.

C. S. Well, Sir, you know all these Scriveners, & have been a Scrivener yourself, pray what was the business of a Scrivener as practised in your own knowledge?

W. It was making all manner of Writings and Instruments to be sealed.

C. S. Was that your constant and only employment?

W. I was so employed from the beginning, & so was my Master, & so I found that the others were.

C. S. Well, you say it was to make deeds ; did you prepare them yourself?

W. Yes, Sir ; we drew them, and engrossed them, and if there was any doubtful points we had advice of Council.

C. S. Pray now did you convey Lands of inheritance ?

W. Yes, Sir, Deeds of Conveyance, & all sorts of Bargains & sales to be inroled, Deeds for leading the use of fines & recoveries, Marriage Settlements, & Mortgages.

C. S. All these things you took the instructions for them, drew them, & went through the whole business ; in cases of difficulty you had recourse to Council ?

W. Yes, Sir.

C. S. Well, Sir, this is the employment of all Scriveners as far as you have been acquainted with them.

W. Yes, Sir.

C. S. I suppose you have taken Apprentices yourself, & I suppose they have served their time out, & followed the business afterwards ?

W. Yes, sir.

CROSS EXAMINATION.

C. NORTON : Well, Mr. Ellis, you speak of a great while ago ; do you never remember Scriveners putting their names over their doors ?

W. Sometimes I have ; my fellow Clerk did put his, James Raven, Scrivener, but that was an uncustomary thing, & was not so customary as for a Surgeon to put his name over the door.

C. N. May be Mr. Raven might be something like a Surgeon. You say that the business of a Scrivener was making all Deeds for to be sealed, did you never hear of Scriveners taking other men's money and lending it out ?

W. That is no particular mark of a Scrivener any more than it is of a Broker.

C. N. So that if a Broker and a Scrivener each of them procure money, it is not encroaching upon each other's trade ?

W. A Broker is obliged in some respect to be insured* by the City of London.

C. N. Then why is not a Broker a Scrivener ?

W. Because he makes no writings ; I make the writings if I procure the money.

C. N. It is then part of the business of a Scrivener to procure money ?

W. We do it ; we do such a thing.

C. N. And the Brokers are not angry with you, nor you with the Brokers ?

* uncertain.

W. It is no necessary part of a Scrivener ; I have not procured any money this twelve month.

C. You say there are a great number of opulent Scriveners, but I fancy they did not all procure it by making deeds ?

W. Yes, Sir ; & they might go to Newmarket & get a great deal of money there too.

C. Were there many Attorneys in the City of London when you first remember that were not free of the City ?

W. There were very few Attornies, but those that were free of the City of London, and some of the City Courts, that did live in the City, when I was an Apprentice.

C. Well pray, Sir, are not all the Inns of Court and Inns of Chancery, within three Miles of the City of London ?

W. We had nothing to do with that, we never made with them.

C. You take an Oath, every Man is to take an Oath ?

W. I did take an Oath.

C. I ask you whether you took an Oath to observe the By-Laws ?

W. So far as they have been required of me I have, so far as they were practicable.

C. You took an oath to observe the By-Laws in the manner they were put ?

W. Yes ; all the good laws & ordinances of the By-Laws so far as God shall give me grace, & so far as God have given me grace I have observed them.

C. Well, I ask you one plain question, have you ever endeavoured to put this By-Law in force, or do you know those that ever did ?

W. No, Sir, I never did.

C. You say there were few Attornies that lived in the City that were not free of the City when you first remember ; be so good as to recollect yourself.

W. As to Council, I know there was a Councillor that lived with Messrs. Gibson & Jacomb who was not free of the Scriveners' Company.

C. But if a Council in your way of thinking makes a Deed, he must be free of the City.

W. He was under the immediate direction of Messrs. Gibson & Jacomb, so that he was as it were a Clerk to them.

C. Who would not but wish to be free of this Company ! then the Scriveners they employ Council for their Clerks ? Well, but I thought by the By-Law they are not to employ Foreigners & Strangers ? so then he was a writing Clerk for them ? pray tell us his name after this.

W. I do not suppose that a Council wants to be free of the City of London to exercise his science. I forget his name truly.

C. Then if I understand you right, Messrs. Gibson & Jacomb kept a Councillor for their Clerk, & a writing Clerk too ?

W. It is very well known in the neighbourhood that he did keep a Councillor always in his house ; & he used to draw his nice draughts.

C. Now, Sir, I want to know if these people kept shops ?

W. No, Sir, any more than an Attorney keeps a Shop.

C. Did you ever hear of the Ordinances in 1300 & odd ?

W. Yes, Sir, I have heard them.

C. And how do you reconcile them ?

W. Why Tempora mutantur, why formerly our Apprentices would scrape our enteries & sweep our Shops, why they will not do that now.

C. So because the times are changed the Councillors & Attornies are all to be Sciveners ? Now, Sir, did you ever hear before these late disputes took place that those Gentlemen professors of the law were ever looked upon as becoming liable to be part of your Company of Sciveners ?

W. Yes, Sir, I have many years ago, but I don't consider all the ranks of Gentlemen you speak of, but we have long had it in our consideration to take in Attornies when they broke in upon us, when they practiced as Sciveners in the City of London, & undertook to draw deeds.

C. So then you take it that every person preparing a deed, or causing it to be prepared, which is the same thing, is to be free of the Sciveners Company ?

W. If it is done in the City of London. Whoever sets up a livelihood in drawing deeds and preparing them to be done, incroaches on the trade of a Scivener.

C. Then it is only those who make it a principal means of livelihood, that those & those only are to be called upon to be free of your Company. Am I right ?

W. Those who draw them, & make it their means of livelihood, are Sciveners.

C. Then you & I can't differ about what you mean, & those only who make it their means of livelihood are Sciveners.

W. I do not know of any other.

Com. Sargeant. You say you remember, Mr. Ellis, that the names were upon some doors, or at least upon one door, of such a one Scivener. Now what was the business done within those doors ?

W. Making of Deeds & Writings to be sealed.

C. Was that the proper & only business you served your apprenticeship to ?

W. That was the business that denominated me a Scivener.

C. You say that you are a Scivener, & have followed it many years, & particularly for twelve months past, & in the last 12 months past you have not procured any money.

W. Yes, Sir.

C. It seems to be a kind of Handmaid to a Scivener. Well, Sir, you have been asked by this Gentleman whether any body has a right to make deeds ?

W. He is a Scrivener that makes deeds.

S. Well, Sir, you say that he is a Scrivener that makes deeds and writings to be sealed as the means of his livelihood, do you mean he that does it as the means of his livelihood?

W. I deem him a Scrivener.

S. Now do you mean to put this as your definition of a Scrivener, that whoever causes a deed to be made is to be free of the Scriveners' Company.

W. No, Sir.

S. Then I ask you if you mean to convey to these Gentlemen in your definition of a Scrivener, that every man that makes a deed by which he gains anything, is to be free of the City of London?

W. Yes, Sir, he is a Scrivener.

S. And if he never procures anything upon Mortgages, nor lends money on a Mortgage, he is a Scrivener never the less.

W. It is a very different thing from making a deed in the way of a person's business, if he is in another employment, and makes deeds by which it is a principal means of his livelihood.

C. Now this Gentleman has got you to say that whenever any man makes a deed he ought to be free of the Scriveners' Company.

W. I don't know whether we mean the same thing.

C. NORTON. Now suppose an Attorney living in the City of London is employed to suffer a recovery, that you Scriveners can't do, and suppose it is necessary that an * attendant on the presipes should be made; well now, suppose an Attorney makes a deed without which the recovery cannot be is he to be a Scrivener?

W. I say, Sir, he is there acting as a Scrivener. In the suffering of the he is acting as an Attorney.

C. N. Why then the deed is part of the recovery.

W. No, Sir.

C. N. Why then he could make a Recovery without a deed.

W. No, Sir.

C. N. Suppose a Warrant of Attorney to confess a Judgment, do you think that is the business of a Scrivener?

W. Yes, Sir; let him appear as an Attorney.

C. Now, Sir, I would ask you whether you yourself have not in many instances been witness to deeds that have been drawn by Attornies, that have not been free of the Scriveners' Company?

W. Yes, many a time; for if I have been present wherein they have transacted any negociation I never refused it.

C. Not many years ago?

W. I may very likely twenty or thirty years ago.

C. So then you have done that?

* uncertain.

W. Yes.

C. N. Suppose an honest man puts his Son Apprentice to a Paper Stainer, or any other business, that man has a right to be a Scrivener has not he?

W. No, Sir, not to make deeds.

C. N. Supposing an honest Scrivener should be a paper stainer or a grocer, supposing that a man shou'd put his son to such a Scrivener, he has a right to follow the business of a Scrivener when his time is out?

W. No, the business that he learnt and was instructed in.

C. You have in your Scriveners' Company all trades.

W. Yes, we have.

C. I ask you whether a Scrivener bridle-cutter, whether he could not at the end of his apprenticeship set up the business of a Scrivener?

W. I think not, Sir; I never knew a Grocer who was free of the City come into practice of a Scrivener when he was out of his time.

C. N. Do you know what Mr. Gibson was 'prentice to?

W. No, I do not know, Sir.

C. Nor Mr. Willm. Fashion?

W. Yes, Mr. Willm. Fashion was 'prentice to a Scrivener.

C. N. I ask you whether he was not 'prentice to a Linen Draper?

W. No, Sir, he was not, but his Son was, and he turned Attorney. Mr. Willm. Fashion was bred a Scrivener, he was a free Citizen.

C. N. I have this moment seen an Indenture by which a Man stiles himself a Scrivener and calls himself a Paper Stainer, do you understand what Fashion I mean? I mean Willm. Fashion.

W. No, Sir, it was Laurence Fashion that was a Linen Draper and afterwards followed the business of an Attorney, but I don't know that he ever made deeds. I believe Mr. Laurence Fashion I have seen, and certificates of his admission as an Attorney and Solicitor, but he was never able to draw a deed in his life.

C. Was that Linnen Draper of the Scriveners Company?

W. No, Sir, but I believe he was a Freeman of the City of London.

Sar. Were those persons that you have now mentioned free of the City of London at the time they followed business?

W. They were, Sir.

MR. BEEDLE.

Coun. Field. You are a Scrivener I believe, Sir, not by Company, but by business?

Witness. I was bred, under a Scrivener, by Company as well as by business.

C. F. Pray how long have you known the business?

W. I came to live with my Master about the year 23/4. I was entitled to the Freedom of the City by Patrimony, and I did take up my Freedom.

C. When did you come to your Master, Mr. Beedle?

W. In the year 23/4.

C. Now, Mr. Beedle, during the time that you have exercised this business, pray what do you think the nature of it is?

W. What I understood by it was to draw deeds of Conveyance of Estates of Inheritance, Assignments of deeds of inheritance, Released, all sorts of deeds that require Seals set to them.

C. Now you must as you was a good while in that business; there have been a great many names mentioned to you. Do you know any of them?

W. Some of them, Sir.

C. Now, Sir, during the whole time that you have been conversant with business, did you never witness deeds which you have known to be made by Attornies?

W. I did, Sir, to be sure.

C. Pray did the Scriveners you have known follow their business in making of deeds, ingrossing, & in that way only?

W. I believe confined themselves to that business.

Norton. I ask you whether you take the drawing deeds to be the business of a Scrivener?

W. If I was to be asked my opinion of what such a one's profession was, I should look upon him as a Scrivener.

Nort. Now supposing I was at the South Sea House, & had contracted to confer Stock, & a letter of Attorney was necessary, ought the Broker that brought me that Letter of Attorney to be a Scrivener?

W. Indeed I cannot say.

C. Did you never hear of a Broker bringing a Gentleman that wanted to confer Stock a Letter of Attorney?

W. Yes, Sir.

C. I ask you whether you would call that Broker a Scrivener?

W. Really, Sir, I cannot take upon me to say what he would be.

C. I ask you what your own trade is?

W. The making of all sorts of Writings to be sealed. I should have thought he was in that instance acting the part of a Scrivener.

C. Now let me put you an instance. You say you have been called upon yourself to prepare such things. I ask you whether it is not customary for the Clerks of those Offices to prepare the Letter of Attorney?

W. I know very few instances of that sort; I have not been conversant with what has been transacted by the Brokers.

C. I ask you what would be your idea of a man preparing such a thing, not being a Scrivener by trade or profession?

W. I should look upon him in a double capacity, as acting as a Broker & a Scrivener.

C. Norton. Do you consider them as acting in that character as a Scrivener?

W. Yes, Sir.

C. Norton. Well, Sir, supposing an Attorney not having the honour to be a

Scrivener, in the course of a cause has occasion to make a general release, is he acting as a Scrivener ?

W. As to the Capacity of the Gentleman doing business of that sort, if I understand it of a general release it is such an Act as I should think I had a right to transact.

C. Unless we could have the happiness of having some gentleman who could transact such business the cause must be stopped. Pray, Sir, there is another branch of your business which is taking the proper commission upon procuring & lending out money, & that subjects you to all the many *made against People's getting a livelihood. †

W. I have thought wherein I have been at trouble to procure money for a Client I had a right to ‡

C. Do you call transacting money affairs, whether by Mortgage upon Land, whether by way of Assessment, of security, or otherwise ; do you take that to be a part of the Scrivener's business ?

W. I take it, it must be part of the Scrivener's business, because I make the deeds for the money I procure.

C. Who is it that is to make the Security ? Here are two people, there is a Broker & a Scrivener.

W. Most certainly, Sir, a Scrivener ought to be concerned.

C. I believe, Sir, there have been instances wherein they have done like other businesses, hung out signs, & put their names over their doors.

W. I believe they have put their name as a token that they live there ; there were some particular motives for my doing it, & I had over my door, William Beedle Scrivener.

C. Now I ask you if you have not been witness to several deeds that you knew were drawn & prepared by Attornies that were not Scriveners ?

W. Undoubtedly.

Com. Sarg. Mr. Beedle, from what has been said it will be necessary to ask you a few questions. What was the nature of the business which you transacted in the house that you put your name over the door of ?

W. It was making deeds & bonds.

MR. COVERLY.

C. Field. Mr. Coverly, was you bred up to the business of a Scrivener ?

W. I was, Sir.

C. Was you bound Apprentice ? Are you of the Scriveners' Company ?

W. I live out of the City, & am not a freeman of the City.

C. How long is it since you was bound apprentice ?

W. It is 47 years ago.

C. Who was you Apprentice to, Sir ?

W. To one Mr. Trudd in White-Chapple, in the house that I now live in.

* Don't know the word.

† desunt cet.

‡ desunt cet.

C. As you have been so long acquainted with the business, will you give an account of what you understand the business to consist in?

W. In buying & selling estates & procuring money for Clients.

C. Do you look upon him who buys and sells estates, & does not engross deeds, do you look upon him to be a Scrivener?

W. No, Sir, I look upon him to be a broker.

C. You look upon this, Sir, to be generally understood as the business of a Scrivener, & the persons who have called themselves Scriveners have acted in this Capacity?

W. I do, Sir.

C. Was you acquainted with the State of this profession at the early time you speak of?

W. I transacted business in London the same as in the country.

C. Did Attornies transact business the same?

W. Yes, the same.

C. Was there the same number of Attornies in the City then, as there is now?

W. I cannot take upon me to say.

C. The Scriveners generally do deal in procuring money?

W. I think so.

C. Nor. Then, Mr. Coverley, you look upon it to be the business of a Broker? then are all the Scriveners Brokers?

W. Yes, they are in fact; we don't chuse to divide the profits.

C. You have been concerned sometimes in transferring of Stock? You have seen Brokers transfer Stock?

W. I have, Sir.

C. Does a Broker by transferring Stock become a Scrivener?

W. No, Sir.

C. Suppose I should buy a printed Bond & fill it up, should I be a Scrivener?

W. You would do a Scrivener's Act.

C. Some of the evidence that has been heard say it is making Testaments or Wills & Charters. Well, if a Man was dying & wanted his Will made, I should subject myself to the penalty of five pounds if I made his Will?

W. I would venture that.

C. Have you ever been prosecuted yourself?

W. No, never.

C. How long have you followed the business?

W. In the City & out of the City upwards of forty years.

C. Well then for upwards of forty years together you have done all these actions & have never been prosecuted?

W. I have, Sir; I have run the risque.

C. You have a Son an Attorney?

W. I have, Sir.

C. I would ask you whether in the course of the business of an Attorney it is not absolutely necessary that he should draw a Conveyance? supposing we were trying a cause at Westminster Hall, & it was necessary to must the Court stop till they have sent for a Scrivener?

W. You are asking me a question which seems foreign.

C. You know a little of the Laws of these Scriveners, they have a power of searching.

W. No, Sir, I know nothing of the Laws.

C. Did the Scriveners never come in & look at your performances?

W. No, Sir.

C. Would you have permitted the Company to have come in & searched?

W. They must have shown me good authority for it.

C. You was asked whether a Broker making a Letter of Attorney to transfer Stock, whether it did not make him a Scrivener?

W.*

COUNCILLOR NORTON.

Mr. Recorder, and You, Gentlemen of the Jury!

This is the cause of the whole profession of the Law, not confined to any body; but if the evidence we have heard to-day is to govern your Verdict in the latitude in which it has been attempted to be laid, it is not only the profession of Attornies that is to be involved, but all the Serjeants at Law, for they have told you,

“that every one making any manner of deed or writing to be sealed within the City of London that is not free thereof is liable to the penalty of this By-Law on which the Action is brought,” & in that sense and latitude it becomes a very serious matter with us, as we shall all of us either come into the City of London, & beg of the City that we may be admitted of the City, or we never can afterwards exercise that profession wherein we have been bred; you will pardon me, Gentlemen, if I enter a little more minutely into this Cause.

I cannot account for the reason of Mr. Sergeant's telling you “The favourable mention that is made of the City upon every occasion, that now as she has done formerly she rides the Mistress of the World,” let her do so, don't let her ride the Mistress of the Law! & I will join with the Serjeant. I have great reason to do it, in rejoicing as much as he at the great figure she makes in this Commercial Kingdom; But I am sorry to see it stoop so low to fill the coffers of the City, to try whether they can't open one door more to raise contributions in a manner which I don't chuse to take notice of, but if this day's suit is attended with success I will venture to pronounce, they will reap a greater harvest than anything they have got from time immemorial. If every man is to be a freeman of the City that draws a deed, I say from this

* Deest.

moment the City will be able to collect from this head of contributions only, more than from all the emoluments they have practiced.

Let me now put you in mind of all I have said, the innumerable numbers of people that must be brought into the list. Not only every Attorney & every Gentleman that wears the Gown in Westminster Hall must be submitted to this, but every person belonging to the Bank, the South Sea and India House, Million Bank, London Insurance, York Buildings, &c. &c. &c. must of necessity become free of the City of London. And I will add to these another number, & which perhaps will not be inferior to the number I have now mention'd, all Gentlemen that now practice in & about Doctor's Commons. And then there are pretty perquisites behind too; it is not only being free of the City, but when I see who are concerned, I cannot but observe to you that there are others who will avail themselves of this plentiful harvest; for if every man is to be free of the City who makes a deed, there comes binding of Apprentices & twenty other perquisites to the Company in that way, & by a good wholesome By-Law of the City of London all persons exercising any mystery within the City shall be free of the City, but he shall take up his freedom in the Company of Scriveners, so you are likewise loading him with the burdens of this particular Company. In that light the question is not only a very weighty but a very serious one: in that light give me leave to state the question, & by a due attention in stating you will lay out of your consideration many things which you have heard to-day. The two general questions can only be—

1. Whether there is such a By-Law as that upon which the present Action is founded? and if there is, Whether the Defendant, Mr. Smith, has transgressed this By-Law?

Now with regard to the first of these questions, that you may lay it out of the case, I don't dispute that there is such a By-Law existing. It will be proper to put you in mind that a By-Law in restraint of trade by foreigners must be, of necessity, grounded on a Custom, that if there is not such a custom to enforce such a By-Law, the By-Law is void or vain. Nothing but immemorial usage to bottom that By-Law upon can make it a good one. Having said this, another observation will occur to this, that it cannot come higher than the By-Law.

And now, Gentlemen, give me leave to state what the Custom is, the By-Law cannot vary the Custom. Why the Custom is, & I will read it in the very words of their own By-Law in the manner it is stated:—

“Whereas by the Laws and Customs of the City of London, no person or persons shall be suffered to use or exercise any manual occupation or handicraft, or to sell or put to sale any ware or merchandise by retail in any Shops either inward or outward,” & the third object “that no artificer or handicraftsman or other Shopkeeper or trader by retail shall employ or set to work those who are not free of the City.”

And unless the By-Law is warranted by the Custom all that goes beyond the Custom is absolutely void and of none effect. Now in order to enable

the Plantif to recover this Action he must be guilty of one of these two things. That he has carried on a handicraft business, or that he has employ'd one or other to retail goods out of his Shop which are not free of the City.

The By-Law for reformation hereof says that no person shall exercise any handicraft, or shall employ any other than freemen. And now please to observe how very artfully the By-Law had slid into words not warranted by the Custom. The By-Law says that no person not being free of the City by any Custom whatsoever, *any art or mystery*. Here you see is art & mystery thrown in, & you are to confirm by your Verdict and construction on the By-Law the words of the Custom then relative to the By-Law.

Having said so much upon the nature of the Custom, & the nature of the By-Law, give me leave to make one observation. That it cannot be accompanied with success, for now, Gentlemen, consider we are now in the year 1760 disputing whether all professions of the Law are not obliged to be free of the City. The ideas you must take along with you are these. The Customs of the City are from time immemorial.

That there has been Attornies in the City from time immemorial is not to be disputed ; that it should be left now at last to the penetrating eye of the Clerk of this Company to discover a right which has been buried so long unthought of is very strange ! I say, Gentlemen, the *time* if you consider how it applies to the present action, for do they imagine that Gentlemen of your sense and understanding are not to take into consideration, how it comes to pass that this cause is brought on now. Why can you imagine if you look back into the ancient priviledges of the City of London, into the Great men that have had the government of this Metropolis, that if the practice of an Attorney had been an infringement of the liberties of the City of London it would never have been thought of to dispute with the Attornies whether by following the business of an Attorney he is bound to be a freeman ? No, Gentlemen, in the nature of the thing it is incredible, but poreing eyes will find out if they can something that they may draw advantage from ; whether that was the case with the City now, perhaps will not become me to say, but I am convinced it must have had its foundation there, if this Great City of London had conceived that the whole body of the Law had transgressed the By-Laws of the City of London, & not to stoop to take advantage of a By-Law made in the year 1712.

Now give me leave to follow Mr. Serjeant.—I have not a doubt but the learned Judge who is related to the City must feel, & every feeling mind must feel for him on such an occasion, wherein the rights of the City are brought before him, there is not a man but must feel for him on this occasion. I will add that my Client has nothing to fear from such a Judge with such feelings about him. I speak it because I think it. Gentlemen, having said this give me leave to follow Mr. Sarjeant in the several matters he has endeavoured to lay before you to make out his Client's cause.

On the propositions there can be but two things, though it may be branched into many heads.

Mr. Sargeant begun his account with telling^v you that he would rake into antiquity and that he would give us antiquarian learning & give you the usefulness of the antiquarian writings, the antiquity of this Company—that you should find them in all ages a most useful body of men.

The Company of Scriveners taking other peoples money into their Custody.*

Gentlemen, I do not think it very necessary for me to dispute with Mr. Sarjeant whether it has been a Company so anciently, & I hope you will think it not at all worthy your consideration in determining the present cause, whether it is of yesterday, or from 1373 I am satisfied will not weigh a grain in the determination of this cause, but he tells you they were from 1373, what are they? they are the Scriveners of the Court Letter of the City of London. Well now what is a Scrivener? why everybody knows that is a Writer, and as a Writer may be an object of this By-Law of the City of London, & a Scrivener means a writer, & we all know before the growth of literature by printing came into this Country, the business of a Scrivener was a business in the whole of this Country; before that time all the learned works of learned Men were handed down to posterity by means of Scriveners. Why the Scriveners of the City of London? Why the Writers of the Court Letter? why the very name is a description of them, that they were those men that applied themselves to the writings of the City of London, & whoever will look into the Writings of the City of London they will find that exactness and beauty in them which Mr. Sargeant said that it was a set hand. Then these Scriveners, these writers of the Court Letter, are very properly the objects of the ancient custom of this City because it is a manual occupation.

But however from the name itself it carries its own meaning beyond all comment upon it, & beyond all proof that can possibly be given to explain it.

But Mr. Sargeant told you he would define what a Scrivener was, & that was to prepare all instruments & writings for seal; & then he says that any person making a deed is guilty of breaking the franchises of the City, & therefore liable to be punished.

And now give me leave to make this observation, & that you will take it along with you that if a person uses an occupation that is in the language of the Custom a manual occupation he is guilty of a breach of the franchises of the City of London, but none else but those that follow such occupations.

Having said this give me leave to state the evidence. And to be sure Mr. Sargeant was right when he said “that we should take a view of them what they were.”

A leading feature of their countenance, is, that they kept open shops. There

* desunt cetera.

has not been a bit of old evidence produced, wherein it does not speak of them as People keeping open Shops ; all of them treating them as people who had shops. Ah ! But, says Mr. Sargeant : “ I will show you by every ancient “ testimony that they were writers of deeds.” They might as well be Deed-mongers as you have Felt-mongers & many other trades in the City of London. But then, says he, they made Deeds.

They admit themselves to be ignorant of making deeds of inheritance. Now they tell you that no man can draw a deed, let it be of ever so important a nature, but the Scrivener, by the Account the Witness has given you, is the only person to be applied to on this occasion.

Now, Gentlemen, they are under the old evidence clearly people that kept shops, they were to be such, & none were to be admitted amongst them but such as were examined by the Master & Wardens & Lord Mayor. Now the Master & Wardens are some of them, as I am informed, Grocers, & some of them may be Booksellers & Stationers, & therefore may be very good judges of parchment, but know nothing of what is to be put upon it—are these men to be the Judges of what the Attornies are to do ?

Gentlemen ! but this is not all : by the regulations it appears that every Scrivener is to put his name to the deed he makes. It is very well known, Gentlemen, that neither the party nor the witness putting their names to the deed is not the essence of the deed, it is not the essence of the deed that there should be names to it, it is the seal that makes it a deed, then, Gentlemen, it was the Seal that gives the authenticity to the deed.

Gentlemen, it is notorious that by the Statute of the 37 of Henry 8th, they were indeed so very small in their contents, but were so simple in their kind & nature, that any body could draw them that could write.

But, Gentlemen, to come to the point with regard to the evidence that great stress was laid upon, *viz.* that persons should set their names to the deeds they draw. But if a bad man drew a deed he would never be afraid to set his name to it, & it certainly cannot be a means of preventing any fraud.

But I would produce more deeds of antiquity even recorded in the City of London and inrolled there not drawn by Scriveners.

Why, Gentlemen, what does this prove, but that there was not an idea then in the mind of any Scrivener that an Attorney could not draw a Deed ? There was then not an idea in the Lord Mayor of London, the Sheriffs or Court of Aldermen.

The oath of a Scrivener was next adduced, and great stress was laid upon it : among other things they swear to observe the By-Laws of the City of London. But you have heard one of the witnesses say, “ I only swore to observe them “ so far as God gave me grace, I could not in those instances help transgressing.” There is a salvo for this Gentleman ; but to come to the matter of the oath. The great matter was that they would not make deeds of long date before they

were executed, or of long date after they were executed. Now, Gentlemen, that may be right, & that may be proper, and there are many deeds in their nature to answer the honest fair purpose which the Partners cannot in such a deed avoid dating it contrary to this oath.

But you will please to observe what are the particular parts of the Oath. It considers it as a craft, it calls it a craft, it is a handicraft, that they were writers of the Court-Letter of the City of London, & professes their ignorance in matters of importance, drawing deeds of inheritance; they are nothing at all better than deed-mongers.

We all know that in these early times Men did not take a bond to these drawing of deeds, the drawing of deeds they were equal to, & this was all the business of a Scrivener, not the drawing a conveyance, not the carrying into execution the provision of Families, which has obliged them to have recourse to people the most eminent in the Profession of the Law, & is part of their oath; but, Gentlemen, be so good as to carry your eye a little further, to the very second item, & you will there find what they all swear to observe, "that they shall not on Sundays nor on days of double fast keep open shop for business nor gain." And now does not this infer that they did on other days keep open shops? Another thing too, Gentlemen, & another provision this great body of Men to shew you what they were, that they were mere handicraftsmen, there is an express provision that none of the Company of Scrivenership shall have any Foreigner to keep shop for them; another thing, Gentlemen, they in their occupation (for here it is called such *

Gentlemen, there is another provision. No man shall have an apprentice on pain of paying forty shillings unless it be allowed. Now does not this speak of it as carried on in a shop?

This is, Gentlemen, their own drawing. Now can any one doubt that at that time of day the Scriveners did keep open Shops?

Gentlemen, besides this is read a Petition to John Tyan, the Mayor of the City of London in the year 1373, and let any body consider the prayer of this Petition & the great indulgence the then Lord Mayor shewed this body of Scriveners, & then say whether it does not carry the strongest proof of their carrying on their trade in Shops. It goes on "that Foreigners not free of the City of London have carried on the occupation of Scriveners much to the prejudice of the said Company, & they desire that none might be allowed to keep Shops within the said City that were not free thereof."

But, Gentlemen, it goes on & says—"that none are to be received into the Company and have the benefit thereof he be found fit to carry on trade, by the Master and Wardens of the Company." Now, Gentlemen, consider what work you would make if you was to say that every Attorney must either be subject to the penalties of this By-Law every time he makes a Deed, or be

* Something further wanting.

subject to the Judgment of the Lord Mayor, Master & Wardens of the Company of Scriveners. Gentlemen, I think this was the principal part of the ancient evidence that Mr. Sergeant read to prove to you two things. First— That there has been such a business as that of a Scrivener from time immemorial within the City of London, & secondly—To prove to you the nature of such a Business, beside that I say there was too another application of a subsequent date to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen which was likewise read And that was—

To the honourable the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London, &c.

Now, Gentlemen, can you suppose that an examination by people of this Cast can possibly be an examination capable of proving whether they are fit to transact such a craft? there are the same observations occur on this as on the former; they speak of themselves as keeping open Shops, they speak of themselves as taking apprentices just in the manner that all other arts, crafts and mysteries in the City of London do.

This I think is all that Mr. Sergeant meant to state to you of the antiquity of this Company.

That they kept open shops. That they were subject to inspection & regulation, & that these writings, whether it was drawing of deeds or any other thing, were their means of livelihood. Mr. Sergeant subjoins to this & proves that now every Attorney that draws a deed is a Scrivener.

Now he could just as well prove that a Man is a pin, a Man has a head, a pin has a head, therefore a Man's a pin. Unless Mr. Sargeant has forgot Burgusdicius he must know that because he can predicate anything with one essential, therefore there may not be every essential, this is a way of arguing which I don't comprehend.

Now when you cannot predicate two things with all the essentials you cannot call those two things the same. Now I will attempt to prove that there is nothing more unlike than those two people the Scriveners, and an Attorney bred to the bar. Give me leave just to mention concerning the two heads of Mr. Sergeant's oration.

Unless they can prove that Mr. Smith has offended against this By-Law it is impossible for them to recover this Action. No, Gentlemen, there turns the whole Cause; we say let the business of a Scrivener be what it will we have not been guilty of the penalty brought against him.

The next piece of written Evidence was this Charter, before I come to take a Survey of their Charter you will give me leave to make one or two observations which I will premise before I do that. That they cannot avail themselves of their Charter in this Action, they must stand or fall by the Custom, from which the By-Law has been made. They cannot connect the Charter & the By-Law together, to make them a bit better than it stood on the original custom, having said this I will take notice of some of the great outlines of this Charter, & I really think of all the grants made by the Crown this is the most extraordinary, & I will shew that it is almost throughout illegal.

Now you see these shopkeepers being ignorant of one part of their Charter, unless they can avail themselves of that ridiculous Article in one of their By-Laws. "That they shall be conversant in Grammar." I do not see that there is the least Science from beginning to end to make these Scriveners. But now take a view of them in their new dress, they don't come to be sworn now in their party-coloured boat as they came to be sworn formerly. They stand reciting the validity of this body of Men, they are people conversant in the important and arduous affairs of men, and therefore it is necessary that these Men should be a Corporation. And really it would make a person stare if any body was to produce such a Charter as this to support the most sinking Cause.

There are powers given to the Master & Wardens, to visit, inspect, correct, and punish not only the freemen of the City, but foreigners not only foreigners within the City, but foreigners within three miles of the City of London. It is said by way of description in that Charter that the Company has accepted it & they are bound by it. They must say that from time immemorial they are possessed of these powers and privileges, they are powers of visiting & trying, of correcting, & punishing all persons. They have all these powers given them by this Charter. Then the power of the Scriveners Company to visit, inspect, & correct from three miles round London has been from time immemorial, though there have been Serjeants, though there have been Attornies, from time immemorial, & in general this body of Men are collected within three Miles round London, yet there is not till these disputes an instance to be met with, wherein any one of these Gentlemen have been called upon to take up their Freedom in the City, how is this silence to be accounted for but that they were wiser than to think that they were obliged to be free of a Company? by what right has the Crown authority to grant to these Gentlemen a power of inspecting the Chambers of every Gentleman of the Law? & seeing what is doing there? what a Tallow Chandler & a Fishmonger come into my Chambers & see what is doing there! and yet will you throw open the Chamber Doors & the Desks & Bureaus and inspect what is going on there! everybody knows that the business of the law is incompatable with anything that way, Gentlemen; that is not all, they have power to punish & levy money to be applied to their own use. Gentlemen, what are the kinds of power they are to exercise on these searches? they are to look & see whether my deeds are fitt & proper. Now let me put a strong instance once for all.

Suppose a Grocer & a Tallow Chandler for instance were to come into my Chambers and I will suppose them extremely well skilled in the old Court hand, though perhaps they may neither of them be able to read it; Sir, says one, this is blured, you see it is not fit, what is he to do with this Deed? is he to punish me, or get the secret that it contained & tell it to the whole 'change of London?

The Charter & the By-Laws were not calculated to oblige Attornies,

Councillors, & Serjeants at Law to come into the City, no the Scheme was not ripe enough for that, but they were to bring them into contributions, what were those who lived in the City of London or three miles round to do? to be free? no but they were to pay eight pence a quarter to be excused.

But, Gentlemen, you see by the By-Law that has been produced, for I am now speaking of their own evidence, you have heard the modern oath of a Scrivener, indeed they read an Oath of a person who followed the profession of a Scrivener, the oath was read to you that is now taken by the Scriveners Company, from this charter & it is tacked to the observation of a By-Law that is intolerable, because they are endeavouring to carry those powers that are illegal into execution. Mr. Ellis knew the Scope and tendency of this By-Law & therefore when he was pressed upon it said—"yes I take an Oath to "observe these By-Laws, but I take them with a Salvo to my own mind."

Gentlemen, I don't care to comment upon anything which taking such an Oath must lay heavy upon the mind of a good man; besides this the Gentlemen have gone into further proof & I must beg your attention for a moment to consider the scope of that paralell proof. Mr. Ellis & Mr. Beedle did both of them prove this, & I would not be sure I don't mean to blink their evidence, or to take it in the full manner in which they would have it believed, & they would prove this, that every man who makes a deed in the making of the deed does the office of a Scrivener, & therefore in their opinion every such man is a Scrivener. Why now, Gentlemen, I hope when I come to state the case to you, & the witnesses we have to lay before you, that it would be impossible to be so unless you carry it to such a length as no thinking man would wish to carry it.

For what is the business of a Scrivener? it is receiving other mens money, & other mens properties on trust, but, Gentlemen, they all of them said this, that is the business of a Broker to procure money, but that a Scrivener did procure money—suppose there is a By-Law that makes a person that exercises the trade of a Bro'er should belong to the Brokers Company, they would not have you believe that he is guilty of an Offence in infringing on the trade of a Broker, no it follows out of their business the making of deeds; & if so, Gentlemen, you see

This is their paralell proof, such has been their written evidence; & I must submit it to you whether it does not amount to this that the Scrivener is a man who keeps a Shop, or should keep one, who makes writing or if the Gentlemen please drawing deeds the principal means of his livelihood; now if I can shew you that an Attorney does not come within that description, then an Attorney may still go on to follow his profession without submitting himself to the City By-Laws.

If the Attorney procures money I give him up from being an Attorney, let him be a Scrivener & nothing else. But if an Attorney follows his profession as a Gentleman & an honest man, why must he be called upon to be free of

the City of London? why should he be called upon to do it *now*? If I was on a Jury this would weigh with me much.

And I will now shew you that the Attornies now do, & have done no more, than what every Attorney since the beginning of time has done—I will not say anything of the utility of that profession—of the honour which that profession merits because I have already involved myself in it, and therefore in decency, I ought not to say it.

Gentlemen, the Attornies have been from time immemorial, he must be from the nature of his profession learned in the Laws of his Country, 'tis the Ancient description of them—they can't be admitted Attornies 'till they have gone through nice trials by those who are good judges of their merit—no man can be admitted as an Attorney till they be found equal to the profession, & care is taken to have them Men of probity as well as ability. I am sorry if after this Attornies & Councillors are to be laid open to all that visiting punishment & castigation.

There is an end of a mans carrying on his business in that proper way hereafter there will be then these handicraftsmen that are made the objects of such a Custom.

As these, Gentlemen, as Attornies have been from time immemorial; so their business has been as ancient as their profession and they necessarily must draw deeds, they do not this as manufacturers & handicraftsmen and I'll shew you how it is so intimately & closely connected with an Attorney & cannot be separated without throwing this Country into confusion, that no man could do his business, unless he had a Scrivener for his Clerk, I will not say so because they have turned the tables & made Councillors clerks to Scriveners, Gentlemen be so good as to attend, whether this will not be the Pole Star to guide you where you are to direct your attention, your own good sense will suggest to you to reason. Why, Gentlemen, let me suppose an Attorney employ'd to make a deed of entery, they are all matters of record & can be done by none but Attornies, what are we to call a Scrivener out of Threadneedle Street to make a deed of recovery? perhaps he may be able to do that, what extravagant doings that would be! Why, Gentlemen, another thing, it very often happens that the last step in the suit.—

what make the subject liable to double expenses to employ a Scrivener & employ an Attorney! & would you then in matters of this sort say that a Scrivener should be called? But to go a little further, we could not practice after term if we were not free of the City.

Nothing is so frequent, Gentlemen, as for a cause to be brought on, that 'till objections are made to witnesses, as the incompetency of these witnesses are known.

We all know that the Council casts about in his mind whether some reason can't be made to make a competent witness—why what to become of this?

suppose we are at Westminster Hall why we must have a Scrivener, he will be as necessary a person as the foreman of the Jury is.

There cannot be a cause tried where we now are without having a Scrivener stand there, if this Action succeeds, & we are all dragged in a net into the City of London.

I still keep my eye upon that distinction that drawing of deeds is not the principal means of living; why, Gentlemen, by the same rule they might make an Attorney a Scrivener because he draws a deed.

It is not because I do a thing in the course of my profession, that I am to be of that trade, it is not because any Attorney draws a deed in the course of his profession that he is therefore to be a Scrivener, but, Gentlemen, you not only include us but you take in all the Insurance Offices, all persons in the City of London that take a farthing for making a deed are in consequence of this By-Law to be free of the City of London, but, Gentlemen, to shew you our own sense of the matter, & that we never ourselves (for I consider this as a Common cause) to shew our own sense of it I will call, Gentlemen, the first in the profession, deservedly in point of character, & the first in point of fortune, they will tell you that they never imagined that because they drew deeds they committed an Offence to the By-Laws of the City of London.

Assignments of Commissions in Bankruptcy, what are we all to be free! Why, Gentlemen, it is big with absurdity, not only the Article of Wills, what a man in extremis, wishes for God's sake Mr. Norton you would help me! I cannot, Sir, I am no Scrivener, why the man must die without a Will, or I must be guilty of the breach of this Law,—Gentlemen, I was going on to tell you that Gentlemen of affluence and fortune will speak their own sense of this matter, but I will say the sum of all will be this, but they never thought they should be called upon to be answerable for making deeds.

WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENDANT.

MR. FILMER.

C. How long have you practiced in your profession as an Attorney?

IV. It is now twenty years since I have confined myself to Chamber practice only & during that time have made several deeds.

MR. WILBROME.

C. How long have you been in business?

IV. Upwards of forty years, but I have had Chamber business & run into Conveyancing I have had a great deal of business of the City of London & have always looked upon it as the business of an Attorney to transact Conveyancing, & I profess as old as I am now, I never heard of a Scrivener till within Three years ago when this Cause was first instituted.

C. Had you never any deeds brought you by Scriveners to be?

T

W. The Accounts which were brought me sometimes I gave a short sketch to direct them, in what manner I would have them drawn.

MR. BOOTH.

Pray, Sir, how long have you been acquainted with the business of an Attorney?

W. About twenty-three or twenty-four years.

C. Within the time of your practice have you known Attornies to attend you in your practice?

W. Scarce any body else, in Conveyancing of lands, Marriage Settlements, Deeds of partnership, Articles of Apprenticeship, I knew of but very few Scriveners in my practice,—Mr. Gibson & Mr. Jacomb had offended me. I thought, of the two, Mr. Jacomb understood his business a great deal better than Mr. Gibson. I also have been concerned for Mr. Colebroke the father of Sir James, I very frequently consulted with him, I cannot say that the deeds that were brought to me were well drawn; those that were drawn by them were very incorrectly drawn, & I was forced to have them done over again.

MR. CAPPER.

C. How long have you been acquainted with the profession of the Law with respect to Conveyancing?

W. Why, Sir, in the year 17 I was concerned in deeds of Partnership, & many other things.

C. Who usually brought these things to you?

W. Attornies.

C. Do you know any Scriveners that have brought them?

W. Mr. Gibson sometimes brought them.

C. I would ask you during the whole of your practice if you have not been attended with Gentlemen who did nothing in the Chamber business of the Law, but gentlemen whose whole concern was in Conveyancing?

W. I do not recollect that any drafts of deeds have been laid before me, but those who were concerned in the Law.

MR. HARPER.

How long have you been conversant in that branch of the profession of the Law which consists in passing of deeds?

W. Why, Sir, I may reckon it above forty years.

C. Now, Sir, who have usually brought you in that course of time drafts & deeds?

W. Why a great many drafts & deeds have been brought by Attornies.

C. How often have Gentlemen who have not called themselves Attornies come to you?

W. Why there was a Gentleman whose name was Swift, I think, who calls himself a Scrivener came to me.

C. You have, Sir, I think applied yourself to the bar principally. Pray how long is it since?

W. *

C. You have more particularly had Conveyancing business brought before you. Pray how long have you followed that branch?

W. Why I believe I may say ever since any body would trust me.

C. Do you know whether Mr. Rymer was free of the City?

W. I know several Attornies residing in the City, but I never enquired whether they were free of the City.

MR. WEBB.

You have been in business in the early part of life as an Attorney, & since you have been at the bar as the
of the Treasury?

W. It is above 40 years ago since I first began business.

C. Was Mr. Harwood an Attorney?

W. Mr. Harwood was an Attorney & not a Freeman.

C. And these nonfreemen presumed to make deeds?

W. One great branch of their business was the making of deeds. I believe the notion of their not having that right did not exist till thirty years after that time.

C. Pray, Sir, when you followed the profession yourself you lived in the City?

W. Immediately upon my coming out of my Clerkship, I entered into Partnership and afterwards continued in business by myself in the Old Jewry till I was called to the Bar.

C. Well, Sir, I ask you if you never made deeds?

W. Numberless times, & I remember that Mr. Gibson was witness to some deeds that I made & he knew me to be the maker of the deed.

C. Well, Sir, you had a great deal of business in the deed way?

W. A great deal. I have, Gentlemen, dedicated a good deal of time to the antiquarian knowledge of this Country, and amongst others, I have had the curiosity to peruse & inspect original deeds, wrote about the time of Richd. 3, Harry the 7th, & upon occasion of having read this By-law some time ago, it revived in me an observation, which I had never been able to account for before, that in all this period there was never any signing of the party or of the witnesses, all that made it a deed was the putting the name to it, & he that wrote the deed commonly added by way of witness—Clericus,—and no name of the writer of the deed, very soon after the year 1373.

upon my reading this By-Law it occurred to me that in Mr. Maddox's Homiliary that there was the names of people to some of these instruments I had the curiosity to turn to this book & there I found the name of S. that immediately struck into my mind that that must be a Scrivener & upon search into the Records of this Country, that at some period of time there

* Wanting.

were some deeds that had names and many others that had not. I searched in *the Chapel of Westminster, the Archives of the Dean and Chapter at Westminster, the †augmentation office, & the British Museum, where I believe I may say without augmentation there may be 60,000; when I came to examine these I found there was ten to one that had not the Scriveners name, attested, with the name of the Mayor & Aldermen of the Ward enroled in the hustings, attested by the Town Clerk of London, & these not signed one of them by the Scrivener. In order that any Gentleman might see them I did select some of them & desire the Officers of these four great repositories to attend here, & this is so concurrent and so clear an evidence.

C. You never saw the name of a Scrivener to any of these deeds?

W. Yes, there are a few of those that are enroled signed by Scriveners, for if it is a concurrent right for each to make deeds to be sure a Scriveners, for right to make deeds.

MR. NORTH.

C. Mr. North, what profession are you of, Sir?

W. An Attorney.

C. In the course of your business have you drawn Conveyances?

W. Frequently, Sir. All kinds.

C. Would it be convenient for you to let the Scriveners inspect them?

W. I could not have executed the Office of an Attorney faithfully if I had done it.

MR. HARDIN.

C. Pray, Sir, what profession are you of?

W. An Attorney.

C. Where do you live, Sir?

W. In Drapers Hall.

C. Are you free of the City?

W. No, Sir.

C. Have you, Sir, since you have been an Attorney been concerned in the business of Conveyancing?

W. Yes, Sir.

C. In particular, or every branch of it?

W. Every branch.

C. May be you may know many eminent Attornies who were not free of the City & yet exercised that branch of business?

W. Yes, Sir.

C. Was you ever, Sir, waited upon by the Master or Company of Scriveners in order to be searched?

W. Never, Sir.

MR. WOODCOCK.

C. Mr. Woodcock, I believe you are acquainted with the profession

* uncertain.

† uncertain.

of an Attorney, as well in the Article of Conveyancing as every other branch?

W. Sir, I always understood that the Article of Conveyancing was the part of the business of an Attorney.

C. Do you live within the City of London? or have you done that business in the City of London?

W. I have done it frequently for myself; as well as for my Master in my Clerkship.

C. Do you know many Attornies that were not free of the City of London?

W. I have known several Gentlemen of the first character that were not free.

C. Did you ever practice in the Common Law?

W. No, Sir, only as a Solicitor.

C. I suppose you have as a Solicitor Bills taxed by

W. Yes, Sir.

C. Pray, Sir, as a Solicitor had you ever a Bill taxed for Conveyancing only by the Master of—

W. No, Sir, I don't think he has Jurisdiction.

MR. HENSHAW :

C. You are an Attorney & Solicitor, Sir. How long may you have known the profession of an Attorney?

W. I went Clerk, Sir, about 1719 to a Gentleman that was Sworn Attorney to the Common Pleas during all the time that I lived with him & Mr. Austen who was my first master. We did various businesses in every branch of Conveyancing & I then looked upon it, & ever after to this time I considered it as a branch of an Attornies profession to make deeds. And I remember particularly a friend of my Fathers gave this a reason why it would be proper for my Father to advance so much money because it was a particular branch of his business to make deeds & conveyancing.

It was said in the course of Mr. Ellis's Evidence that he did not know of many Attornies that lived in the City that were not free of the City.

C. Pray, Mr. Henshaw, you have mentioned a number of Gentlemen who were Attornies when you went Clerk. Was you ever told by a Scrivener that you was acting out of your proper sphere in making deeds?

W. I knew Mr. Taylor, Mr. Limmerey, &c. &c. &c. Many of these Gentlemen I have been concerned with after I came to be a Master & Mr. Beedle who was examined, & I never knew a hint, thrown out that it was an improper business I was concerned in, & I never heard of this thing till it came into the City cognizance, I never heard of it till then, & really the reason given was a very moving reason but it did not move me; it was said the Company was thrown into very great streights & therefore must make use of this means to recover itself.

C. Mr. Henshaw, you are a freeman of the City of London?

W. Not when I was a Clerk. I have been a freeman of London this twenty-five years.

C. Since you first set up you was a freeman of London?

W. No, I took up my freedom by patrimony, & when I came into the Common Council it was necessary to take it up.

C. How soon after you began to do business for yourself did you become a freeman of the City?

W. Not very long, for I was entitled to my freedom by patrimony.

SARGEANT HEWETT.

Gentlemen of the Jury, spare me a word or two by way of reply. After this cause has taken up so much time, I will be as short as I can.

I own we have heard a great many evidences that did not apply, & I would beg leave to state to you that the true question is in order to divest it of a number of things that have been insisted upon, & which cannot be insisted upon in a close argument.

We have heard a great deal of the Scriveners Company; we have heard a great deal of their By-Laws, & many objections to them; this is no action founded upon them. This is an Action founded entirely upon the By-Laws of the City, & is the plainest, simplest case imaginable, which has received a sanction from the custom of the City of London, which says, "That no person shall follow any Art, Mystery or Occupation within the City, not being free of the same" the Action was founded upon that By-Law which says "That no person &c. &c." What then can be the question? it can be nothing else than this, whether the practicing as a Scrivener is an Art & Mystery within the City, & what that Art & Mystery is. Now that is the great question, with respect to that what has been the evidence? I will make this observation upon it, that the evidence we have laid before you is for this purpose. Not to show you that the Action is founded on the Charter, for there may be such an Art & Mystery without such a Company, & the whole use & intent of producing that evidence was merely to shew that there was such an Art & Mystery as that of a Scrivener, we see at the same time too they are spoken of as persons employed about * feats & deeds of that kind.

Then comes their oath that they would make them according to their best knowledge, & cunning. Why then this shews (so far as it goes) that there were Scriveners, that they were called the Art & Mystery of Scriveners at that time. And it is also manifest & clear, & shews that that Art & Mystery did consist in making deeds & writings, in the time of Harry the 7th you find the same sort of persons existing as an Art & Mystery, & then please to take Notice that the 13th of Harry the 7th provides that they shall be educated in a particular manner, it is very right that men should know equivocal words for if this was observed there would be little trouble about the construction

* uncertain.

of deeds & writings, it is therefore very proper that such persons should understand words & the definition of them.

Well, Gentlemen, you find them all spoken of as the same persons existing and continuing writers of the Court-Letter. Men who were concerned in making deeds perpetual, it was very proper that they should do it in a hand that would always be known.

And now with respect to the Charter, I have read it for this purpose & for this only, merely to shew you that there was such an Art & Mystery, and says the Gentleman your Charter is illegal, but does it shew or not shew this? now they say that these Men were not Scriveners but mere writers of the Court Letter only, they kept a Shop. What does that prove? nothing at all as I know of, were they less writers because they kept a Shop? Trade & Commerce are fluctuating things, Trades that had no existence anciently are sprung up; as the Optician for instance, there is no Argument from that at all & proves nothing, why then what is the next thing? dress, there is something in their Ordinances, if one was to go into some of the particular Companies of the City of London we shall find many things somewhat ridiculous in their dress; & then their name a mere writer a Scriptor; well what was that Writer? what does the name of an Attorney import? a subsidy for another person, well then there is nothing in the Argument to be produced from the name. And then as to the examination. The examination is to be by the Master & Wardens of the Company, or the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, some of them you find were a respectable body, now were there none to be found of the profession of Scriveners & might they not apply themselves to it? Why there was to be an examination before some of these persons, there was no occasion as to their examination, but if there was a defect in this matter we are now endeavouring to repair it, we are endeavouring that these Gentlemen should be the four or the six, and every body knows the abilities of these Gentlemen extremely well.

Well then it was a manual occupation—every body knows that the words art, mystery, manual occupation, every body knows they import the same thing, they are synonymous, but I have no need to insist upon this matter for they themselves have shewn what the business of a Scrivener is, there is a right that runs together, a concurrent right, to do what? why a concurrent right to make deeds, why then what did Scriveners do? why then Scriveners did make deeds, then Scriveners did put their names to some deeds, that appears then there is an end of everything else of this mere writer and comparer, they find deeds with a Scriveners name to them.

Why then, Gentlemen, it comes clearly to this that the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener does consist in the making & preparing writings & instruments to be sealed, & that upon their own profession, & then, Gentlemen, if that is the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener what is the Argument? it is an Art & Mystery in London.

What is the difference between that & any other Art & Mystery, where

would the line be drawn to distinguish them, would you single out & say that particular art & mystery shall be free and others not? there can be no reason for this distinction.

Why then it comes to this, has it been followed in the City of London or not? Why then what is it that they do insist upon? if they confess all this it certainly must come to this that the following it in the City of London makes them liable to the penalty incurred by it.

Mr. Norton formed some solyigisms upon it, but I beg leave to tell him

That he that does that in the doing of which that Art & Mystery consists subjects himself to the laws of that Society.

That the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener consists in making deeds & instruments to be sealed.

Why then what is there that can be said that cannot be avoided? why the Gentleman said one thing that carried great weight with it, why they say that Attornies in general have a right to make deeds & writings in the City of London & have done so. Now these ought to be distinctly considered.

I don't know that it belongs to Attornies to make deeds and writings any more than it does to any other person that can make it, it prevents no person that can make a deed or writing from doing it.

Attornies have naturally & properly a right to make deeds, & to be sure they have a very good right to make deeds & writings everywhere but in the City of London, and there they have a right if they are free of it & that is the Argument whether or no they can make deeds in the City of London not being free of the City of London, and with respect to that it is said that they have a right because they have always done it.

Here is a Custom of the City of London that no man has a right to follow a Trade in the City of London without being free of the City.

The Recorder knows that this is a Custom of the City established by a By-Law & that this By-Law is well founded.

But the Attornies have always done it, that is there have been Attornies that have been free of the City & a greater number that have not been free of the City, does this give a right?

Now the Recorder knows that there is such a Custom if it is an Art & Mystery, now I say does the doing of it for a great many years give a right to do it? it is equal in the City to an Act of Parliament. Then I say can they prescribe against anything of this sort? They might as well say upon every action that might be brought against a person in a Common Case, "why there "have been many that have, escaped notice, or have not been prescribed at all" does that give a right? certainly not, why then it comes to this. Is there such a Law in the City? Is there anything that does dispense with it? Their doing it certainly does dispense with it & will do it.

But the Gentlemen say that with respect to this matter *

* something wanting.

and indeed how has the case been with respect to Mr. Ellis, 45 years ago there was very few Attornies in the City; what were they compounded of? some of them Freemen of the City. We say some time ago it was under consideration, why then it has been a sort of litigated matter, & has been like those usages that have had as it were something like interruption in them. But a cause of this nature is a long time before it becomes worth taking notice of, but as soon as the Scriveners find that their business is going away from them, talking of it a great while they have at last done it.

Why, Gentlemen, then they say that there is something in the nature of the case that makes it absurd that it should be otherwise, because it may happen that a writing may be wanted at the time of trial. Why he may be at some difficulty about it, whether he take money for it or did not take money for it, is that a usage and exercise? it is meant of repeated Acts & not of extraordinary occasions. Why but they say it would be strange & absurd, & then it is of so extensive a nature, but then, Gentlemen, how is this matter? we are now doing this in the City of London, they have talked of three miles round but there is nothing of that in the By-Law, it says within the City, this is not saying a word of within three miles round. The moment I become a trader in the City of London I become a Member of the Society & submit to all the rules of the City of London, it is therefore my own choice if I go there for advantage & gain, what is the consequence? I must take up with them, well then it will subject them to honours they don't chuse, well but the City of London must be supported by the Members of it, if this is a hardship, it is a hardship that a man puts upon himself and rises from his own Choice, it is very well known that Attornies did greatly or principally reside in the Court of Chancery, but if they will come into the City of London they must act accordingly. I am persuaded every Gentleman that resides in the City of London must find great advantages from it, it is said that with respect to the By-Law the By-Law itself is not a good one, now let us consider what that is. Mr. Norton has taken up the Custom from the words of the By-Law, not from any custom itself asserted, but however upon the face of the Custom itself as it appears by the By-Law I submit it to Gentlemen that if the Custom was so, but I say even upon the words manual occupation & handicraft, an Art & Mystery is a manual occupation, they are synonymous, they signify the same thing, for my Lord Cooke says, "that there is no question but the business of a Scrivener is "an Art Mystery and Manual Occupation."

Why, Gentlemen, considering this matter a little further as to this Art, the Attornies it has been said has a right to practice this Art as Attornies, the very name imports that they substitute one in the place of another, well then how is it as an Attorney? Why let us see how it stands when you come to tax his bills if it contains nothing but the Act of Conveyancing, it is not liable to be taxed; if it consists partly in one and partly in another, we will take it altogether, it is come before him as an Attorney & you have mixed this matter together—

I say, Gentlemen, when you come to consider this matter thoroughly & the nature of it; as such it has no concern with the making of deeds & writings, no they say the making of deeds & writings is something incidental to it and goes along with it. So that you see as an Attorney there can be no right belonging to it, why then if it has been practised in the City of London how has it been practised? because the Scriveners did not think it worth while to take notice of it.

It has been said by respectable Gentlemen that the time they have been in practice a great number of deeds has been brought them by Scriveners, well then it belonged to them as Scriveners, they were no Attornies confessedly. So that I say from thence it appears that if the Attornies have practiced it, it must flow from that general right which every man has to make local deeds. I have seen deeds made very often by persons themselves. I say Attornies do but make them by that general right which every man has to make local deeds.

That there is in the City of London an Art & Mystery which consists in the making of deeds & writings to be sealed which is called the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener & therefore is concluded within the By-Law which says no one shall exercise the Art & Instruments of a Scrivener without being free of the City of London—Mr. Smith has exercised this Art, & therefore it follows as a necessary consequence, that Mr. Smith has been guilty of a breach of the City By-Law.

THE RECORDER.

Gentlemen of the Jury, this is an Action that is founded on a By-Law made in the 11th year of Queen Ann which says:—

* * * * *

And now in Order to support this declaration here has been a variety of evidence given & the evidence which has been very properly opened by the learned Sargeant he has certainly proved in various instances of it.

He has proved by written evidence that the Company of Scriveners obtained the following indulgences by the Charter, they have all of them been laid before you, & the use that is made of them is to prove that these were a subsisting Society & body of men to the time of granting their Charter by Ordinance made 47th Edward 3rd; it appears very clearly that they were under several regulations, by an Application that was made afterwards they were taken notice of as a body of men carrying on the Art & Mystery of the Writers of the Court Letter, & there it is expressly mentioned as people who have kept shops & were known to carry on their trade in shops; they were likewise in Harry 7th taken notice of, but the last Charter of all of K. James the first is produced, by which they are incorporated, & there are many expressions there that are expressly pointed out as illegal which no Crown can Grant & I thank God the Crown cannot grant, and this, Gentlemen,

is the state of the written evidence that was produced, then they produce three witnesses, the first is Mr. Ellis who tells you that in the year 1714 he was bound apprentice to one Mr. Taverner, who was a Scrivener in Thread-needle Street. He gave a description of the Art & Mystery of their trade & says it is the making of all sorts of Deeds to be sealed & in short everything of this sort that carry force along with them.

It is in order to authenticate these deeds that the Scrivener is to set his name to the deed, & to shew that he was qualified within the description of a Scrivener by the several By-Laws which have from time to time been made, well then Mr. Ellis tells you that he took that to be the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener, & in this he goes so far as to say, that Conveyancing of all sorts was the work of a Scrivener.

Well then he tells you that they always in matters of difficulty applied to Council. And he tells you that people bred up to that business are always regularly bound Apprentice to the City of London.

Why then he is Cross-examined by the learned Gentleman for the defendant, whether it was Customary for him to put his name over the door, & whether he looked upon it as part of his trade to lend money. He says that Brokers cannot make a writing which is the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener. He was asked as to the number of Attornies. There were but very few Attornies, their numbers were but small. He was asked whether he took the Oath to observe the By-Law. He owns that he did take the Oath & he says he has conscientiously kept it. He tells you that he remembers Messrs. Gibson & Jacomb carrying on their trade as Scriveners, he tells you that there was a Councillor who lived with them, and he thinks upon the whole that it is his opinion that all those who prepare & make deeds whereby they get a livelihood are Scriveners properly; But then he is asked a question which there is some difficulty to answer; he is asked if there are not numbers of people bound 'prentice to a trade which trade he does not follow, as for example an Upholsterer or any other trade whatsoever and yet is free of the Company of Scriveners, but now the question is not so much here but it is carrying on the Art and Mystery of that trade & not being free of London.

The next Witness is Mr. William Beedle. He says he was bound to one who exercised the business of a Scrivener, he tells you that in his opinion it ought to be sacred only to Scriveners.

He was asked who it was that prepared Letters of Attorney, who it is that prepares Assigns for Stock, why it is his opinion that numbers of people do that business? What do you apprehend all Transfer of Stock is properly the business of a Scrivener? But that as I told you is not my present business.

Mr. Coverly is called & he tells you that he is a Scrivener, & that he carries on this business but is not free of the City of London. He has lived for a matter of forty years in White-chapple, and he described the business of a Scrivener pretty much in the same manner as the others have done. He says that he does not think that merely transacting money is the proper business of

a Scrivener, but however he says that at various times he has procured money & charged for that business, but he says procuring money is more particularly the office of a Broker, than a Scrivener, but that he has dealt in both, & those he has procured & lent money on those occasions, yet taking the whole together a Scrivener may do that business as well as a Broker.

The observations on the Evidence are very accurately made & strongly insisted upon! that the whole profession of the law is involved in this Action.

It is said what will become of Mankind if this business is confined within so few hands as those of the Scriveners Company only, and if Attornies are not at liberty to carry on their business without being free of the City of London! what would you do in Warrants of Attorney? what would you do in suffering recoveries? why we should be all to seek! we should not know how business could be carried on! why it is very possible that a Gentleman may be called upon to draw a deed or make a Will, there is no precedent of an Action of this sort, no precedent whatever.

There is another difficulty which he makes with regard to the Custom, that the custom to make By-Laws is very certain, & that these By-Laws must be founded upon Custom or else are void. Now the question is whether this is a By-Law warranted by the Custom of London, the Custom is that everything relating to trade is in the Corporation, now here is a By-Law made not to restrain trade but to regulate it; & the reason that supports this Custom is a very plain and good one; people must be educated in trade or else they will not be qualified to carry on trade, and therefore these By-Laws are made and made consistent with that custom which requires a regulating them.

Why then it is insisted upon likewise that this business is necessarily carried on likewise in this manner; if it were not for that, says this learned Gentleman, you must run away & get a Scrivener or else you are at a full stand, what can a man do who is a dying and wants to make his Will? an Attorney must not do it, it must be a Scrivener, if it is confined to the Scriveners then you take away the business of an Attorney, and says the Attorney you take that business away from me, what have we done from time immemorial? I can't go on! I cannot complete my business! I cannot do my duty!

Now in order to prove that Attornies have always carried on their business there are several witnesses called. The first is Mr. Filmer, who is a Gentleman of great knowledge in his business & universal good character. Now he tells you that he don't remember being consulted by a Scrivener but once; he has had drafts of all sorts of Conveyancing, he excepts one *charts of Partnership & that by none but Attornies, & he always looked upon it that it properly was their business, & that they were always the people who prepared and drew these drafts for his perusal, & he confines the whole to the Attorney.

Why then Mr. Wilbrome is called, who tells you that he has been at the

* uncertain.

Bar 42 years, & though he has had a great deal of business in Court, yet he had a great deal of business in Chamber too, he knows nobody at all except Mr. Jacomb, nay he was surprised at the name, he mentions Mr. Gibson & Jacomb, but all his business which had been very great was transacted by an Attorney.

But then Mr. Booth was called. He says all the business which was from time to time brought him, except one or two instances, were all brought to him by Attornies.

Why then Mr. Capper is called & he says the very same thing, that he has been concerned pretty much in the same manner.

Mr. Harper the very same, he has been forty years in business and those who attended him were Attornies.

Mr. Webb he tells you that about forty years ago he was Clerk to Mr. Harwood, he says that he did a vast deal of business here in the City of London in drawing Bills. He says he drew a great number of Bills both as Partner with Harwood & afterwards for himself, he says that neither Harwood or himself were free of the City of London. He has produced a number of original deeds, he says he has observed a great many witnesses who have attested these deeds, he says that some few instances & but few were attested by Scriveners, but the bulk of them were not attested as he asserts by any Scrivener at all, he says he has searched all the ancient repositories & that here were some very few Scriveners names to the deeds, and the bulk of these people were those who were not Scriveners; he says he has observed several deeds that were inrolled here in the hustings, & he says that those very deeds were not attested by any Scriveners at all.

Then Mr. North was called. He says he has drawn numbers of Conveyances within the City of London, but that he never was questioned for doing so by any body.

Why then the next Witness is Mr. Hardin. And he has been a number of years an Attorney in the City, he was Clerk to Mr. Wood, Mr. Wood was called, a very eminent Solicitor, & he says that in drawing of deeds he always thought was the proper business of an Attorney, that he never knew it was a business sacred only to the Scriveners, but diffused through the whole body of Attornies. That he has drawn a great many deeds, and was never prosecuted in any manner for doing what he has done for so many years.

Then Mr. Woodcock was called. He says that he always did it & always thought he had a right to do it.

There have been a great many observations made by the Learned Sargeant, & these I hope will make that impression upon you so as not to escape your attention.

You will consider that this is an action brought upon a By-Law which is calculated in order to secure the freedom of the City of London, and supported by a Custom of the City of London, which is formed into a By-Law for that purpose, & the words of the By-Law are "That any person using the Art,

“Mystery or Occupation of a Scrivener within the City of London who is not free of the same incurs the penalty of five pounds.”

The question is whether this is an Art & Mystery that falls within the By-law.

You will consider then the Evidence we have heard ; what three witnesses have told you is the Art & Mystery of a Scrivener ; they have told you that they look upon the making of deeds to be the Mystery of a Scrivener, now this is their description of it, & this is contraverted by the contrary party, they say it is the proper business of an Attorney to draw deeds. Now three Witnesses tell you that it is the proper business of a Scrivener to prepare deeds and arguments in order to be sealed, one says it is the business of an Attorney, & the other it is the business of a Scrivener. The Attornies admit that they have done so, but they justify doing it because they are Attornies, now, Gentlemen, that is the question ; you are to determine whether you think it the proper business of a Scrivener or an Attorney. If you are satisfied that it is the proper business of a Scrivener to draw these deeds then you are to give your Verdict for the Plaintiff. If you are of opinion that it is the proper business of an Attorney then you are to give your Verdict for the Defendant.

FOR THE DEFENDANT.

**SOLICITOR PRACTISING WHILE
UNCERTIFICATED.**

Wednesday next after Fifteen days of the Holy Trinity in the
40th year of King George the 3.

Beresford } Upon reading the affidavit of
Crowder & anr. } Germain Lavie.

Upon hearing Mr. Erskine of Counsel for the Defendants, and Mr. Espmasse of Counsel for the Plaintiff, and by their Consent, and the Defendants hereby undertaking to pay to the Plaintiff, the sum of Fifty pounds, being one of the Penalties mentioned in the Declaration, as a Composition in full satisfaction and discharge of this suit together with one hundred guineas for his costs of suit. It is Ordered that the Plaintiff have leave to compound this Action with the Defendants for the said sum of Fifty pounds and one hundred Guineas costs as aforesaid for the offence for which this action is brought, namely for acting as Attornies and Solicitors without having obtained their Certificates contrary to the statute of the thirty-seventh year of his present Majesty.

In the King's Bench.

John Beresford agt. { Wm. Henry Crowder and
 } Germain Lavie.

It is hereby understood and agreed between the Plaintiff and Defendts above named that this Action shall be compounded on the payment of one penalty of £50 with the costs of Suit or leave of the Court, being for that purpose obtained, and it is hereby further understood and agreed between the Parties, in order to save the trouble of taxing costs, that the costs to be paid to the Plts. Atty. in this Cause, shall be one hundred Guineas. Dated this 24th day of June 1800.

Witness,
G. Heath.

Thos. Platt, agent for the Defts.
Chas. Yarrell, Clk. to Mr.
Morton, Plts. Atty.

Beresford agt. Crowder and anor.

Received the 30th day of June 1800, of the above Defendants by the Hands of Mr. Thomas Platt, the sum of Fifty pounds for one Penalty and one hundred and five pounds costs, pursuant to the Rule of Court made in this Cause.

ARNOLD MORTON, Plts. Attorney.

£155 os. od.

Witness,

GEO. HEATH.

OATH BY JEWISH SOLICITOR.

Joseph Abrahams, Son of Abraham Abrahams of Mitre Court, Leadenhall Street, was on the 29th Decr., 1763, articulated as clerk to George Ellis the younger of Deans Street, ffetter Lane, an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench.

Affidt. of due execution of the Articles sworn 25th Jan. 1764, fyled
18th feeb. 1764.

On ye 18 July 1769 the said Joseph Abrahams was assigned over by Articles by the said George Ellis to Robt. Gill of Angel Court, Throgmorton, Street Attorney in the Common Pleas.

23rd Jan. 1770 the said Joseph Abrahams was admitted as an Attorney of the King's Bench by Mr. Justice Yates.

13th feebry 1770 was admitted a Sollr. in Chancery. The Deputy Clerk of ye petty Bagg informed me Abrahams was sworn on the Bible.

10th Geo. 1st Cap. 4. Subjects professing ye Jewish Religion presenting themselves to take ye Oath of Abjuration (the words *Upon the true faith of a Christian* to be omitted) and deemed a Sufft. taking of the abjuration Oath.

OATHS TO BE TAKEN BY ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS.

1st Geo. I. c. 13. It is enacted *Int. al.* That every Attorney, Sollr. or proctor practising in any Court whatsoever residing in the Citys of London and Westmr, or within 30 miles distant on ye 1st day of Michaelmas term following or at any time during ye sd. term in some of ye Courts at Westmr. shod take ye oaths in ye Act mentioned or at ye Quarter Sessions on or before ye 23rd Janry. following.

And that every Attorney Sollr. or proctor who shall after ye 10th of Augt. 1715 be admitted and shall within 3 months after such admission take and subscribe ye sd oaths in one of ye Courts at Westmr or Quarter Sessions.

And in case of neglect or refusal shall be *ipso facto* adjudged incapable and disabled in Law to practice and shall forfeit £500 to be recovered by any person who shall sue for the same.

2nd Geo. II. c. 31. sect. 3. So much of ye sd Act as requires the sd persons to take ye sd Oaths in 3 months after admission is repealed.

Sect. 4. It is enacted *int. al.* that every Attorney, Sollr. Proctor and who shall after ye 21st Janry 1728 be admitted and shall take and subscribe the oaths directed by first Act to be taken at such places and in such fform as by that Act is directed in the Courts at Westmr. at any time before ye end of the next Term after admission or before the end of ye next Quarter Sessions for ye County where such person shall reside.

And all the penaltys and forfeitures of ye 1st Act are inforced by this Act.

4 Geo. 2d, c. 6.	Time for taking ye oaths enlarged to ye 23d Jan. 1731.
7 Geo. 2d, c. 10.	Enlarged to ye 29th Sepr. 1734.
9 Geo. 2d, c.	Enlarged to ye 1st Augt. 1736.
10 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 28th Novr. 1737.
11 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 28th Novr. 1738.
12 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 28th Novr. 1739.
13 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 8th Novr. 1740.
14 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 28th Novr. 1741.
15 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 31st Decr. 1742.
16 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 31st Decr. 1743.
18 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 25th Decr. 1745.
19 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 1st Decr. 1746.
20 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 28th Novr. 1747.
21 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 28th Novr. 1748.
24 Geo. 2d,	Enlarged to ye 28th Novr. 1751.

UNQUALIFIED PERSONS.

A clause submitted to be added in the Bill now depending in the Honourable the House of Commons for continuing the acts for regulating attornies and sollicitors.

And for the better preventing unqualified persons from being admitted Attorneys and Sollicitors and for rendring the said Act more effectual for the purposes thereby intended Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid that every person who shall from and after _____ be Bound by Contract in writing to serve as a Clerk to any Attorney or Sollicitor as by the said Act is directed, shall within _____ next after the date of every such Contract cause an Affidavit to be made and duly sworn of the actual execution of every such Contract by every such Attorney or Sollicitor, and ye person so to be bound to serve as a clerk as aforesaid, and in every such Affidavit shall be specified the names of every such Attorney and Sollicitor and of every such person so Bound and their places

U

become bound by contract in writing to serve any Attorney or Solicitor as by the said Act is directed, shall during the whole time and term of service to be specified in such Contract continue and be actually employed by such Attorney or Solicitor in the proper Business Practice or employment of an Attorney or Solicitor, Provided always and it is hereby Enacted if any such Attorney or Solicitor to or with whom any such Person shall be so Bound shall happen to die before the expiration of such Term, or shall discontinue or leave of such his Practice as aforesaid, or if such Contract shall by mutual consent of the Parties be cancelled, or in case such Clerk shall be legally discharged by any Rule or Order of the Court wherein such Attorney or Solicitor shall practise before the Expiration of such term, and such Clerk shall in any of the said cases be bound by another Contract or other Contracts in writing to serve, and shall accordingly serve in manner herein before mentioned as Clerk to any other such practising Attorney or Attorneys Solicitor or Solicitors as aforesaid respectively during the residue of the said term of 5 years, then such service shall be deemed and taken to be as good effectual and available as if such clerk had continued to serve as a Clerk for the said Term to the same Person to whom he was originally Bound, so as an Affidavit be duly made and filed of the Execution of such second or other Contract or Contracts as is before directed concerning such Original Contract. And be it further Enacted, that every person who from and after shall become bound as a Clerk as aforesaid, shall before he be admitted an Attorney or Solicitor according to the said Act, cause an Affidavit of himself or such Attorney or Solicitor to whom he was bound as aforesaid to be duly made and filed with the proper Officer herein before for that purpose appointed that he hath actually served and been employed by such practising Attorney or Attorneys Solicitor or Solicitors to whom he was bound as aforesaid during the said whole Term of five years according to the true intent and meaning of every such Contract in writing and of this Act.

A Clause submitted to be added to the Bill now depending in the
Honorable the House of Commons for continuing
the acts for Regulating Attorneys and Solls.

And for the surer preventing unqualified persons from being admitted Attorneys and Solicitors, and for rendering the purposes of the said act more effectual, Be it enacted by the Authority aforesaid, that every person who shall from and after be bound by Contract in Writing to serve any Attorney or Solicitor, as by the said Act is directed, shall within next after the date of every such Contract cause an Affidavit to be made and duly sworn of the actual execution of every such Contract by every such Attorney or Solicitor and person so to be bound, and in every such Affidavit shall be specified the names of every such Attorney and Solicitor and of every such person so to be bound and

their place of abode respectively, together with the Day of the date of such Contract, and every such Affidavit shall be filed within the time aforesaid with the proper Officer of the Court where the Attorney or Solicitor to whom every such person shall be so respectively bound as aforesaid hath been enrolled as an Attorney or Solicitor, which said proper Officer shall make and sign a Memorandum or Mark of the day of filing every such Affidavit on the back, or at the bottom thereof. And be it further enacted, that no Person who shall after the said

become Bound as aforesaid shall be admitted or inrolled an Attorney or Solicitor in any Court in the said Act mentioned before such Affidavit so mark' by the proper Officer as aforesaid, shall be produced and openly read in such Court. And it is hereby declared, that the proper Officer for filing such affidavits in the High Court of Chancery shall be with the Senior Clerk of the Petty Bagg Office or his Deputy; in the Court of King's Bench with the Chief Clerk
Mar of that Court or his Deputy
King's Bench Office

and in the Court of Common Pleas with the Clerk of the Warrants of *that Court or his deputy*; and in the Court of Exchequer with the King's Remembrancer of that Court or his Deputy; and in the Court of the Duchy of Lancaster with the Chief Clerk of that Court or his Deputy; and in the principality of Wales and Countys Palatine with the respective proper officers of the several Courts who Inroll Attorneys and Sollrs there sworn and admitted. And be it further enacted, that every such Officer shall keep a Book wherein shall be entred the substance of such Affidavits specifying the names and places of abode of every such Attorney or Solicitor and Clerk or person bound as aforesaid, and of the person making such Affidavit with the Date of the articles or contract in such affidavit to be mentioned, and the Days of Swearing and filing every such affidavit respectively; and every such Officer shall be at liberty to take at the time of filing every such Affidavit the sum of

and no more, which shall be deemed a Recompence for his trouble in filing such Affidavits and preparing and keeping such Books as aforesaid, which shall be searcht in Office Hours without Fee or Reward. And be it further enacted, that if at any time hereafter any person shall be admitted or inrolled an Attorney or Solicitor in any such Court or Courts contrary to the true intent and meaning of the said Act, or contrary to the directions hereinbefore given concerning the same, that upon proof thereof to be made to the Court or Courts where such person shall be so unduly admitted and inrolled such Court or Courts shall and are hereby required to vacate every such Admission and inrollment by advising the name of every such person to be struck out of the Roll or entry of Attorneys or Solicitors of such Court or Courts. And Be it further enacted, that from and after

if any person who is or shall be sworn, admitted, and inrolled an Attorney or Solicitor in any Court in the said Act mentioned, shall consent or permit any person not sworn, admitted and Inrolled an Attorney or Solicitor according to the said Act for or in expectation of any Gain Fee or Reward to sue any Writ or process, or commence carry on prosecute or defend in the name of

such Attorney or Solicitor any Action or Actions or other proceeding in any such Court every such Attorney or Solicitor, or consenting or permitting such unqualified person to make use of his name as aforesaid for every such offence shall forfeit and pay _____ to such person, to be recovered in such manner as the penalties and forfeitures incurred by any person offending against the said Act may be Recovered. And be it further enacted, that every consent or permission of any Attorney or Solicitor given to any person to authorize him to sue out any Writ or process, or to commence carry on or defend any action or proceeding as aforesaid the name of such Attorney or Solicitor shall from and after _____ be ingrossed on parchmt and signed by ye person so permitting his name to be made up of and be filed with such Officer and Officers with whom such Affidavits hereinbefore mentioned are directed to be filed, and no such consent or permission shall be admitted as an authority, or held to be of any force or validity whatsoever until the same shall be filed as aforesaid.

ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS.

23rd Feb., 1742. General Meeting. Ordered that all proper and necessary Inquirys be made by the Committee to discover any Attorneys or Sollicitors who have or shall be surreptitiously admitted, and that every Member do use their utmost endeavours to discover and discountenance any such practices.

15th Feb., 1744. General Meeting referred to by ye Committee to enquire if any persons have been attorneys or Sollicitors who was not duly qualified, and to report ye same at the next general Meeting, with their opinion thereon what may be proper to be done to remove such persons from the office of attorneys and Sollicitors, and to prevent the admission of unqualified persons for the Future.

10th July, 1745. General Meeting. The preceding Order recomitted, and further Ordered that every member of ye Society give notice in writing to the Deputy Secretary of the names and places of abode of such person or persons who they know or have been informed were admitted as aforesaid, that the same may be laid before the Committee the more effectually to enable them to make such Rept as by the sd Order is directed.

14th Feb., 1745. General Meeting. The Orders touching the undue and irregular admission of attorneys and Sollrs. continued and made standing Orders of the Society.

Resolved application be made to ye Court of Chancery to strike off Langdon Jones out of the roll of Attorneys and Sollrs.

4th June, 1746. Committee was informed that Mr. James Hodgson was admitted an attorney of ye Ks. Bench while serving a Clerkp.

16th June, 1746. Committee resolved to lay that matter before the Society next General Meeting.

20th June, 1746. General Meeting. Prolocutor reported that Jones was in the last Easter Term struck off the Roll of Sollrs. in Chancery.

The Order with regard to Hodgson referred back to ye Committee.

Ordered, That the Lists of Attorneys and Sollrs. admitted be laid before the General Meeting twice a year.

7th Nov., 1746. Committee, Resolved no application be made for striking off Hodgson from ye Roll.

18th Feb., 1746. General Meeting. Complaint agt Wm. Sparry an attorney, and Referring to ye Committee.

15th July, 1747. General Meeting. Complaint agt Sparry to be further considered.

10th Feb., 1747. Committee. It appearing Sparry was not surreptitiously admitted an attorney, now of opinion not to apply to have him struck off the Roll.

21st Feb., 1752. General Meeting. Ordered that ye Committee take notice of and prosecute any attorneys guilty of Illegal practices at the Society's expense, and every Member is desired to give notice to ye Secretary of all Illegal practices as shall come to their knowledge, who is to lay the same before the Committee.

9th Augt., 1753. Committee. Complaint against Jno. Sparry for practising tho' a prisoner.

Ordered that it shall be referred to ye consideration of ye next General Meeting whether to apply to Parliamt for an amendmt of ye Act to prevent attorneys whilst prisoners practising.

20th Febry., 1756. General Meeting. Ordered, an application to be made for striking off Wm. Wreathock from the Roll of Attorneys.

25th Febry., 1757. General Meeting. Reference to ye Committee to consider of an application to ye Courts of Law and Equity, or to Parliamt to prevent unqualified persons being admitted attys and Sollrs.

11th July, 1757. Comittee. Secretary's information with regard to his assistance to Mr. Jnos. on the motion against Greenwood and Sliper.

15th July, 1757. General Meeting. Secretary ordered to continue his assistance.

24th Febry., 1758. General Meeting. Reports with regard to Greenwood Slipper and Wreathock.

The Order of Reference at ye last General Meeting. For the Committee to Inquire if some attorneys have not been lately surreptitiously admitted, amounts to no more than the General Standing Orders of the Society, and if any particular person shall be pointed out to have been surreptitiously admitted, the Committee have already a power to make proper applications to strike him off the roll. It is therefore incumbent on ye person who made the motion to point out the person complained of, otherwise the General Enquiry is to no purpose.

SIX CLERKS' OFFICE.

In the year 1748 the sworn clerks in the Six Clerks' Office applied to be admitted Solicitors. The Law Society before referred to strenuously opposed their admission. They had interviews with the Master of the Rolls on the subject, and even had an interview with the Clerks themselves, but as the Clerks at this interview would not discuss the question at issue the Solicitors withdrew, and the matter went before the Court, and the Clerks were prevented from being admitted Solicitors.

It might not be uninteresting to give the reasons adduced in opposition to the admission of the Clerks, and for this purpose it will be necessary to mention some of the Orders of Court made for their government.

1666, July 18, fo. 103, printed in the book of orders. Prior to the year 1666, it appears that manifold disorders and undue practices had crept into the Six Clerks' Office to the great dishonour of the Court, the obstruction of Justice, the damage of the Client, and confusion and loss of the records. It was therefore amongst other things declared to be very manifest that these misdemeanours and enormities had grown up in the Six Clerks' Office *inter alia* by receiving into it too many Clerks of little or no experience, and every Six Clerk was stinted to 12 under Clerks.

1668, June 18, fo. 160. In 1668 the six Clerks were stinted to 10 under Clerks; and it was ordered amongst other things that when any vacancy should happen in any of the under Clerks places none should be nominated by the Six Clerks to fill such place unless he had been educated and brought up in the Office, and had served 7 years at least as a Clerk under one of the Six Clerks, or under Clerks. The form of the oath for the under Clerks to take was prescribed by this Order, and related chiefly the care of the record books, &c., and the secret keeping Depositions and Examinations till publication pass, or by consent of the parties or their Attorneys.

1668, Mar. 20, fo. 222. Another Order was made for regulating under Clerks in the Six Clerks' Office, inasmuch as it appeared that great and manifold disorders and undue practices in the Six Clerks' Office had grown up in consequence of the Sworn Clerk taking more under Clerks than one apiece, and discharging and turning them off from their service to the ruin of many, and to the discouragement of the training up and breeding of industrious and diligent young clerks to serve and succeed in the said Office. It was therefore ordered that the supernumerary, or Licentiate Clerks should be discharged, and they were thereby prohibited and hindered from practising in the Office.

1693, Decr. 9th, fo. 241. In 1693 an Order was made in which it was recited that complaints had been made by the Sworn Clerks of their under Clerks having behaved themselves in a bold, insolent, rude and disorderly manner, and that the under Clerks had complained of the Six Clerks that

they employed persons to be their waiting Clerks who had not been articled or even educated in the Office, and that several of the sworn Clerks took more than one articled Clerk, which by the rules and Orders of the Court for the government of the Office they ought not to do, and had also carried the records out of the office, and got them copied by persons out of the Office rather than allow their underclerks their due fees for copying them, not only contrary to the rules and orders of the Office, and to the discouragement of diligence and industry of the Clerks, and to the introduction of ignorance. In order to prevent the like and all other abuses for the future, it was ordered, That the Six Clerks should not for the future take any person to be his waiting clerk but such as had been an articled clerk to a sworn Clerk, and should have but 2 waiting Clerks each, and that no sworn Clerk should have or take more than one articled Clerk at the same time. From these Standing Orders of the Court it would appear that a Clerk in Court could have but one articled Clerk at a time, and the reasons for this limitation are fully expressed in the Orders. It further appears that a Clerk should serve for 7 years, and that the waiting Clerk to the Six Clerk and the Sworn Clerk were to consist of the persons thus regularly brought up in the Office, and the Orders gave very strong reasons to shew the necessity and utility of these regulations, all of which would be entirely frustrated, and all the mischief and disorders be again introduced in the Six Clerks' Office, which these Orders were intended to remedy and prevent if the Clerks in Court prevailed in their attempt to be admitted as Solicitors under the authority of the Act of Geo. II. chap. 23, their principal object being plainly to enable them instead of 1 to take 3 Clerks, viz. one under the Order as Clerk in Court, and 2 under the sanction of the Act of Parliament as Solicitors.

2 G. II. c. 23. The Title of the Act is entirely confined to the regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors only, and all the enacting Clauses of the Act make no mention of or reference to the Clerks in Court, and the Act itself expressly declared it did not extend to them. The whole nature of the Act shows it was impossible it could be so meant or intended. For by the Act all those who were at that time out of their Clerkships and were in practice themselves were required to be sworn and admitted by the 1st of December 1730, and if they omitted that time they could not afterwards be admitted, but by either a new service or a new Act of Parliament.

By Section 7, after the 1st December 1730 no person who had not before that day been admitted, should be permitted to act as a Solicitor, or to sue out any process &c., unless he had been bound by Contract in writing to serve as a Clerk for 5 years to a Solicitor duly sworn and admitted, and during the same time continued in such service, and also unless such person after the expiration of the said 5 years had been examined, sworn, admitted, and inrolled.

The Clerks in Court were so conscious that they were not within the directions of this Act that none of them applied to be sworn and admitted as

Solicitors before the said 1st of December 1730, and having omitted that time were in no other respect within the direction of the said Act, and could and would not be admitted without a direct and open violation of the positive words of the Act, by which even any Attorney or Solicitor who was a practiser in his own right at the time of passing the Act, if he omitted being sworn in before the 1st of December 1730, could ever after be admitted to practice.

No person could after the 1st of Decr. 1730 be admitted as required by the Act except that the Legislature were informed that there were several Clerks to Attorneys and Solicitors who were articed only for 4 years, and whose Clerkships were not then expired. The Act therefore provided (Section 9) that nothing therein contained to exclude any one from being admitted as an Attorney or Solicitor who had on or before the 25th of March 1729 been bound by Contract in writing to serve as Clerk to any Attorney or Solicitor.

Sect. 15. The Act further directed, that no Attorney or Solicitor should have more than two articed Clerks at one time; this was with the intention of lessening the number of Attorneys and Solicitors; but if the Clerks in Court were to be admitted as Solicitors it would enlarge their power of taking Clerks, and greatly increase the number of Solicitors, and would in effect overturn the chief and principal point the Legislature had in view by passing this Act.

Provision was made by the Act (Section 20), that a Sworn Attorney may be admitted a Solicitor. But there was no provision whatsoever for admitting a Clerk in Court as Solicitor, as certainly would have been done if the Legislature had so meant or intended.

The Clauses at the end of the Act free this question from all possibility of doubts, which were doubtless inserted on purpose to show that this Act was not meant or intended to extend to Clerks in Court, for it expressly provided that the Act should not extend to the Examination, Admission, Swearing or Enrolment of the Six Clerks of the Court of Chancery, or their Sworn Clerks in the Office, or the waiting Clerks belonging to the Six Clerks. But that such Clerks should and might be examined, sworn, admitted, inrolled and practise in their respective Courts and Offices in like manner, as they might have been or done before the making of the Act. It will be observed that there was no provision in the Clause relating to the Clerks in Court being approved, sworn, and admitted according to the directions of the Act, as there was in the next subsequent Clause with regard to the Attorneys or Clerks in the Exchequer.

This Clause declaring the Act should not extend to the Clerks in Court was inserted on their own application, which clearly showed that all they then desired was that they should not be affected by the Act one way or the other, and the Act accordingly in the most express words declared that it should not at all extend to or affect them. The Act took away none of their old rights, and it plainly gave them no new ones. It was neither to their benefit nor to

their prejudice, but left them in possession of the same rights they had before the passing of the Act.

Before this Act no Clerk in Court could have more than one articulated Clerk at a time; whereas Attorneys and Solicitors, who were under no limitation in this respect, were by its provisions confined to two. Again at the time of passing the Act, a Clerk in Court could not take an articulated Clerk for less than seven years; but by this Act Attorneys and Solicitors were empowered to take articulated Clerks for five years.

Another reason against the sworn Clerks being admitted Solicitors was that it would withdraw their attendance from the proper business of the Office, and introduce the greatest disorders and confusion between the Clerks they took as Solicitors and those taken as Clerks in Court.

It appears that Mr. Joseph Nicholls, one of the sworn Clerks, was admitted a Solicitor as having served under Articles dated before 25th March, 1729, to one of the sworn Clerks, and afterwards practised as a Solicitor. Admitted 28th November, 1734, by Sir Joseph Ishyll.

That Mr. Markham and Mr. Oliver Edwards, two other sworn Clerks, were, according to the precedent of Mr. Nicholls, admitted Solicitors in the time of Mr. Verney, and during his illness by Mr. Edwards and Mr. Sawyer on the 12th May, 1741.

That Mr. Cranmer and Mr. Sambourne were, under the same precedents, admitted by his present Honour the 4th June, 1742.

The persons who claimed to be admitted in, based their claim upon the precedents before mentioned.

The Clerks in Court, whilst they continued such, had an undoubted right to practise as Solicitors, and this under the Act of 2nd Geo. II. section 26, which saved the right of practising to them as before the making the Act.

This Act was a Declaration of an entirely new Law, and if the 26th section had been omitted, the Clerks in Court could not have practised as Solicitors.

At the Sessions of Parliament in 1741 a clause was, by Order of the House of Commons, added to a Bill for explaining the Laws for punishing persons who should destroy Turnpikes, which was as follows:—

“After reciting the 2nd George II. for the relief of persons who, since the 1st December 1730, had served as Clerks for five years to Attorneys or Solicitors, in pursuance of Contracts actually made and intended to have been reduced into writing, and extended according to the directions of the said Act; but which Contract, through the death, omission, or default of such Attorneys or Solicitors happened not to be reduced into writing, or extended in the lifetime of such Attorneys or Solicitors, Be it enacted That every such person being first examined as the Act directs, should and might, upon proof of such Agreement and Service as aforesaid, to the satisfaction of some, or one of the Judges of Courts of Law in Westminster Hall, on or before the last day of Michaelmas Term of 42 be sworn, admitted, and inrolled.”

Some reasons were reduced into writing against this Clause by the Law

Society, and delivered to some of the members of the House of Commons, stating that the Act was chiefly to guard against any indirect methods in the admission of Attorneys and in the qualifications of their Clerks.

That the dispensing with the regulations of the Acts (which had been so long in force) would be a precedent for future innovations, and tend to the discouragement of Attorneys duly qualified, and their Clerks by Contracts duly executed, increase of Attorneys and Solicitors and prejudice of the Subject.

The House of Commons, as we presume, being tender of any innovation of the Act, without either Motion or Debate struck the Clause out of the Bill.

CLAUSE IN FAVOUR OF THE SIX CLERKS.

And be it further Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That any Person who shall have been admitted a Sworn Clerk or a Waiting Clerk in the Office of the Six Clerks of the Court of Chancery, or shall have been bound by Contract in Writing to serve as a Clerk for and during the space of five years to a Sworn Clerk in the said Office, and for and during the said term of five years shall have continued in such service, may be examined, sworn, and Admitted and Inrolled as a Solicitor in the same manner as Solicitors in Courts of Equity are by the said Act required to be examined, sworn, admitted and inrolled, anything in the said Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

Provided also, And it is hereby further enacted, That if any Sworn Clerk in the said Six Clerks' Office with and to whom any person hath been or shall be bound by Contract in Writing as aforesaid to serve as a Clerk for the term of five years, shall happen to die before the expiration of the said five years, or if such Contract shall by mutual consent of the party be vacated, or in case such Clerk be legally discharged by any Rule or Order of the said Court of Chancery before the expiration of the said five years, then, and in any of the said Cases, if such Clerk shall by Contract in Writing be obliged to serve and shall accordingly serve as a Clerk to any other Sworn Clerk in the said Six Clerks' Office, or to any Solicitor who shall be sworn, admitted, and inrolled pursuant to the said Act of the second year of His present Majesty during the residue of the said term of five years, then such service shall be deemed and taken to be good and effectual, as if such Clerk had continued to serve as a Clerk for the term of two years to the same Person to whom he was originally bound by Contract in Writing as aforesaid.

Provided always And it is hereby further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That no Sworn Clerk in the said Six Clerks' Office shall have more than *two* Clerks at one and the same time who shall become bound by Contract in Writing to serve him as Clerks.

REASONS AGAINST THE CLAUSE IN FAVOUR OF THE SIX CLERKS AND
THE SIDE CLERKS.

1st. Because such Clause is inconsistent with the Orriginall Act, which only regards Attorneys and Solls, and not Clerks in Chancery, Except in a Clause therein obtained by themselves, whereby they are particularly excepted out of the same Act, the consequence of which was, and has been, that they thereby avoided the payment of the Stamp Dutye by that Act laid upon all Attorneys and Solls. preserved to themselves an Independent Right they then claimed of not being affected by that Act as Attorneys and Solls. were, and procured an Exemption to themselves of those regulations and difficultyes which that Act subjected the Attorneys and Solls. to.

2ndly. For that by the Antient Constitution and constant usage of the Six Clerks' Office, the Sworn Clerks were only at Libertye to take one articulated Clerk, and the Waiting Clerks are not allowed to take any, by which means the Sworn Clerks have constantly, on having Exorbitant prizes with their clerks, and as by the intended clause so great an increase of Clerks is attempted to be made in that office (altho without the necessity or the use thereof can easily be demonstrated). It is not a difficult matter to conclude that the desired increase has more of Lucre than Utility in it.

Reasons against encreasing the number of Attorneys and Sollicitors, and against the Clauses inserted in the Bill now depending in Parliament (for continuing amongst others the Acts made for the better Regulation of Attorneys and Sollrs.), with regard to the Swearing, Admitting and Inrolling as Sollicitors the Sworne Clerks and Waiting Clerks in the Office of the Six Clerks of the Court of Chancery.

It has ever been the Intention of the Legislature to prevent the undue and unnecessary increase of Attorneys and Sollicitors, and that none should practise as such but persons of character and integrity, regularly brought up, and well qualified to act in the profession; and with this view and to restrain their number, the Act of the second of his present Majesty for the better regulations of Attorneys and Sollrs. was made, and which principally regards the Regulation of Attorneys and Sollrs., practising in the several Courts of Law and Equity, and not Officers of such Courts practicing in virtue of their office which with regard to the Six Clerks of the Courts of Chancery, or the Sworne Clerks in their Office, or the Waiting Clerks, is evident, for to them by a provisoe in the said Act, the same is declared not to extend, but they are left at large to practice in their Court and Office in like manner as they might have done, before making the Act. They are not thereby laid lyable to any of the restrictions and directions therein contained, to which practicing Attorneys and Sollicitors are subjected.

Notwithstanding this provisoe and exception the Sworne Clerks of the Six

Clerks' Office have now offered several Clauses to Parliament, which are inserted in the Bill for continueing (among others) the aforesaid Act, and which are to the following purport :—

“That any person who shall have been admitted a Sworn Clerk or a Waiting Clerk in the Office of the Six Clerks of the Court of Chancery, or shall have been bound by Contract in writing to serve as a Clerk for and during the space of five years to a Sworn Clerk in the said Office, and for and during the said term of five years shall have continued in such service, may be examined, sworn, admitted, and inrolled as a Solicitor in the same manner as Solicitors in Courts of Equity are by the said Act required to be examined, sworn, admitted and inrolled.”

Against this Clause the following Reasons are humbly submitted :—

1st. For that the said Act solely regards the Regulation of Attorneys and Sollrs., and the sd Clause now afford is inconsistent with the provisoe in the sd Act, and if carried into a Law will give powers to persons to be admitted as Sollrs. under an Act to whom it is expressly declared the same does not extend.

2d. There is no necessity for any new Law or particular Act in favour of the said Sworn Clerks, and to intitule them to practise as Sollrs. in regard by virtue of their Office they have already yt priviledge in as extensive a manner as can be required.

3rd. By the Rules and Orders of the Court of Chancery the Sworne Clerks as such are intituled to take and qualifye one articled Clerk, and if allowed to be sworne and admitted Sollrs. of the Court in the same manner as Sollrs. in Courts of Equity, are directed to be admitted under sanction of the sd Act, they will be enabled to take and qualifye two more clerks, a priviledge the practicing Attornys and Solicitors are restrained from, and those clerks when out of their time will have the like power to qualifye clerks, which in process of time will make a prodigious and dangerous increase.

4th. Any person who shall be sworn, admitted, and inrolled a Sollr. in the Court of Chancery have a power given them by the sd Act with the consent of an Attorney of any of the Courts at Law, in the names of such Attorney to sue out any Writt or process, or to comence, carry on, prosecute or defend any Action or Actions at Law: If the said Sworn Clerks &c. shou'd be admitted Solicitors, they and their Clerks when admitted will be enabled to act as Attorneys in the Courts of Law, in a Branch of Business wherein they are no ways conversant or in the least capable of.

5th. The Sworn Clerks of the Office &c. are now possess of a distinct branch of business, to wch none but themselves can be intituled, and it wou'd be unreasonable to permitt them to act in a double capacity as Clerks in Cot. and as Attorneys and Sollrs. when the latter was totally abridged of the liberty of becoming Clerks in Court.

Lastly. If the said Clause shou'd pass into a Law, it may be an Inlett to the Cursitors of the said Court of Chancery, Clerks of the Petty Bagg Office,

Clerks of the King's Coroner Attorney in the Court of King's Bench, ffilazers of the same Court, ffilazers of the Court of Common Pleas, Attorneys of the Dutchy Court of the Chamber of Lancaster, Attorneys of the Court of Exchequer at Chester, and Attorneys of the Courts of the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs respectively for the time being, who are by the said provisoe in the said Act equally with the said Sworn Clerks excepted out of the said Act to make the like application to be admitted Attorneys and qualifye Clerks which wou'd introduce that increase of Attorneys and Sollicitors wch the Legislature intended to prevent.

For which reasons it is humbly submitted the said Clauses ought not to pass into a Law.

COMPLAINT AGAINST SAMUEL JORDAN, AN ATTORNEY.

In the year 1749 Samuel Butler of Saint Mary Axe, in the parish of Saint Andrew Undershaft, London, an Attorney, made an affidavit in the matter of a Complaint against Samuel Jordan, to the effect that Jordan late of Cumber paved Court, Blackman's Street, Southwark, but then of Mile End in the County of Middlesex, Victualler, had taken upon him to practise as an Attorney in the name of Butler in several Causes, and particularly in a certain Cause or Action wherein John Morris was plaintiff and Thomas Fowls Defendant, pretending to be the Agent of one Iohn Brittle, And that he Butler was not concerned as Attorney in the above-mentioned Cause, or any other Cause or Suit prosecuted or carried on by or in the name or names of Jordan and Brittle or either of them, and was an entire Stranger to them, and never did directly or indirectly give his consent or permission to them or either of them to sue out any Writ or process, or to commence, carry on, prosecute or defend any Action or Actions or any other proceedings. Henry Lloyd Clerk, to Samuel Butler, swore that he went to the house on the 6th of April, 1749, then or late known by the name or sign of Mother Red Caps at Mile End (which sign was subsequently taken down), and there enquired who kept the Ale house, and was there informed by a woman belonging to it that Samuel Jordan an Attorney kept it since Christmas. That by the direction of his Master he searched the Remembrance Roll of Writs of Michaelmas term last, from which it appeared that on the 25th day of October, 1748, a Writ of Latitat was issued for John Morris plaintiff against Thomas Fowls Defendant, returnable on Monday next after one month from the day of Saint Michael, to which the name of Brittle was there inserted as the attorney, and on the præcipe left in the Office in the Cause it was there inserted Brittle by Butler. That he on the seventeenth day of April carefully searched the Book of the names of Attorneys admitted and enrolled in Court at the Office of Samuel Clarke, Secondary of the Court, and could not find

any person admitted as an Attorney thereof of the name of Samuel Butler, save and except his Master.

George the Second, by the Grace of God of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, and so forth, To the Sheriff of London Greeting, Whereas we lately commanded our Sheriff of Middlesex that he should take Ann Walker, Widow and Administratrix of John Denton deceased and John Doe, if they might be found in his Bailiwick, and keep them safely so that he should have their Bodies before us at Westminster at a certain day now past to answer to Margaret Bun, Widow of

And our said Sheriff of Middlesex at that day returned to us that the aforesaid Ann and John Doe are not found in his Bailiwick, whereupon, on the behalf of the said Margaret, it is sufficiently attested in our Court before us that the aforesaid Ann and John Doe, doe run up and secrete themselves in your County, Therefore we command you that you take them if they may be found in your Bailiwick, and safely keep them so that you may have Bodys before us at Westminster on Monday next after fifteen days from the day of Saint Martin, to answer to the aforesaid Margaret of the place aforesaid, and that you have there then this Writ. Witness, Sir Wm. Low, Knight, at Westminster, 24th day of October, in the 22nd year of our reign,

LEE and ANTONIE.

Ann Walker—You are served with this process to the intent that you may by your Attorney appear in his Majesty's Court of King's Bench at the return thereof, being the 28th day of November, in order to your defence in this Action.

In the King's Bench.

Margaret Bun, Widow, Plaintiff,

and

Ann Walker, Widow, and Adm̄ratrix of
John Denton, deceased, Defendant.

Ann Eales (late Ann Walker) of Castle Court, Lawrence Lane, Cheapside, London, Widow, maketh oath, That on or about the thirtieth day of November last she was served by one Samuel Jordan with a copy of a Writt or process issuing out of this Honourable Court at the Suit of Margarett Bun, Widow, the plaintiff in the above cause returnable on Monday next after fifteen days from the day of Saint Martin, with the name of Brittle by Butler for Plaintiff, and also the date and words following indorsed thereon at the time of the said service, that is to say 23rd Novr., 1748, Mr. Jordan No. 20 in Cumber paved Court, Blackman Street, Borough, Agent for the said Mr. Brittle, which said copy is hereto annexed.

Sworn the 28th day of April 1749 at my
Chambers in Serjeant's Inn in Chancery
Lane before

ANN EALES.

T. DENISON.

COMPLAINT AGAINST JOHN JACKSON, AN ARTICLED CLERK.

In 1766 it appeared that John Jackson of Sleaford, Schoolmaster, who was previously Butler and Clerk to Sir John Therold of Cranwell, Baronet, an acting Justice of the Peace, had for two or three years practised as an Attorney and employed one Mr. Mason of Staple Inn as his Agent, and it appeared on searching at the King's Bench Office, that he was then Articled to one John Koyan, Attorney of that Court, who lived and resided at Holbeach in the County of Lincoln, distant from Sleaford about 30 miles, and that his Articles bore date the Fourteenth May 1764, and were filed the Twenty-third of July following, and that it was greatly to be wished for the credit of the profession that the Master and Agent both might be punished for such a barefaced violation of the Law.

It also appeared that Jackson had a Commission for taking Affidavits in the Common Pleas, the fiat for which was granted him by Mr. Justice Gould at the recommendation of Mason on the Twelfth July, 1764, for the Counties of Lincoln, York, Nottingham, Norfolk and Northampton, the Cities of Lincoln, York and Norwich, and Town of Nottingham. It was stated that he also took Affidavits in the Exchequer, and that he probably had a Commission flowing from the same fountain of recommendation, but no particular search was made for it. The Master had no connexion at Sleaford or the neighbourhood, save with his Clerk, and that he did not carry on any Business whatsoever that could entitle him to keep a Clerk at that distance. As a proof of Jackson's practising on his own account a receipt, of which the following is a copy, was put in evidence—

20th April 1760. Rudford against Bird. In the Exchequer of Pleas
Received of Jeremiah Bird the sum of Three pounds fifteen shillings
and four pence, being in full of Debt and Costs in this Cause.

p me JNO. JACKSON.

This Action was commenced for the recovery of 27 Shillings, and all the proceedings taken was the service of proceeds out of the Exchequer, and the Defendant not appearing an Affidavit was made whereupon to issue an Attachment, but no Attachment appeared to have been sued out.

The Memorial further shewed that there was another person of the same stamp at Heckington, in the said County of Lincoln, who likewise practised for himself, his name being Thos. Pilgrim, aged about 40 years, who had been bred and still continued a Farmer and Grazier, but by the Indulgence

of Mr. John Noble Taylor, who was brought up an Attorney (yet being a man of fortune did not pretend to the least practice), had within two or three years set up as an Attorney. Mr. Taylor lived at Sleaford, 5 miles distance from Heckington, and had given the fellow Articles which were dated the 20th February 1764, and duly filed the 12th May following. Mr. Taylor did not appear as had been observed before in business at all, but all letters which were sent by the Agent were directed to Mr. Thos. Pilgrim, Attorney, at Heckington, and it was well known that he practised openly as such.

Names of y^e Clerks.

Names of y^e Attorneys.

1764, No. 33. Thos. Pilgrim of Heckington in Com. Lincoln to Jno. Noble Taylor of y^e same place.

Wm. Middlebrook swore y^e Affid.

Common Pleas.

John Noble Taylor, Mr. Powell's Clerk.

He was admitted 25th May, 1759.

K.'s Bench. John Jackson put Clerk to John Key of Holbech in Com. Lincoln.

Articles dated 14th May, 1764

Affid of Execution sworn same day,
fyled 23rd July, 1764.

COMPLAINT AGAINST CHARLES COTTERELL, AN ATTORNEY.

Easter Term in the 18th year of the
Reign of King George the 3rd.

Common Pleas.

In the Matter of Complaint against Charles Cotterell, Gentleman, one of the Attornies of this Court, Monday the 11th of May, upon reading the Rules made in this Matter on the 31st of January and the 9th February in Hillary Term last and on the 6th Instant, And the Affidavit of James Little, Gentleman, mentioned in said Rule of the 31st of January, And the Copies of the Articles of Clerkship and the Affidavit and Paper Writing annexed to the said Affidavit, And also upon reading the Affidavit of the said Charles Cotterell and of Samuel Malin, Gentleman, And the paper Writing thereunto annexed, and the Affidavit of Mathew Ryder, And upon hearing Counsel on the behalf of the said Charles Cotterell, And also on behalf of the Society of Attornies and Sollicitors, And upon reading the Affidavit of John Ratcliffe and the Affidavit of Wm. Downes, Gentleman, and the Articles thereto annexed, on which the said William Downes, was admitted an Attorney of

x

this Court on the 12th day of February 1774, It is Ordered that the said Charles Cotterell be struck off the Roll of Attornies of this Court.

By the Court,

FFOTHERGILL.

On the Motion of Serjt. Grosse for
the said Charles Cotterell.

Serjt. Davy for the Society of Attornies
and Sollicitors.

re Frazer, an articled Clerk.

Wed. 14th May, 1757. *The Court was full.* This Frazer being an Attorney of this Court, had taken for his Articled Clerk one Smith, a Turnkey of the King's Bench Prison, a full aged Man, and who still continued to act as Turnkey. It did not appear that any money was paid ; or that the Master fed, lodged, or entertained the Clerk (though the Articles indeed covenanted "that he should"). Nor did the Clerk officiate for Frazer but in matters relating to the Prison. It appeared that Frazer had, since these Articles (which were dated only two years ago, in 1755) became concerned in 63 Causes on behalf of the Prisoner in the Gaol.

This whole matter being disclosed to the Court, upon the application of Mr. Moss, the Clerk of the papers in ye prison.

The Court were all very clear that these Articles were merely collusive ; that the whole was a contrivance between Frazer and the Turnkey to secure the business arising from the Prisoners ; that the exercise of the office of a Turnkey in a Prison was, both in itself and also according to ye intent and spirit of the Act for regulating Attornies, a very improper education for the profession of an Attorney ; and that these articles ought to be cancelled. And accordingly they were by express order of the Court.

Cancelled in Court (by Master Clerk), and directed to be kept in Court and not delivered back.

In the Common Pleas.

In the Matter of Complaint agt Robert Simpson, Gentleman,
one of the Attornies of this Court.

9th June, 1774. On reading the Affidt of Gregory Godring, Gentn (a copy of which is hereto annexed), the Articles of Clerkship therein mentioned, and also an Affidt of Samuel Eva Gould on the execution of the articles filed with the Clerk of the Warrants of this Court, it was ordered that the said Robert Simpson, upon notice of that Rule to be given him, should show cause to the Court on Monday the 20th of said June, why his name should not be struck out of the Roll of Attorneys of that Court.

On an Affidt being made that the sd Simpson could not be found so as to be personally served with that Rule—

22nd June, 1774. A like Rule as above was made with this addition, that it was Ordered That on the handing a copy of that Rule at the Lodgings or

usual place of abode of the sd Robt. Simpson should be deemed sufft notice of that Rule given to him the said Robt. Simpson, and by this Rule the sd Simpson was to show cause the 2nd day of the then next Michaelmas Term.

The 8th of Novr. 1774, an Affidt was made of handing a Copy of the last mentioned Rule at the house of one Mr. Stringer in Flower de Lys Court near Fleet Street, where the said Robert Simpson then lodged with a Woman whose name was Brown, who promised to deliver the same to said Simpson when he came home.

On this Affidt a Motion was made to make the sd Rule absolute, but the Court apprehending the Affidt not sufficient,

28th Novr. 1774. A Motion was made and Rule obtained for Simpson's shewing cause the 24th day of Janry last, but this Rule was not served.

13th Ffebry, 1775. A like Rule with that of the 22nd of June, 1774, was made for the said Simpson's shewing Cause on Thursday the 11th day of this Instant May.

This Rule was personally served on Mr. Simpson the 29th of April, put Affidt which you herewith receive.

In the Common Pleas.

Gregory Geering of Capel Court, Bartholomew Lane, London, one of the Attornies of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench at Westminster, maketh Oath and saith, that on or about the twenty-fourth day of March, which was in the year One thousand seven hundred and seventy-two, this Deponent did hire one William Hurley to live with him as his Servant after the rate of Ten pounds and Ten shillings for a year, from which time and untill the twenty-fourth day of March One thousand seven hundred and seventy-three the said William Hurley did live in this Deponent's service at the rate aforesaid, And this Deponent saith that sometime afterwards the said William Hurley and one Paul Hurley his ffather having applied to and requested this Deponent to advance the said William Hurley's Wages, he this Deponent did accordingly agree to pay the said William Hurley after the rate of Twelve Guineas a year, Whereupon the said William Hurley did with his said ffather's consent engage to continue with this Deponent as his Servant at such last mentioned price; and this Deponent saith that the said William Hurley did actually live in this Deponent's house as his Servant untill the twelfth day of Ffebruary last, upon which day this Deponent did cause the said William Hurley to be taken up on suspicion of a robbery which had been committed in this Deponent's house in Capel Court aforesaid, for which offence he was afterwards convicted and executed. And this Deponent ffurther saith he did upon the said twelfth day of Ffebruary search a Chest of the said William Hurley in the presence of the said William Hurley and others, and therein did discover the annexed Articles of Agreement which the said William Hurley did endeavour to conceal from this Deponent, And this Deponent Saith he verily believes that the name William Hurley appearing to be subscribed to the said Articles is of the proper handwriting of the said William Hurley.

Certificates to be taken out by Solicitors, Attornies, and others practising in certain Courts of Justice in Great Britain, and certain other duties with respect to Warrants, Mandates, and Authorities, to be entered or filed on record as therein mentioned, certain Duties were granted on Certificates to be taken out by any Solicitor, Attorney, Notary, Proctor, Agent, or Procurator of his admission, enrolment, or register in any of the Courts therein mentioned. And whereas for the avoiding frauds it is expedient that the Certificates shall be taken out only at the head office of Stamps, be it further enacted, that from and after the 1st day of November 1797, every person admitted, sworn, enrolled or registered a Solicitor, Attorney, Notary, Proctor, Agent, or Procurator in any of his Majesty's Courts at Westminster, or in any Ecclesiastical Court, or in any of the Courts of Admiralty or Cinque Ports, the Great Sessions in Wales, or in any Courts in the Counties Palatine, or in any other Court in that Part of Great Britain called England, holding Pleas where the Debt or damage shall amount to Forty shillings or more, shall annually between the 1st day of November and the end of Michaelmas term then next following, during such time as he shall continue so to practise in any of the said Courts, or before such Person shall commence, carry on, or defend any Action or Suit, or any proceedings whatsoever in any of the said Courts deliver in to the Commissioners appointed to manage the duties on stamped Vellum Parchment and Paper, or to their Officer or Officers appointed by them at the head Office of Stamps in Middlesex, a Paper or note in writing containing the name and usual place of residence of such person and thereupon, and upon payment of the duties by the said Act imposed according to the place of his residence described in such Paper or Note, in writing every such Person shall be entitled to a Certificate duly stamped, to denote the payment of the duty by the said Act imposed according to the place of residence described as aforesaid, which Certificate the said Commissioners or such person or persons who shall be appointed by the said Commissioners, shall cause to be immediately issued under the hand and name of the proper Officer, in such form as the said Commissioners shall

And be it further enacted, that every Certificate so to be obtained as aforesaid shall be entered in one of the Courts in which the Person described therein shall be admitted, enrolled, sworn, or registered with the respective Officer or Officers of the said Courts appointed by the said Act to grant Certificates of Enrolment, Admission, or Register within the time hereinbefore prescribed, or before such person shall be permitted to practise as aforesaid, and the said respective Officers shall, and they are hereby respectively required from time to time, upon payment of a fee of One shilling, to enter in alphabetical Order the names of the persons described in such respective Certificates, together with the Places of such their residence as aforesaid, and the respective dates of such Certificates in Books or Rolls in the said Courts respectively, all persons shall and may, at seasonable times, have free access without Fee or Reward.

And be it further enacted, that every Certificate issued by virtue of this Act between the 1st day of November in any year, and the end of the then next Michaelmas term, shall bear date on the 2nd day of November in such year, and every Certificate issued at any other time shall bear date on the day on which the same shall be issued, and every such Certificate shall cease and determine on the 1st day of November then next following. And be it further enacted, that every Certificate granted, or which shall be granted at any time before the 1st day of November, 1797, by virtue of the said recited Act, and in the manner therein mentioned, shall cease and determine on the 1st day of November, 1797, and any person who shall deliver any Certificate granted after the 1st day of November, 1796, or to be granted before the 1st day of November, 1797, and then in force to the said Commissioners at their said Office, or to any person appointed by them to receive the same to be cancelled, shall be entitled to an allowance of duty in proportion to the period then unexpired of the time for which such Certificate was granted, which allowance the said Commissioners, or their respective Officers, are hereby authorised and required to compute and pay to the person delivering such Certificate to be cancelled, and the same may be paid out of any duties in their hands, or in case any of the persons bringing any Certificate to be cancelled shall require a new Certificate for the ensuing year then to deduct the same out of the duties to be paid for such new Certificate.

And be it further enacted, that from and after the 1st day of November, 1797, if any person shall in his own name, or in the name of any other person or persons, sue out any Writ or Process, or commence, prosecute, carry on, or defend any Action, or Suit, or any proceedings in any of the Courts aforesaid, for or in expectation of any Gain, Fee, or Reward, or shall do any act in any of the said Courts as an Attorney, Solicitor, Notary, Proctor, Agent, or Procurator of such Court without obtaining a Certificate in the manner hereinbefore directed, or without entering the same in one of the Courts aforesaid, wherein such person shall be admitted, enrolled, sworn or registered as Solicitor, Attorney, Notary, Agent, or Procurator, or shall deliver in to any person at the said head Office any Account containing a place of residence as the Place of his residence, contrary to the directions of the said Act of the 25th year of the reign of His present Majesty aforesaid, with intent to evade the payment of the higher duties of £5 by the said Act imposed, every such person shall for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of £50, and shall be and is hereby made incapable to maintain or prosecute any action or suit in any Court of Law or Equity for the recovering any fee, Reward, or Disbursement on account of prosecuting, carrying on, or defending any Action, suit, or proceeding, or having prosecuted, carried on, or defended any Action, Suit, or proceeding or any Matter or Thing relating thereto, without such Certificate as aforesaid.

And be it further enacted, that every Person admitted, Sworn, enrolled, or registered in any of the said Courts as aforesaid, who from and after the

said 1st day of November shall neglect to obtain his certificate thereof in the manner before directed for the space of One whole year shall from thenceforth be incapable of practising in his own name, or in the name of any other person in any of the said Courts by virtue of such admission, Entry, Enrolment, or Register, and the Admission, Entry, Enrolment, or Register of such person in any of the said Courts shall be from thenceforth null and void, Provided always that nothing hereinbefore contained shall be construed to prevent any of the said Courts from readmitting any such person on payment to the said Commissioners of the Duty accrued since the expiration of the last Certificate obtained by such person and such further sum of money by way of penalty as the said Court shall think fit to order and direct, Provided also that nothing hereinbefore contained shall be construed to include within the regulations of this Act, respecting such persons as last aforesaid, any person who is exempted by the provisions of the said Act of the 25th year aforesaid from the payment of the duty imposed thereby.

PROPOSALS FOR A COLLEGE OF ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS.

That measures be taken to incorporate all the Members of the profession under the Name of the

College of Attornies and Sollicitors.

The College to consist of the following Officers—

A President.

Two Vice Presidents,

A Council,

and

A Senate

The Council to consist of a Number hereafter to be determined, and going out by Rotation, to be elected out of the general Members of the profession.

They are to be divided into Committees of

Common Law,

Equity,

Conveyancing,

and

Crown Law.

Boards of Examiners to be found by the Council consisting of One of each of the above named Committee men, who are to examine all applications for admission into the profession on the following subjects—

Their Legal Acquirements,

Their Character,

and

Their Prospects.

The like Council, Committees and Examiners to be formed in all Counties, Cities and Towns of sufficient Importance, and the respective Officers to have equal powers with those in the Metropolis, and their Certificates to have equal power over their own Counties.

The members of provincial Councils to be entitled to the same privileges of attending Metropolitan Meetings if they think fit as the Metropolitan Officers. Powers of making Byelaws for regulating fair practice

RETAINERS OF COUNSEL IN MARINE INSURANCE CASES.

IN June 1747 demands being made by some of the assured on the Insurers on the Ghent Packet for a total loss, the Ship being sunk in her voyage from Dort to London, and the Insurers having information of unfair dealings as to all the goods pretended to be landed on her, they agreed to defend such suits as might be brought on any of the Policies, and a Committee of them to whose care the business was referred employed Mr. Charles Browne as attorney for that purpose, desiring him to retain Sir John Strange and Mr. Hume as Counsel for all the Insurers on that ship not knowing on whom the suits might fall.

Sometime in that month Mr. Browne entered Retainers in the said counsel's books, they not being before retained, in the following manner:—

For the Insurers on the Ghent Packet, Richard Sparkes, Commissioner, at the suit of the insured Browne.

And paid the usual fee of 5 guineas to each for a General Retainer according to the rules settled by Sir John Strange, Mr. Hume and other eminent Counsel in February 1745, viz.—

1. If any Attorney would enter a Retainer against a single underwriter or for a single underwriter to take it unless there is a General Retainer before.

2. If the assured will retain against underwriters in general to the number of five or more to mention the name of the Ship and enter it as a General Retainer against all underwriters, and though they are ever so many to take five guineas only.

3. The same rule as to underwriters to the number of five or more.

In September last, before any actions were brought upon any of these Policies, there was a General meeting of the underwriters at Lloyd's Coffee House, and it being resolved to contest all the Policies, and expected that there would be a great number of actions brought, it was proposed to Mr. Browne that Mr. Nuthall should be joined with him in the management of these causes, which Mr. Browne readily consented to, and they were desired by the gentlemen present to act in concert together in all their measures. It was afterwards agreed between Mr. Browne and Mr. Nuthall that as there were several different Policies, in order to prevent confusion in the conduct of

the causes and of making out two Bills for the same business, Mr. Browne should take upon himself the management of some of the Policies and Mr. Nuthall of the rest, being nearly alike in value, and they from time to time met together to consult about their proceedings, and in framing Bills which were filed in the Court of Equity for discovery of fraud relating to these insurances.

Just before Michaelmas term Mr. Cracraft, who was employed by the Insured on one of the Policies which Mr. Nuthall had the defence of, sued out 11 special writs in the Court of King's Bench against 11 underwriters on that Policy returnable the first return of the term, but on the very day of the return he told me Mr. Nuthall that as Sir John Strange and Mr. Hume were retained against his Client he should bring his actions in the Common Pleas; but a day or two after he sent Mr. Nuthall word that he had altered his writs to the second return of the term, and should try his causes in the King's Bench, and that he had retained Sir John Strange and Mr. Hume, who had not been retained as he pretended for Mr. Nuthall's clients, but Mr. Browne's, and it appears that Mr. Cracraft left his retainers though they were not permitted to be entered a day or two before the term, soon after which Mr. Hume's clerk as well as Sir John Strange's, sent to Mr. Browne to acquaint him with what Mr. Cracraft had done.

On the 17th or 18th of November Mr. Browne and Mr. Nuthall both waited on Mr. Hume at his house and acquainted him with their being jointly employed by the underwriters on all the Policies in the manner above stated, but Mr. Hume intimated that he looked upon himself to be retained for the Attorney and not for the Client, and seemed to make a distinction between Mr. Browne's and Mr. Nuthall's clients; however he did not then come to any determination about it, but said he would consider what to do in it.

On Saturday following the 21st Novr., at near 7 at night, the following note was left at Mr. Browne's house in Bucklersbury, and the person who left it owned to Mr. Browne's clerk that he had before been at Mr. Cracraft's house, and had left the like notice.

“As there has been a dispute about my being retained for the insurers by Mr. Browne and against them by Mr. Cracraft in causes wherein Mr. Nuthall is Attorney for the insurers, both the retainers are retained, and therefore it is left to Mr. Nuthall and Mr. Cracraft, that who ever is the first to retain me after this time I shall be on his side.

A. HUME CAMPBELL.

21st Novr. 1747—4 o'clock.

Mr. Browne's clerk upon receiving this note went immediately up to Chancery Lane to acquaint Mr. Browne's senior Clerk who was there on business therewith, who went directly to Mr. Hume's Chambers in order to retain him for Mr. Nuthall, but received for answer that Mr. Cracraft had left his retainer there betwixt six and seven o'clock.

Mr. Nuthall knew nothing of this notice from Mr. Hume till the next day, when Mr. Browne brought it to him, and it was then agreed betwixt them to call their Clients together in order to lay before them this affair, before which meeting Mr. Nuthall wrote the following letter to Mr. Hume.

“On Sunday morning Mr. Browne sent me a note signed with your name dated at 4 o'clock of the 21st of Novr., and left at his house near seven o'clock that night, wherein you mention that both Mr. Browne's and Mr. Cracraft's retainers in the insurance causes on the Ghent packet were returned, and therefore it was left to Mr. Nuthall and Mr. Cracraft, that whoever first retained you after that time you should be on that side.

“You must, sir, on this occasion give me leave to say that I think this usage very extraordinary both as to my clients and myself—not only as this could never be considered as any sort of notice to me of your thinking yourself at liberty to be retained by Mr. Cracraft or me who could first get up to your chambers for that purpose; but as I can depend on Mr. Browne's information that his clerk as soon as this notice was left went up to your chambers, and there received for answer that Mr. Cracraft had left his retainer by half an hour after six o'clock, which was before your note was left at Mr. Browne's house.

“Mr. Browne and I have thought proper, in justice to ourselves, to call all our clients together in order to lay before them a true state of this affair, which I must take the liberty to say appears to me and to every other practiser I have spoken to about it not only as an entirely new precedent in the doctrine of retainers, but as an instance of uncommon partiality in favor of the attorney concerned against me.

“I am, Sir,

“Your most humble servant,

(Signed) “T. NUTHALL.”

Mr. Hume upon the receipt of this letter was stated by Mr. Nuthall to have given directions to his clerk to take no retainer or fee for the future in any cause wherein Mr. Nuthall was concerned, and an entry to that effect is made in Mr. Hume's book, which Mr. Nuthall thought extremely injurious and a great reflection upon his character, as every person who might go to Mr. Hume's retainer book could see this entry without knowing the reasons for such directions being given.

A deputation of Attorneys and Solicitors interested in the case waited upon Mr. Hume Campbell upon the subject, and were received by him in a most “genteel” manner; and after they had explained to him the whole substance and effect of the case, Mr. Campbell stated that he did not know or apprehend that he had done anything in his profession that should give them the least displeasure. He did not know until some days previously that any such entry as that referred to had been made in his Retainer Book, and the instant he knew it he directed his clerk to strike it out of the book, and was

extremely concerned that it should have been made. He added that the entry of the memorandum was occasioned by the officiousness of his clerk, whom he had directed upon or soon after receiving Mr. Nuthall's letter not to take any fees or retainer from that gentleman without first acquainting him and that he had never directed his clerk to make any such entry or memorandum.

Mr. Campbell looked upon himself as retained by the clients of Mr. Browne solely who originally employed him, but that he esteemed Mr. Nuthall being concerned jointly with Mr. Browne was occasioned by other insurers or underwriters coming in to defend subsequent to the retainer given by Mr. Browne, and to avail themselves of Mr. Browne's retainer, which they ought not, as he apprehended, to have done, and he consequently returned Mr. Browne's retainer in order that he, Mr. Nuthall, or the parties might retain in such manner as they should think fit as a dispute had arisen on original retainer.

If Mr. Nuthall had applied to him, in case there was any impropriety in returning the retainer, he would have heard all sides and done what was right, or would have left the determination of any question arising thereupon to any gentleman of the Bar, and been guided by his opinion. He considered that the letter he had received from Mr. Nuthall previous to any application to him was a little unkind, but he had no resentment to him.

Mr. Campbell concluded by declaring that, whether in or out of Parliament, he would in all places be ready to assist the Society in every way possible.

Whereas by an Act made and passed in the second year of the reign of his late Majesty King George II. entitled an Act for the better regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors.

It is enacted that no person should be permitted to act as an Attorney or sue out any writt or process or to commence or to carry on or defend any action or actions or any other proceedings in the name or names of any other person or persons in his Majestie's Court of Kings Bench, Common Pleas, Exchequer or Dutchy of Lancaster, or in any of his Majestie's Courts of Great Sessions in Wales, or in any of the Courts of the counties palatine of Chester, Lancaster and Durham, or in any other Court of Record in the part of Great Britain called England, where Attorneys have been accustomedly admitted and sworn, or to act as a Solicitor, or to sue out any writt or process or to commence, carry on, solicit or defend any suit or any proceedings in the name of any other person in any Court of Equity, either in his Majestie's High Court of Chancery, Court of Equity, in the Exchequer Chamber Court of the Dutchy Chamber of Lancaster at Westminster, or Courts of the Counties palatine of Chester, Lancaster or Durham, or of the Great Sessions in Wales, or in any other inferior Court of Equity in the part of Great Britain called England under the penalties therein mentioned, unless such person and persons respectively should be sworn and admitted and enrolled in the manner and in and under the rules and Directions in and by the said Act mentioned, appointed and prescribed, and the Judges of the Courts of Law and Equity respectively

were thereby authorized and required to examine and enquire touching the fitness and capacity of such persons to act as Attorneys and Solicitors before they should be sworn and admitted respectively by such ways and means and in such manner as is therein mentioned, and it was thereby also enacted that no person should be admitted to act as an Attorney or Solicitor respectively who had not been bound by contract or writing to serve as a clerk for such term or number of years as is therein mentioned. And whereas great numbers of persons educated and brought up at a great expense and duly qualified within the intent and meaning of the said Act, have by virtue and in pursuance of the same Act been admitted and sworn as Attorneys and Solicitors in Courts of Law and Equity respectively. And they respectively, according to the constant usage and practice of former Attorneys and Solicitors, have been employed in preparing and making of Deeds, Bonds, Writings, and instruments of various kinds, as incident and belonging to and being part of their profession. And whereas several parish clerks, school masters, and other persons not educated in or professing or qualified for the practice of the Law, and also divers other persons, without knowledge or skill in such matters have heretofore from time to time and do now take upon themselves and are employed to make, draw, prepare, write, and engross Bonds, Leases, Articles of Agreement, Deeds, Writings, Instruments, conveyances, assurances of all kinds which has tended greatly not only to the loss, damage and prejudice of the persons by whom they have been employed and intrusted, but to the diverting and reducing the business properly belonging to and constantly exercised and practised by persons educated in and professing the Law, and also to the prejudice of the Publick revenue, wherefore for preventing the said mischief and inconveniences for the future. Be it enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal and commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the no person or persons whatsoever the other than and except such as shall *be* for the time being be authorized and qualified to act as Attorneys or Solicitors, within the tenor and true meaning of the said recited Act, and other than and except such other persons as are here in after *mentioned* (described) *shall from and after the which shall be in the year of our Lord for profit, fee or reward*, make, draw, prepare, write or engross, or in any manner whatsoever finish or perfect any bond, Letter of Attorney, Agreement, indenture, lease, deed, writing, Instrument, conveyance, or assurance whatsoever chargeable with and liable to the payment of the Stamp duties, and all and every person and persons who shall offend in the premises in controversion of this Act, and shall thereof be legally convicted upon the oaths of two or more witnesses, shall for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of To the use of such persons who shall sue and prosecute for the same, and the said penalty shall and may be recovered by action of debt, Bill, plaint or information in any of his Majestie's Courts of Record at Westminster,

or any of the Courts of Record of and for the counties palatine of Chester, Lancaster and Durham, or in any of the Courts of the Great Sessions in Wales, within the Jurisdiction where of such offences shall respectively be committed by any person or persons who shall sue for the same within 2 years next after such offence shall be committed, together with treble costs of suit wherein no Essoin, protection or wager of Law shall be allowed, or any more than one imparlance, and that no such bill, plaint, suit or information nor any proceedings thereupon shall be removed before judgment or stayed by any Writ of Certiorari, Habeas Corpus, or other writ whatsoever, provided always that nothing in this Act contained, shall extend or be construed to extend to any Barrister at Law, or the freemen of the Scriveners Court in London, or to restrain, prohibit, or prevent any publick Notary duly admitted, allowed and appointed, or the Clerk of the Bank of England, Southsea Company, India Company, and other publick Company in the City of London, or any bodies corporate or collegiate, *or any stewards or receivers of rents*, from making, preparing, writing and perfecting any deed, writing, Instrument, or Assurance requisite and incident to the exercise of their several offices and employments respectively.

And for the better preventing unqualified persons from being admitted Attorneys and Solicitors, and for rendering the said Act more effectual for the purposes thereby intended, Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every person who shall from and after be bound by contract in writing to serve as a Clerk to any Attorney or Solicitor as by the said Act is directed, shall within next after the date of every such contract, cause an affidavit to be made and duly sworn of the actual execution of every such contract by every such Attorney and Solicitor, and the person so to be bound to serve as a Clerk as aforesaid, and in every such affidavit shall be specified the names of every such Attorney and Solicitor, and of every such person so bound, and their places of abode respectively, together with the day of the date of such contract, and every such affidavit shall be filed within the time aforesaid in the Court where the Attorney or Solicitor to whom every such person respectively shall be bound aforesaid hath been inrolled as an Attorney or Solicitor with the respective officer or officers or his or their respective Deputy or Deputies in the respective courts here in after mentioned, who shall make and sign a Memorandum or mark on the day of filing every such affidavit on the back or on the bottom thereof, and be it further enacted that the person who shall after the said becomes bound as aforesaid shall be admitted or enrolled an Attorney or Solicitor in any Court in the said Act mentioned before such affidavit so marked by the proper officer as aforesaid shall be produced and properly read in each court where such person shall be admitted and enrolled an Attorney or Solicitor. And it is hereby enacted and declared that the several persons following shall be deemed and taken to be the proper Officer for filing such affidavits in respective courts here in after mentioned, that is to say in the High Court of Chancery, the senior

Clerk of the Petty Bag office, or his Deputy; in the High Court of King's Bench, the chief Clerk of the Court or his Deputy. In the Court of Common Pleas the Clerk of the Warrants of that Court or his Deputy. In the Court of Exchequer, The King's remembrancer of the Court or his Deputy. In the Court of the Dutchy Chamber of Lancaster at Westminster, The chief Clerk of the Court or his Deputy, and in several Countys palatine of Chester, Lancaster and Durham, the respective prothonetarys of the said Countys palatine or their respective Deputys, and in the several courts of the great sessions of Wales the respective prothonetarys of the said Court or their respective Deputys, and be it further enacted that every such officer or officers or their respective Deputy or Deputys filing such affidavit as aforesaid shall keep a book wherein shall be entred the substance of such affidavits, specifying the names and places of abode of every such Attorney, Solicitor and Clerk or person bound as aforesaid, and of the person making such affidavit with the date of the Articles or contract in such affidavit to be mentioned at the days of swearing and filing every such affidavit respectively, and every such officer or officers, their Deputy or Deputys, shall be at liberty to take at the time of filing every such affidavit the sum of _____ and no more, as a recompence for his trouble in filing such affidavits and preparing and keeping such books as aforesaid, and which said books shall be searched in office hours by any person or persons what p _____ fee or reward, and be it further enacted that from and after _____ no Attorney or Solicitor shall take, have, or retain any Clerk who shall become bound by contract as aforesaid, and after such Attorney or Solicitor shall have discontinued, or left off, or during such time as he shall not actually practice or carry on the business of Attorney or Solicitor from and after _____ become bound by contract in writing to serve an Attorney or Solicitor as by the said Act is directed, shall during the whole time and term of service he be specified in such contract, continue and be actually employed by one Attorney or Solicitor in the proper business, practice or employment of an Attorney or Solicitor, provided always, and it is hereby enacted that if any such Attorney or Solicitor to or with whom any such person shall be so bound shall happen to die before the expiration of such term, or shall discontinue or leave off such his practice as aforesaid, or if such contract shall by mutual consent of the parties be cancelled, or in case such Clerk shall be legally discharged by any rule or order of the Court wherein such Attorney or Solicitor shall practice before the expiration of such term, and such Clerk shall in any of the said cases be bound by another contract or other contracts in writing to serve, and shall accordingly serve in manner here in before mentioned as Clerk to any other such as practising Attorney or Attorneys, Solicitor or Solicitors as aforesaid respectively during the residue of the said term of five years. Then such services shall be bound and taken to be as good, effectual, and available as if such Clerk had continued to serve as a Clerk for the said term, to the same person to whom

he was originally bound to as an affidavit be duly made and filed of the executor of such second or other contract or contracts, within the time and in like manner as is before directed, concerning such original contract. And be it further enacted that every person who from and after shall become bound as a clerk as aforesaid shall before he be admitted an Attorney or Solicitor according to the said Act, cause an affidavit of himself or such Attorney or Solicitor or to whom he was bound as aforesaid, to be duly made and filed with the proper officer herein before, for the purpose appointed, that he hath actually served and been employed by such practising Attorney or Attorneys, Solicitor or Solicitors, to whom he was bound as aforesaid, during the whole term of 5 years, according to the true intent and meaning of every such contract in writing and of this Act.

6 Geo. II. ch. 27th.

An Act to explain and amend the Act of George II. for the better regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors that after the 1st day of December 1730 no person who should not before the 1st day have been sworn or should be permitted to act as an Attorney unless such person should have been bound by contract in writing to serve for 5 years to an Attorney duly admitted, and that such person should during the 1st 5 years have continued in such service, and unless such person after the expiration of the said term of 5 years should be examined, sworn, and in the same manner as the persons who should be admitted Attorneys of the said Court are therein required to be examined and now for the relief of persons who have served for and during the space of 5 years as Clerks to Attorneys or Solicitors in many of the Courts of Law and Equity in the said Act mentioned, and have not been bound by contract in writing, and who were by sickness prevented from being sworn, admitted and enrolled Attorneys pursuant to the directions of the said Act, and for the relief of persons who have served as clerks to Attorneys or Solicitors for and during that space of 5 years, and who have been bound by contract in writing but have not served for and during the space of 5 years since the date of such contract, or who being sons of such Attorneys or Solicitors have served as Clerks to their respective fathers for and during the space of 5 years, but have been bound by contracts in writing. Be it enacted that every such person being first examined and approved as by the said Act is directed, shall and may on or before the last day of Michaelmas Term which in the year of our Lord 1733 be qualified to be sworn and admitted an Attorney in the several Courts in the said Act mentioned, anything in the said Act to the contrary not with standing.

Provided also, and it is hereby further enacted that if any Attorney or Solicitor *with and for whom* any person *hath been* or shall be bound by contract in writing as aforesaid to serve as a Clerk for the term of 5 years or 4 years respectively *shall happen to die* before the expiration of the said 5 years or 4 years, or if such *contract shall* by mutual consent of the parties

be vacated, or in case such clerk be legally discharged by any rule or order of the court where in such Attorneys or Solicitors shall practice before the expiration of the said 5 years or 4 years, then and in any of the said cases of such Clerk shall by contract in writing be obliged to serve, *and shall* accordingly serve as a Clerk to any other Attorneys or Solicitors respectively who shall be sworn, admitted and enrolled as before directed during the residence of the said Term of 5 years or 4 years respectively, then such service shall be deemed and taken to be as good and effectual as if such Clerk had continued to serve as Clerk for the term of 5 years or 4 years to the same person to whom he was originally bound by contract in writing as aforesaid.

And whereas by an Act passed in the 22nd year of the reign of his present Majesty entitled an Act to continue several Laws for preventing Erections for the Occupiers of Locks and Weirs upon the River Thames Westward for ascertaining the Rates of Water Carriage upon the said River and for continuing and explaining and amending several laws for the better regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors and for regulating the price and assize of Bread, and for preventing the spreading of the distemper among'st the horn'd Cattle, and also for making further regulations with respect to Attorneys and Solicitors, and for further preventing the distemper among'st the Horned cattle ; and for the more frequent return of writs in the counties of Chester and Lancaster, and for ascertaining the method of levying Writs of Execution against the inhabitants of hundreds, and for allowing Quakers to make affirmation in cases where an oath is or shall be required. It is enacted that every person who shall from and after the 1st day of July 1749, be bound by a contract in writing to serve as a Clerk to any Attorney or Solicitor, shall within 3 months next after the date of every such contract, cause an affidavit to be made and duly sworn of the actual execution of every such contract by every such Attorney or Solicitor, and the person so to be bound to serve as a Clerk as aforesaid, and in every such affidavit shall be specified the names of every such Attorney and Solicitor and of every such person so bound, and their places of abode respectively, together with the day of the date of such contract, and that every such affidavit shall be filed within the time aforesaid in the court where the Attorney or Solicitor to whom every such person respectively shall be bound as aforesaid hath be inrolled as an Attorney or Solicitor with their respective Officer or Officers or his or their respective Deputy or Deputys in their respective Courts in the said Act after mentioned, who shall make or sign Memorandum or Marke of the day of filing every such affidavit at the back or at the bottom thereof, and that no person who shall after the said 1st day of July shall become bound as afore said shall be admitted or inrolled an Attorney or Solicitor in any Court in the said Act mentioned before such Affidavit so marked by the proper Officer as aforesaid shall be produced and openly read in such Court where such persons shall be admitted and inrolled as Attorney or Solicitor.

the service of the present Baron Graham as his Clerk, with whom he continued nearly Eight Years, and until his Death, and ever faithfully discharged the duties reposed in him by these Gentlemen.

That your petitioner regularly served his Clerkship with Mr. Windle of John St. Bedford Row, and has been admitted an Attorney of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, as also a Solicitor in Chancery, wherein he practised for several years on his own account, but in consequence of an unfortunate affliction, as after mentioned, your petitioner lost his principal Clients, whereby he was compelled to offer his services again to the profession as a Clerk to enable him to support his family by his own industry.

That your petitioner hath from his Childhood been unfortunately afflicted with Epileptic or Falling Fits, which of late years have much increased and now exists in an alarming degree, in consequence whereof your Petitioner has been obliged to leave several respectable offices in the profession where your Petitioner was engaged as a Managing Clerk and received handsome salaries for his services (*viz.*) Messieurs Dyneley and Gattys of Grays Inn, Messrs. Hillyard and King's of Cophthall Court, Mr. Ninds of Throgmorton St, Messrs. Dennetts and Greaves of King's Arms Yard, Coleman St, Messrs. Benbow and Albans of Lincoln's Inn, and Messrs. Sandys Norton and Co. of Crane Court, Fleet St., all of whom have dismissed your petitioner from their respective employment, solely on account of such your petitioner's severe affliction, as will appear by the Certificates of all those respective Gentlemen now in your petitioner's possession, and to whom reference can be given by your Petitioner as to the fact, should any Gentleman wish to make an Enquiry concerning the same.

That your Petitioner hath *a Wife and Four Children*, all of tender age, entirely dependent on him for support, and who with your petitioner have been for a considerable time past in the greatest distress, and debarred of the common necessaries of Life by reason of his not having been enabled to retain any permanent situation in an Attorney's office to enable him to support himself and family by his own industry, being thereby prevented *solely on account of his unfortunate affliction of Epileptic or Falling Fits* (to which the Almighty hath subjected him), and not on account of any misconduct whatever of your Petitioner, as the Certificates herein before mentioned will verify, and the distress of your petitioner and family has been for many months past, and is now so great that he has been obliged to solicit Relief from the Parish of Clerkenwell, wherein he resides, and is absolutely without the means of procuring subsistence, Lodging or Raiment, for his wife and family without the aid and assistance of your benevolent society, in whom your Petitioner most humbly places implicit confidence for aid and support in relieving your Petitioner and Family from their present distress.

Your Petitioner therefore most humbly prays and emplores that you will be graciously and humanely pleased *to consider this his lamentable case, and in pity and compassion for his misfortune and*

the distressed condition of his Wife and four helpless children, contribute some trifling pecuniary relief to him and them, as to you shall seem proper. And your Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray, etc.

Thos. White.

15, *Upper Southampton St., Pentonville.*

REASONS against increasing the number of Attorneys and Solicitors.

For the first clauses of amendment in the Bill for continuing and amending the Act for the better regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors, and AGAINST the last Clause concerning the Chancery Clerks.

When Justice is duly administered the general influence of the law has a greater and more extensive effect than the exertion of the authority of the Civil magistrate, therefore no part of government requires the attention of the Legislature more than the administration of Justice, and as that depends not only on the Just Exposition of the Laws, but also on the qualifications and integrity of the Officers and ministers of Courts, The regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors who are the immediate agents of the Suitors and have the Primary Direction of causes is of considerable importance.

In such a regulation the reduction of their number is of principal concern, and should be effected as soon as possible. A numerous body of Law Practicers is almost as great an evil in a Constitution of Liberty as the having none is in Governments of Despotic principles, for where there are more professors than the honest gains of the profession can maintain, necessity may excite practices as injurious and troublesome in many instances to the property and peace of individuals as the want of justice in countrys not governed by Law.

The view of the Legislature in the making the Act for the better regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors was to restrain their number, which at that time was found to be too large and every day increasing, but the purposes of that Act having been greatly defeated by antedating of Articles and by other indirect means of getting unqualified persons admitted, the Bills now depending for continuing that Act contain the following amendments in order to render it more effectual.

1st That for the future every Clerk in a short time after the execution of his Articles, shall cause an Affidavit thereof to be filed with the proper Officer, by which the possibility of antedating Articles will be prevented.

2nd That no Attorney or Solicitor shall be permitted to take any Clerk after he has discontinued his practice, and

3rd That all Clerks shall be actually employed during the time of their service in the business of an Attorney or Solicitor.

As these amendments respect the better qualifications, and are intended to lessen the number of Attorneys and Solicitors, it is hoped they will pass.

But a clause being also inserted in the Bill for enabling sworn Clerks and their Waiting Clerks to be admitted Solicitors, and as such to take 2 Clerks

each, it is submitted that the same ought not to pass into a law for the following reasons.

1st Because it is inconsistent with the design of the Act to which it is proposed to be an amendment, as the authorizing upwards of 60 persons to qualify every five years two Clerks to be admitted and inrolled who at present are disabled by law to qualify one, must in a little time make a prodigious and dangerous increase.

2nd What benefit is the public to expect in compensation for the mischief of such an increase of Attorneys and Solicitors? None at all. The whole must center in the private and particular advantage of the sworn clerk.

3rdly The office of a sworn Clerk is to sue out the process of the Court, and file and copy the proceedings which they enjoy exclusive of the Solicitors, so that a sworn Clerk without being concerned in the burthen is at present entitled to a profit in every Cause.

4th The sworn Clerks have always hitherto been restrained from taking more than one Clerk at a time, and the Waiting Clerks have never been permitted to take any, yet there are Clerks enough to file and copy all proceeding of the Court.

No sworn or waiting Clerk ever practiced as an Attorney at law, yet if this clause passes, every one of them will have the power of qualifying two Clerks to act as Attorneys, without being capable of instructing them in the nature even of the first process.

Lastly. For that the Act in question wholly relates to Attorneys and Solicitors, and contains an express proviso that the same should not extend to the Clerks in Chancery, it therefore seems inconsistent that the powers of the latter should be enlarged by an alteration of that law which was made to restrain the privileges of the former.

For these reasons it is hoped the Clause to enable Chancery Clerks to take Clerks and thereby increase the number of Attorneys and Solicitors, and defeat the purpose of the Bill in which it is inserted shall not pass into a law.

THE CASE OF THE SWORN CLERKS AND WAITING CLERKS OF THE SIX-CLERKS OFFICE.

The sworn Clerks of the six Clerks Office are antient officers of the Court of Chancery, who before they are sworn or admitted into their offices, serve regular Clerkships for 5 years, are examined and approved of by the Master of the Rolls, and afterwards sworn and inrolled in the Petty Bag Office, and have a Freehold in their Offices.

The Waiting Clerks are Articled to the Sworn Clerks to serve 5 years Clerkship, and after their admission into their Offices are employed in the business of the said Court in the same manner as the sworn Clerks, and have likewise Freeholds in their Offices.

The said Sworn Clerks and Waiting Clerks (who are indiscriminately called

Clerks in Court) were formerly the only persons who solicited and carried on the business on the Equity side of the said Court, but in process of time several persons who had been employed by them to assist in their business, and also other persons, undertook the soliciting Part of Causes for their own benefit, and were called Solicitors, but the Clerks in Court being the only Attorneys of the Court, such Solicitors have always been obliged in the causes they have solicited to employ the Clerks in Court as their Attorneys to file all the pleadings and to make out all Writs and Process, and to inroll all Decrees, and to do all other acts of Attorneys.

So that the Clerks in Court, necessarily must be employed in all causes in the said Court, and, when employed by Attorneys in the Country, or immediately by the Suitors of the Court, have the solicitation of the Causes, and when by Solicitors in town they do all the necessary acts of the Attorneys of the Court and advise and assist such Solicitors.

Before the Act for regulating Attorneys and Solicitors, the Solicitors were under no regulations, but many persons who had never served a Clerkship to, or been bred up by any Attorney, Clerk in Court, or Solicitor, but were of mean trades or professions and utterly unqualified to act as Solicitors, undertook the solicitation of Causes in the several Courts of Equity and to act in Courts of Law in the names of Attorneys of such Courts, to the hindrance of Justice, the injury of those who employed them, and the groundless and unjust vexation of those against whom they were employed. To prevent which

2 George II. it was by an act intituled,

“ An Act for the better regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors, Enacted that from and after the 1st day of December 1750 no person who should not before the said 1st day of December have been sworn, admitted, and inrolled pursuant to the directions of the said Act, should be permitted to act as a Solicitor to sue out any Writ or Process, or to commence, carry on, solicit, or defend any suit or proceedings in the name or names of any other person, or persons, in any of the Courts of Equity, unless such person should be bound by contract in Writing to serve as a Clerk, for and during the space of 5 years to a Solicitor duly and legally sworn and admitted, as by the said Act is directed in some or one of the Courts of Equity, and for and during the said term of 5 years, should have continued in such service, and also unless such person after the expiration of the said term of 5 years should be examined, sworn, admitted and inrolled in the same manner, as person who should be admitted Solicitors in the Courts of Equity, are by the said Act required to be examined, sworn, admitted, and inrolled.

With a proviso “ that nothing in the said Act contained, should extend or be construed to extend to the Examination, Swearing, Admission or Inrollment of the Six Clerks of the Court of Chancery, or the Sworn Clerks in their Office, or the Waiting Clerks belonging to the said Six Clerks (and other persons in the Act described), but that the said Clerks and Attorneys respectively, should and might be examined, sworn, admitted, and inrolled

and practise in their respective Courts and Offices aforesaid, in like manner as they might have been, or done before the making of the said Act."

That notwithstanding such proviso, a doubt has arisen on the said Act, whether a sworn or waiting Clerk in the Six Clerks Office who shall have surrendered his seat in the said office, or whether a person who shall have served a regular Clerkship for 5 years to any sworn Clerk in the said Office, may be examined, sworn, admitted, and inrolled a Solicitor of the Court of Chancery, it being before mentioned, enacted by the said Act. That no person who shall not before the 1st of December 1730, have been sworn, admitted, and inrolled as a Solicitor pursuant to the directions of the said Act, shall be permitted to act as a Solicitor, unless such person shall have been bound by contract in Writing to serve as a Clerk for 5 years, to a Solicitor duly and legally sworn and admitted, as in the said Act is directed : And the saving Clause in the said Act, as to the said sworn and Waiting Clerks, having been construed to relate only to their admission into, and their practising in, the said Six Clerks Office, although it is apprehended the intention of the said Act was only to oblige Persons who should act as Solicitors to serve regular Clerkships, and to regulate the Solicitors who before the said Act were under no regulation, and not to prevent the said Clerks of the Six Clerks Office, after they had surrendered their seats in the said Office, or persons serving a regular Clerkship to them, from acting as Solicitors.

It is therefore humbly hoped, that in the Bill for continuing expiring laws, and the Act for regulating Attorneys and Solicitors, such clauses or provisoes shall be inserted as will enable the Clerks of the Six Clerks Office, and persons serving regular Clerkships to them, to be admitted Solicitors.

MEMORIAL TO THE COURTS OF KINGS BENCH AND COMMON PLEAS FOR HAVING THE HOURS OF ATTENDANCE AT THE SEAL OFFICE ALTERED. 23 January, 1770.

This memorial was presented by the Courts of Kings Bench and Common Pleas, and in consequence thereof the hours of attendance at the Seal Office are now,

From 10 o'clock in the morning till 12 at noon, and from 4 to 6 in the afternoon all the year round, except in term time and for a fortnight after the two issuable terms and a week after the others, then till 7.

To the Right Honourable William Lord Mansfield, Lord Chief Justice of his Majesty's Court of Kings Bench, and to the rest of the Justices of the same Court.

THE HUMBLE MEMORIAL OF THE SOCIETY OF PRACTICERS IN THE SEVERAL COURTS OF LAW AND EQUITY,

Sheweth. That by letters patent dated the 30th of April, 25th Charles II. The said King for the Consideration therein mentioned, Granted to George Lord Fitzroy and his heirs Male the Receipts, Revenues and yearly profits to

arise by sealing Writs in the several Courts of Kings Bench and Common Pleas, and thereby directed that no voluntary or unnecessary delay should be used to any subject resorting to any of the Seals in any convenient time of the day for lack of expedition in default of or by reason of the absence or non attendance of the said Lord George or his Heirs Male or sufficient Deputy.

And the High Treasurer of England, Commissioners of the Treasury, under Treasurer, and Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time being, or any two of them, are by the said law commanded to make such appointment and take such Order for the insufficient keeping and using the said Seals for the profit and commodity of the said Lord and his heirs male and the ease and benefit of the Subject as they shall think meet.

That the said revenues arising from sealing of Writs by virtue of the said Letters Patent are now become vested in his Grace the Duke of Cleveland.

That the honour of attendance at the Seal Office are only from 9 till 11 o'clock in the forenoon, and from then till 5 in the afternoon, except in Term Time, and for a fortnight after Hilary and Trinity term, and for a week after Easter and Michaelmas term, during which periods the attendance at the Office is in afternoons extended to 6 o'clock.

That the hours of attendance upon business in general having of late years been greatly altered, many inconveniences have arisen to the suitors and practicers from the early hours of opening and shutting the Seal.

And though much delay and inconveniences have arisen to the suitors from the many Holidays that are kept at the said Office, yet your memorialists unwilling to ask any thing that might create extraordinary attendance for his Grace's Deputy, contented themselves with delivering a memorial to his Grace in May last praying only an alteration of the hours by opening and shutting the Seal an hour later than usual in the morning and afternoon, that his Grace not having been pleased to vouchsafe any answer to your memorialists,

Your memorialists therefore most humbly pray your Lordships that you will be pleased to take such order in the premises as that the hours of opening and shutting the Seal may be altered in the manner aforesaid, and that such other regulations may be made in the Seal Office for the ease and benefit of the subject as to your Lordships shall seem meet and necessary, and your memorialists shall ever pray, etc.

To the Right Honourable Sir John Eardley Wilmot, Knight, Lord Chief Justice of his Majesty's Court of Common Pleas, and to the rest of the Judges of the same Court.

The endorsement on the above document is as follows—

A Bill to indemnify persons who have omitted to obtain who are required to obtain and enter certificates of their enrollment, entry, admission or register in the Courts therein mentioned annually between the first day of November and the end of Michaelmas Term, then next following,

have through absence or inadvertency, or by the neglect or misconduct of others employed by them, neglected or omitted to do without any intention to defraud His Majesty, and have afterwards obtained and entered such certificates and paid the duty thereon, and whereas such persons are nevertheless subject to actions for such omissions although they have so afterwards obtained and entered their certificates as aforesaid. And whereas some *Actions have been commenced and are depending*, and other actions may be commenced against such persons for the recovery of penalties incurred by them, and whereas it is expedient that relief should be given, and that the *said Act* should be amended as far as the same relates to *the time of entry* of such certificates. May it therefore please your Majesty that it may be enacted, and be it enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that where any person who shall have neglected or omitted to obtain and enter his Certificate at the time and in manner required by the said recited Act, shall nevertheless before the commencement of any action for any penalty incurred under the said recited Act, for such neglect or omission, have obtained and entered or shall obtain such his Certificate in manner directed by the several Acts passed relating to certificates to be taken out by Attorneys and Solicitors and others practising in certain Courts of Justice in Great Britain, then and in every such case every such person shall be and is hereby indemnified, freed and discharged from and against all penalties, forfeitures in capacities and disabilities incurred or to be incurred for or by reason of his having so neglected or omitted to obtain or enter such Certificate, and all acts done by any such person shall be of the same force and validity as the same or any of them would have been if such person had obtained his Certificate according to the directions of the said recited Act of the 37th year aforesaid, and in case any action or actions shall have been commenced before the passing of this Act against any person or persons for or by reason of such neglect or omission, such person or persons shall not be liable for such neglect or omission to the payment of any penalty, and the Informer or Informers in such action or actions shall not recover or be intitled to recover more than the costs of suit which may have been actually incurred up to the together with the further sum of £10 in addition to such costs, and the person or persons against whom any such action shall have been brought, shall upon payment to the Informer or Informers by whom any such Action or Actions shall have been brought of such costs of suit to be taxed according to the practice of such court, together with such further sum of £10 as aforesaid, be wholly indemnified, freed and discharged from and against all penalties and forfeitures incurred by reason of any such neglect or omission as aforesaid, provided nevertheless that nothing herein contained shall be construed to extend to indemnify any person against whom final Judgment shall have been given on or before the said day of 1804 in any action in any

of His Majesty's Courts of Record for any penalty or penalties incurred by having neglected or omitted to obtain his Certificate according to the directions of the said Act.

Period of entry of Certificate extended to the commencement of Hilary Term.

And be it further enacted, that so much of the said recited Act of the 37th year aforesaid, as required any such Certificate as aforesaid to be entered in one of the Courts in which the person shall be inrolled, sworn or registered in manner in the said Act mentioned before the end of Michaelmas Term in the year in which the same shall be obtained, shall be and the same is hereby repeated, and that from and after the passing of this Act it shall be lawful for any person obtaining any such Certificate in any year after the first day of November to enter any such Certificate at any time before the commencement of Hilary Term, next ensuing penalties, causes, matters and things in the said Act contained, and every Certificate so entered before the 1st day of Hilary Term of the same had been the period allowed by the said recited Act.

A Clause submitted to be added to the Bill now Depending in the Honourable the House of Commons, for continuing the Acts for regulating Attorneys and Solicitors.

And for the surer preventing unqualified Persons from being admitted Attorneys and Solicitors, and for rendering the purposes of the said Act more effectual. Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every person who shall from and after be bound by contract in writing to serve any Attorney or Solicitor, as by the said Act is directed, shall within next, after the date of every such contract, cause an affidavit to be made and duly sworn of the actual execution of every such contract by every such Attorney or Solicitor and person so to be bound, and in every such affidavit shall be specified the names of every such Attorney or Solicitor and of every such person so to be bound, and their places of abode respectively, together with the day of the date of such contract, and every such affidavit shall be filed within the time aforesaid with the proper officer of the Court where the Attorney or Solicitor to whom every such person shall be so respectively bound as aforesaid, hath been inrolled as an Attorney or Solicitor, which said proper officer shall make and sign a memorandum or mark of the day of filing every such affidavit on the back or at the bottom thereof. And be it further enacted that no person who shall after the said

becomes bound as aforesaid, shall be admitted or inrolled an Attorney or Solicitor in any Court in the said Act mentioned before such affidavit so marked by the proper officer as aforesaid, shall be produced and openly read in such Court, and it is hereby declared that the proper officer for filing such affidavits in the High Court of Chancery shall be with the Clerk of the Petty Bag Office in the Court of Kings Bench, with the Master of the Kings Bench Office, and in the Court of Common Pleas with the Clerks of the Warrants,

sworn Attorneys and Solicitors, and the number of Clerks taken by them, to prevent them being too numerous, and that they should be examined and approved of by the Judges that as near as might be but persons of skill and probity might be admitted, and that they should be sworn and inrolled, for as the execution of the whole body of the law is in great measure in their hands, and as they are intrusted with the conduct and transferring of so large a share of the property of the subject, It is therefore of great publick consequence that persons who never had the learning and ingenious education of a youth trained up for the practice of the law, nor the knowledge and experience.

COMMON PLEAS.

	£	s.	d.
For enrolling Deeds and paid per folio	1	0	
Attending thereon	6	8	
Motion at the Treasury Chamber for Rules	3	4	
Attornies Court and Calling Attorney	6	8	
Common Affidavits Duty and Oath	7	6	
Entering up Judgment on Warrant of Attorney	4	4	0
Instruction to Counsel to move in all Common Cases	3	4	
Attending him and Court	6	8	
Copy and Service of Rule	4	0	
Drawing Cognovit and Copy	13	4	
Attending signing	6	8	
Attending stamping	6	8	

If for Argument.

Copy paper Book for Counsel per folio 4 <i>d.</i> and paper			
Instructions to counsel to move for consilium	3	4	
Attending him and Court	6	8	
Copy and Service of rule	4	0	
Attending setting down cause for argument	3	4	
Drawing out Marginal notes of points if special	6	8	
Attending each Judge with paper Book, Demurrer Book, etc.	3	4	
Attending stamp office on all occasions	6	8	
In all cases of pleadings being settled by counsel, fair copy for counsel at per folio 4 <i>d.</i>	6	8	
Instructions to counsel in all common cases	3	4	
Attending counsel when 10 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> Fee paid 3 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i>			
If one Guinea or upwards 6 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i> each counsel			
Side Bar or Treasury Chamber motions	3	4	
Attending Court per day on Rules	6	8	

£ s. d.

The Act of Parliament of 44 George III. having recognized Special Pleaders by compelling them to take out a licence, it is submitted that the fees paid to them for drawing pleadings should be allowed and the attendance on them

N.B. In the Exchequer of Pleas it has been allowed many years

Special Juries.

The present allowance between party and party being only for the fees paid to the Juries to be enquired into and considered and the fees for naming and striking to be 13s. 4d. each

For drawing and engrossing Writs of Scire Facias Elegit, &c. &c. 1s. per folio

Attending on adverse parties to demand money under rules of Court according to distance

For attending to get a recommendation to Attorney to send Writs to 3 6

For writing letters with Writs to Attorneys to get executed ... 3 6

The like for rules to return Writs, serve Notices of declaration, Inquiry, &c. &c. 3 6

For attending to order and procure office Copies of Affidavits, Rules per a fee of 3 4

Attorney attending as a witness per day 2 Guineas and his travelling expences

All personal services, double common Services—which is allowed in Chancery

All fees on original writs 6 8

The same on Writs of Distringas 6s. 8d. and 1s. per folio entering and ingrossing

Attendance to search for returns 6 8

It is submitted that in all country Causes one Summons and order for time to plead should be allowed in costs for Defendant between party and party

N.B. In Chancery one Order for time to answer is allowed

KING'S BENCH.

s.	d.				£	s.	d.
4	4	Instructions to sue and filing Warrant	6	8	
3	6	If Letter wrote before suit	3	6	
		Paid for warrant to prosecute	5	4	
6	1	Affidavit of Debt Duty and paid swearing	7	6	
12	0	Bill of Middlesex 5s. 4d., 10d., 6s. 8d., total 12s. 10d.	15	0	

s.	d.	£	s.	d.
14	o	Latitat	17	o
15	o	If won omittas	1	o
12	o	Alias Capias Pluries &c.	14	6
12	o	Attaching of Priviledge	14	6
5	o	Copy and service of either of the above process if Common confined by Act of Parliament 5th George II. Ch. 27	5	o
N.B. But the Act if looked into will to relate to common process <i>where the debt is under £10</i>				
3	4	Attending Instructing the Officer, Sheriffs warrant and Chessr The Sheriff of Middlesex has raised his warrant from 4 <i>d.</i> to 1 <i>s.</i>	3	4
3	10	Attending at Westminster searching for return of Writs when Sheriff ruled and paid	7	2
3	4	Searching for special bail at all the 4 Judges	6	8
3	4	Motion for rule to return Writ	3	4
3	o	Copying and service of rule	4	o
2	o	Copy notice of Bail and of Affidavit of Justification sent (if in Country cause)	3	o
3	4	Searching for Common Bail	3	4
6	8	Attending and inquiring after special Bail It often happens that the Bail live at different ends of the Town and in the Country at a considerable distance from Plaintiffs Attorney and each other and often in distant and distinct Counties	13	4
3	4	Attending to enter Exception to Bail	3	4
3	o	Drawing Notice thereof Copy and service	4	o
7	2	Common Bail, see Latitat	8	6
6	1	Affidavit, service, process, duty and paid swearing	7	6
3	4	Instructions for Counsel to oppose Bail	3	4
6	8	Attending him and Court Instructions for Special Affidavits Drawing such Affidavits and folio 1 <i>s.</i>	6	8
In all cases greater care is required in drawing Affidavits than in any other proceeding, to avoid perjury and other inconveniences, and for which 4 <i>d.</i> and folio is now only allowed and the Clerk of the Rules charges 8 <i>d.</i> and folio merely for copy, engrossing per folio 4 <i>d.</i>				
6	8	Attending, reading over the engrossment and swearing ..	3	4
3	4	Instructions for Declaration and all subsequent pleadings Drawing Declaration and other pleadings at per folio 1 <i>s.</i> Declarations on Statutes, Records, &c. as at present	6	8

<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>		<i>£</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
		allowed 1s. 4 <i>d.</i> per folio. If Declarations, &c. settled by Counsel—fair copy for him 4 <i>d.</i> per folio			
3	4	Attending him	6	8	
		Copy on Duty to deliver or file, 4 <i>d.</i> per folio	3	4	
		Attending to deliver same			
		Ingrossing continuing, &c. per folio 6 <i>d.</i>			
		Parchment Duty and filing according to length			
		Close Copy for the Country 4 <i>d.</i> per folio			
		Notice of Declaration copy and service according to dis- tance			
2	6	Rule to Plead	4	0	
3	0	Demands, Plea, Copy and Service	4	0	
		Attending to give Oyer, Bond &c.	3	4	
3	4	Attending summons for time to plead	3	4	
		Copy order in (country Causes)	1	0	
		Attending special summons, which requires stamp duty...	6	8	
		Attending searching for plea after order for time expired...	3	4	
		Copy General Issue sent	1	0	
		Copy special Pleas at per folio 4 <i>d.</i>			
3	4	Attending taking money out of Court giving receipt and receiving same	6	8	
		Copy rules for payment of money into Court and other Common rules	1	6	
		The cause being at issue, attending Plaintiff advising with him as to trying the Cause	6	8	
		Drawing issue per folio 4 <i>d.</i>			
		Ingrossing per folio to deliver 4 <i>d.</i>			
		Entering issue on the Roll per folio 6 <i>d.</i> Exclusive of the payment for the entries			
		Copy for the Country per folio 4 <i>d.</i>			
		Warrants of Attorney and Docket	3	0	
		Exclusive of the payment for the Rolls, which are now charged 9 <i>d.</i> each			
3	0	Drawing Notice of Trial, copy and service	4	0	
		Copy notice of Trial (Country Cause)	1	0	
		Drawing Placitas and Inviata	3	4	
		Ingrossing Record per folio 6 <i>d.</i>			
6	8	Fee on examining and passing	13	4	
10	0	Venire	11	6	
		Attending for Receipt of same	3	4	
11	0	Distringas	12	6	
		Attending for receipt of Distringas	3	4	
10	0	Subpœna	14	6	

<i>s. d.</i>	<i>£ s. d.</i>
	Copy to serve 1 <i>s.</i> each personal service on Witnesses
10 0	5 <i>s.</i> each (if at a distance to be paid for accordingly)
	Subpœned Ducestecum—an additional fee to common Subpœna of 3 <i>s. 4d.</i>
	Mile into a Country Pal 15 6
6 8	Instructions for Brief 13 4
	Drawing brief per sheet 6 8
	Fair Copy 3 <i>s. 4d.</i>
	Attending each Counsel 6 <i>s. 8d.</i>
	Attending setting down Cause 3 4
	N.B. 11 <i>s. 8d.</i> is paid for setting it down besides the trouble
6 8	Attending Cause each day, Cause in the paper in Town Causes 13 4
13 4	And on the day of Trial 1 1 0
	If at the Assizes 1 Guinea per day, exclusive of expenses
3 4	Attending Associate for record when cause made a remanet 6 8
	Altering Invi and attending resealing Record 6 8
2 6	Rule for Judgment 1 0
3 4	Attending Associate for Postea and giving Receipt 6 8
	Drawing Postea in Town Causes per folio 1 <i>s.</i> Ingrossing Postea per folio 6 <i>d.</i>
3 4	Attending stamping postea 6 8
	Drawing Affidavit of Increase Costs per folio 1 <i>s.</i>
	Ingrossing same per folio 4 <i>d.</i>
	Attending Judge in a criminal swearing affidavit of extra costs 3 4
	Attending filing and for Office Copy (in Country Causes) 3 4
	Drawing Bill of Costs per folio 1 <i>s.</i>
	Copy for adverse Attorney per folio 4 <i>d.</i>
	Copy for the Master per folio 4 <i>d.</i>
	Notice of taxing Costs, Copy and Service 4 0
3 4	Attending taxing each time 6 <i>s. 8d.</i>
3 4	Drawing and Ingrossing final Judgment 6 8
	Attending at Westminster to compleat same, exclusive of payments 6 8
	Casa or Fiffa 13 8
	Test Casa or Fiffa 14 6
	Non om Casa or Fiffa 14 6
	Test Non om Casa or Fiffa 15 6
	Term Fee (exclusive of Messengers and post 1 <i>s.</i> , Messages and Letters (Town Causes) 5 <i>s.</i> 10 0

<i>s. d.</i>	<i>£ s. d.</i>
	Country Causes 10s.
	On Interlocuting Judgment.
	Drawing same 3 4
	Copy of the whole pleadings on Duty to sign Judgment per folio 4 <i>d.</i>
	Entering on the Roll per folio 6 <i>d.</i> and Rolls, Warrants and Docket 3 0
	Attending for the Roll and signing Judgment 3 4
	Attending the Plaintiff in consequence of having obtained Interlocuting Judgment, examining the evidence, and taking instructions for the execution of the Inquiry ... 6 8
	Notice of enquiry according to distance
	Drawing enquiry 3 4
	Ingrossing Enquiry per folio 6 <i>d.</i>
	Fee on enquiry 6 8
	Attending under Sheriff with Instructions to Summon Jury 3 4
6 8	Attending execution of Inquiry 13 4
	Attending for Instructions and giving receipt for Writ ... 6 8
	The rule stamping and taxing costs the same as in postea
	If referred to the Master on Rule and Instructions to counsel to move for rules 3 4
	Attending him and Court 6 8
	Copy and Service of Rule 4 0
	Attending Petition for Bills of Exchange &c. and giving receipt for same 3 4
	Appointment to compute and service 4 0
	Drawing account, not of principal and Interest, and fair copy for the Master 3 4
3 4	Attending thereon and taxing Costs 6 8
	The other costs the same as in the last Proceedings by Original
3 4	Instructions for precis 6 8
	Drawing precis for original per folio 1 <i>s.</i> fair copy for the Cursitor per folio 4 <i>d.</i>
	Fee on original 6 8
	Attending to pay fine 6 8
	Fee on Cap 6 8
	Fee on Testatum 6 8
	Ingrossing Writs per folio 6 <i>d.</i>
	Returning and filing original 3 6

<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	£.	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
			6	8
			6	8
			3	4
			3	4

The rest of the proceedings as in Common Cases.

FOR DEFENDANT.

3	4	Attending taking instructions to defend	6	8
4	4	Paid for Warrant paper and Duty	5	4
7	2	Common Bail	6	8
		Entering appearances, Action by original	7	8
		Attending an extract of writs to put in bail and paid	4	4
		Special Bail price and Duty	9	8
3	4	Attending Judges Chambers, to put in bail	6	8
		Attending Common, appointing time and taking bail	6	8
		Paid the Commissioner's fee	6	8
8	1	Affidavit of Justification Duty and 2 Ooaths	9	0
6	1	Affidavit of Caption Duty and oath	7	6
		Attending to file Bail Piece	3	4
3	0	Notice of filing copy and service	4	0
		Copy affidavits Justification to deliver to Plaintiff's agent	2	0
3	0	Notice of Justification Copy and service	4	0
		Attending Commissioner to get sworn thereto	3	4
		Attending to file affidavit of Justification when bail excepted to	3	4
		Searching for Declaration	3	4
		Copy sent per folio		4
		Searching if rule to plead given	3	4
3	0	Summons for further time to plead—Copy and Service	5	0
3	4	Attending Judge	3	4
3	0	Order copy and service	5	0
		Copy for the country	3	0
3	4	Instructions for plea &c.	6	8
		Drawing plea and all other defendant's pleadings per folio 1s.	1	0
		Searching for pleadings each	3	4
		The like after order of plaintiff's for time satisfied	3	4
		Copies of paper books per folio		4

<i>s. d.</i>	<i>£ s. d.</i>
Copies sent into the Country per folio <i>4d.</i>	
Attending to return paper book	3 4
Attending counsels clerk with notice of set-off	3 4
Service of Notice of set off in Town Causes	5 0
Drawing and Ingrossing General Issue and Duty	3 6
3 4 Attending to pay money into Court	6 8
Copy notice of Trial sent	1 0
Copy issue per folio <i>4d.</i>	
3 4 Attend searching if cause set down	6 8
Term Fee	10 0

In Ejectment for Plaintiff.

Copy Declaration and affidavit to keep per folio <i>4d.</i>	
3 4 Searching for Plea at all the Judges Chambers and giving receipt	6 8
Fee signing consent rule	3 4
Drawing and engrossing writ of possession per folio <i>1s.</i>	
Fee thereon	6 8

FOR DEFENDANT.

3 4 Searching if Ejectment moved	6 8
Drawing consent rule and copy, and fee signing	6 8
The rest of the fee as in common cases both Plaintiffs and Defendants	

General Matters.

Attending to procure and examine Office Copy, Plea or Demurrer &c.	3 4
Attending searching at the Judgment Office and Clerk of the papers, if Defendant has abided by plea	3 4
Attend bespeaking paper on Demurrer Book, and to procure and examine same	3 4
Attending to deliver same	3 4
On all the masters rules and which are entered at the clerk of the rules office, a fee of <i>3s. 4d.</i> to be allowed for attending to procure same	
2 6 Rules to reply to rejoin produce record &c. exclusive of the attendances on the Master	4 0
3 0 Copy and service of such rules	4 0
Attending Court when Plaintiff called to produce record	6 8

<i>s. d.</i>		<i>£ s. d.</i>
	2 Copies of Demurrer Books and special cases for Senior Judges per folio <i>4d.</i>	
	If for argument	
	Copy paper Book for counsel per folio <i>4d.</i>	
	Instruction for counsel to move for consilium	3 4
	Attending him and Court	6 8
3 0	Copy and service of rule	4 6
	Attending setting down cause for Argument	3 4
	Drawing out Marginal Notes of points if special	6 8
	Attending each Senior Judge with copy	3 4
	Attending searching up Defendants	
	Attorney had delivered Books	3 4
	Copy of Books for puisne Judges per folio <i>4d.</i>	
	Attending delivering the Books, and afterwards at the Senior Judges, marking their Books	
	No argument	6 8
6 1	Common affidavits, Duty and Oath	7 6
3 3	Entering up Judgment on Warrant of Attorney	4 4
2 6	Instructions to counsel to move in all common cases	3 4
	Attending him and Court	6 8
3 0	Copy and service of rule	4 0
	Drawing Cognovit and Copy, and attending and signing	13 4
3 4	Attending stamping	6 8
3 4	Attending stamp office on all occasions	6 8
	In all cases of pleadings being settled by counsel, fair copy for counsel at per folio <i>4d.</i>	
3 4	Attending him	6 8
	Attending Counsel when 10s. <i>6d.</i> Fee paid 3s. <i>4d.</i> or upwards 6s. <i>8d.</i> each Counsel	
	Side Bar or Treasury Chamber motions	3 4
3 4	Attending Court per day on Rules	6 8
	The Act of Parliament of 44th George III. having recognized special pleaders by compelling them to take out a licence, it is submitted that the fees paid to them for drawing and settling pleadings should be allowed and the attendances on them 1s. In the Exchequer of Pleas it has been allowed for many years. The present allowance between party and party in special Jury Causes being only for the fees paid to the Juries to be enquired into and considered, and the fees for naming and striking to be 13s. <i>4d.</i> each	
	For drawing and issuing writs of Scire Facias Elegit &c. &c. 1s. per folio	

<i>s. d.</i>	<i>£ s. d.</i>
Attending on adverse parties to demand money under rules of Court according to distance	
For attending to get a recommendation to Attorney to send writs to 	3 4
For writing letters with writs to Attorneys to get executed	3 6
The like for rules to return writs, serving notices of declarations, Inquiry &c. &c. 	3 6
For attending to order and procure office copies of affidavits, Rules &c. a fee of 	3 4
Attending as a witness per day 2 guineas and his travelling expenses	
All personal services of Rules, Allocrs, to be double the attendance for common services which is allowed in the Court of Chancery	
It is submitted that in all country causes one summons and order for time to plead should be allowed in costs for defendant between party and party	
N.B. In the Court of Chancery one order for time to answer is allowed	

LISTS, 22 FEB. 1771.

A.	Buxton.	Colston.
Alexander.	Barnardiston.	Cecil.
Adams.	Baynes.	Coates.
Astley.	Bristowe.	Constable.
Acton.	Blake.	Currie.
Atkinson.	Brown, Wm.	Coulthard.
Allen.	Brooke.	Chamberlayne.
Appleby.	Buckle.	Carlton.
	Brewster.	Cooper, Saml.
B.	Brown, Richd.	Clarke.
Baskerville.	Bury.	Cromwell.
Bowman.	Burgh.	Chippendale.
Barnes.		Clarridge.
Benton.	C.	
Brown, Charles.	Combes.	
Boyfield.	Cruttendon.	D.
Bargrave.	Cowper, Thos.	Dax.
Brigstock.	Chambre.	Duroure.
Bennett.	Cobb.	Dublec.

Dagge, John.	Harrison, Jno.	P.
Dagge, James.	Hodges.	Palmer, Robt.
		Pardoe.
E.	I.	Poole.
Eyre.	Jackson, Jno.	Palmer, Charlton.
Edison.	Inge.	Petre.
Elers.	Jenkinson.	Partington.
Ellis.	Jacomb.	Pardon.
Ewer.	J'Anson.	Pealc.
Elliot.	Jackson, Chas.	Pye.
Edmonds.	Irving.	Parker.
	Jefferson.	Partis.
F.	Jenkins.	Price.
Fothergill.	Jenurielt.	Philpot.
Francis.	Joliffe.	Parlewent.
Freslicque.		Potts.
Farrer.	K.	
Fair.	Kaye.	R.
	Kinaston.	Ryder.
G.	Kelsall.	Reynolds.
Gunter.		Richards.
Grubb.	L.	Russell.
Gwatkin.	Lloyd.	Robson.
Goostry.	Letch.	Read.
Gregg.	Letchmore.	Rowlinson.
Geering.	Lifo.	Raincock.
Garth.	Lane.	
Green.	Le Breton.	S.
Goodman.	Lee.	Seaman.
Grogan.		Swale.
Gawler.	M.	Southouse.
	Moak.	Sayer.
H.	Mainwaring.	Seagrane.
Heaton.	Mountfort.	Skyme.
Highmore.	Morgan.	Smith, Jno. City.
Holker.	Manley.	Smith, Saml.
Hutchinson.	Man.	Smith, Jno.
Harrison, Wm.		Smith, Robert.
Hull.	N.	Sutton.
Holl.	Nix.	Skinon.
Hobson.	Newton, Richd.	Smith, Robt.
Hunt.	Newton, Joseph.	
Hodges.		T.
Hodgson.	O.	Tolton.

	U.	Woodhouse.	Welch.
Upton.		Whitchurch.	Walton, Jno. City.
		Wallis.	Winterbottom.
	V.	Worliege.	Wilson.
Venables.		White, Hugh.	Webb.
Vaughan.		Wall.	Walton, Jno. (Temple).
Vernon.		Wynekley.	White, Joseph.
		Willmott.	Ward.
	W.	Welby.	Wise.
Whishau.		Winbolt.	Waye.
Woodcock.			

LISTS, 25 FEBRY, 1779.

	A.		C.	Eames.
	Adams, P. T.		Combes.	Escourt.
	Astley.		Cowper, Thos.	
	Acton.		Cecil, James.	F.
	Allen.		Constable.	Fothergill.
	Adams, Jno.		Coulthard.	Francis.
	Abbott.		Chamberlayne.	Freslicque.
			Carlton.	Farrer.
	B.		Cooper, Saml.	Finch.
	Bowman.		Coord.	Falkner.
	Bargrave.		Clark.	Fairbank.
	Bennett.		Claridge.	Fair.
	Bristowe.		Cecil, Wm.	
	Blake.			G.
	Brown, Wm.			Grubb, Ed.
	Brooke.		D.	Gwatkin.
	Buckle.		Durowre.	Goostry.
	Brown, Richd.		Dagge, Jno.	Gregg.
	Bury.		Dagge, Jas.	Geering.
	Burgh.		Dennison.	Garth.
	Bolton.		Devon.	Goodman.
	Baxter.		Denton.	Grogan.
	Brent.		Douce.	Gerrard.
	Bayley.			Griffin.
	Berry.		E.	Gibbs.
	Bray.		Eyre.	Goldard.
	Bliss.		Elison.	Greenwood.
	Belfour.		Elers.	Grubb, Jno.
	Bolton, Thos		Ellis.	Gapper.
			Edmunds.	

Green.	Manwaring.	S.
Gibbons.	Manley.	Swale.
Greenwollers.	Mann.	Sayer.
	Maberley.	Smith, Jno. City.
H.	Morgan.	Smith, Saml.
Hutchinson.	Meggison.	Smith, Robt. Castle Sq.
Hull.	Malton.	Skirron.
Holt.	Maltby.	Smith, Robt. City.
Hobson.		Strong.
Hunt.	N.	Sill.
Hodson.	Newton.	Skim.
Hodges.	Nash.	Smith, Cha. Lane.
Heathcote.	Nicholls.	Sauter.
Higden.	Norris.	Sheppard, Wm.
	Nalleriss.	Sheppard, Chas.
I.	O.	T.
Jackson, Jn. Red Lion		Tolton.
Sqre.	P.	Townsend.
Inge, Edwd.	Palmer, Robt.	Tudman.
Jacomb.	Pardoe.	
Irving.	Palmer, Charleton.	V.
Jenkins.	Petre.	Venables.
Jemmell.	Partington.	Vernon.
Jackson, Westmr.	Pardon.	U.
Inge, John.	Peal.	W.
	Pye.	Whishau.
K.	Partis.	Whitchurch.
Kaye.	Price.	Wallis.
Kinaston.	Philpot.	Wynekley.
Kelsal.	Parlewent.	Wilmott.
Kenderly.	Polls.	Welby.
	Parkin.	Winbolt, Robt.
L.	Parker, Wm.	Walton, City.
Lloyd.	Palmer, Jno.	Winterbottom.
Lane, Senr.	Pearson.	Wilson.
Le Breton.	Parker, Jno.	Walton, Temple.
Lee.	Parntker.	White.
London.	Price.	Ward.
Lewis.		Way.
Lowten.	R.	Winbolt, J. H.
Lane, Junr.	Reynolds.	Watson.
	Robson.	Wade.
M.	Read, Saville.	Wright.
Monk.	Raincock.	Windus.
	Reid, Isaac.	

BUSINESS AT THE GENERAL MEETING.

1st To name a Prolocutor hac
Vice, if Mr. Fothergill is not there.

2nd To read the General Orders
for the Members to contribute to the
fund for the support of the Society.

Collection to be made.
3rd To Read the Committees Report
on Auditing the Secretary's Accounts.

4th To read the Minitts of the
last General Meeting and Subsequent
Committees and Confirm the same if
approved.

5th Stewards to withdraw and name
their successors.

6th On Stewards return, the names
of the new Stewards to be called (and
if approved of) to be conducted to
the head of the table.

7th General Business (if any).

Healts.

Their Majesties and Royal Family.
To be drank standing.

The Lord High Chancellor.

The Lord Chief Justice, and other
Judges of the Kings Bench.

The Master of the Rolls.

Lord Chief Justice, and other
Judges of the Common Pleas.

Our Law, Liberties, Trades, and
Navigation.

The Prolocutors Health.

The present Stewards Health.

The Stewards Elect.

The new admitted members, if any.

20 July, 1764.

Ordered that no motion shall be made, or Business done, at This or any
other day of General Meeting after 7 o'clock in the Evening.

17 July, 1789.

The above order extended to 9 o'clock.

feast 16th february, 1749.

Stewards.

Receipts and Disbursements.

Feast 16th february, 1749.

Contra paid.

Mr. Bernard	} Stewards.		To Mr. Fletcher, Dinners for 90	£	s.	d.				
„ Browne			at 5/- per head	...	22	10	0			
„ Letch			Old Hock	...	7	4	0			
„ Pardoe			Port	...	3	12	0			
Received by 163 tickets disposed		£	s.	d.	White Wine	...	0	10	0	
of		...	40	15	0	Madera	...	0	15	0
By the 2nd Collection		...	19	10	0	Cyder	...	0	10	8
		Total	60	5	0	Strong Beer	...	0	1	0
Deduct paid as on yd otherwise		40	13	6	Tobacco	...	0	1	1	
		Remains	£19	11	6	Oranges and Lemons	...	0	8	0
					Bristol Water	...	0	0	8	
					Sugar	...				
					Claret	...	3	5	0	
							38	17	5	
							1	11	6	
							0	5	0	
							£40	13	11	

No. of Tickets disposed of.					
By Mr. Bernard	34	...	8	10	0
„ „ Browne	35	...	8	15	0
„ „ Letch	8	...	2	0	0
„ „ Pardoe	86	...	21	10	0
	163		£40	15	0

2nd Reckoning.

In hand	£	s.	d.	
2nd Bill deducting yd Returns	19	11	6	
					1	16	0	
					Remains	£17	15	0

Feast 22nd february 1754.

Stewards

Receipts and disbursements.

Feast 22nd february, 1754.

Mr. Colston	} Stewards.		To Mr. Fletcher Dinners for 110	£	s.	d.				
„ Tovey			at 5/- per head	...	27	10	0			
„ Haywood			Old Hock	...	10	16	0			
„ Whishaw			Port	...	3	12	0			
Received for 208 Tickets disposed		£	s.	d.	Madera	...	0	19	6	
of		...	52	0	0	White Wine	...	0	12	0
By the second collection		...	24	5	0	Cyder	...			
		Total	76	5	0	Strong Beer	...	0	3	4
Deduct paid as on the other wise		46	14	5	Oranges and Lemons	...	0	7	9	
		£29	10	7	Sugar	...				
					Tobacco	...	0	1	4	
					Punch	...	0	16	0	
							Total	44	17	11
							0	5	0	
							1	11	6	
							£46	14	5	

Number of Tickets disposed of.					
By Mr. Colston	59	...	14	15	0
„ „ Tovey	40	...	10	0	0
„ „ Haywood	59	...	14	15	0
„ „ Whishaw	49	...	12	5	0
„ „ at yo feast	1	...	0	5	0
	208		£52	0	0

						2nd Reckoning.		
						£	s.	d.
In hand	29	10	7
2nd Bill	6	11	0
						Remains <u>£22 19 7</u>		

						22nd feby, 1754.		
						£	s.	d.
Dinner for 110	27	10	0
Wine	15	19	6
Ale		3	4
Oranges		7	9
Tobacco		1	4
Punch		16	0
						<u>£44 17 11</u>		

Feb. 22nd, 1754.

Received of Mr. Bonner the contents
in full for my Father, Francis Fletcher,
M. Fletcher.

						£	s.	d.
Bread and Beer		6	8
Wine	5	3	0
Punch		15	0
Ale			8
Oil		1	0
Cheese and Welsh Rabbits		1	8
Oranges and Sugar		1	0
Oyster			6
Tobacco		1	0
12 Welsh Rabbits		2	0
						<u>6 12 6</u>		
Received 1 doz. Port	1	4	0
						<u>5 8 6</u>		
Wine and Sugar	1	2	6
						<u>£6 11 0</u>		
4 doz. and 6 Bottles Hock	10	16	0
3 doz. Port	3	12	0
6 Bottles and Pints Madera		19	6
6 Bottles and Sherry		12	0
						<u>£15 19 6</u>		

20 Ffebry., 1761. Dinner.
20 Feb., 1761.

2nd Table.	1st Course.	To be 1st Served.	2nd Table.	To be first served.
Salmon.	For Glasses.	Salmon.	Tongue and Udder.	Tongue and Udder.
2 fowles.		fowles.	Gravy and Jelly.	Gravy and Jelly.
Greens.		Greens.	Apple Pye.	Marrow Pudding.
Ham.		Ham.	Roast Lobsters.	Roast Lobsters.
Hash't Calves Head.		Chickn Pye.	Marrow Pudding.	Gravy and Jelly.
2 fowles.		fowles.	Roast Lobsters.	Tongue and Udder.
Greens.		Greens.	Beef.	Apple Pye.
Chicken Pye.		Salmon.	Sallad.	Beef.
Salmon.		2 fowles.	Marrow Puddg.	Sallad.
2 fowles.		Greens.	Gravy and Jelly.	Roast Lobsters.
Ham.		Chickn Pye.	Tongue and Udder.	Marrow Pudding.
Hash't Calves Hd.		Hd. Calves Hd.	Roast Lobsters.	Gravy and Jelly.
Salmon.		Ham.	Apple Pye.	Tongue and Udder.
Chicken Pye.		Greens.	Gravy and Jelly.	
Greens.		fowles.	Tongue and Udder.	
2 fowles.		Salmon.		
Hash't Calves Hd.				
Ham.				
Greens.				
2 fowles.				
Salmon.				

26 ffebry 1768.
feast.

Stewards Receipts and Disbursements.

feast 26 ffebry, 1768.

Mr. John Hodges	}	Stewards.	
„ George Green			
„ James Garth			
„ Joseph White			
Received by 139 Tickets disposed			£ s. d.
of 34 15 0	
By the 2nd collection 58		... 14 10 0	
		Total 49 5 0	
Paid as on the otherwise		... 48 1 11	
		Ballance £1 3 1	

Paid Mr. Smith's Bill 46 15 11
To the Messenger 5 0
To the Servants 1 1 0

Number of Tickets disposed of.		
By Mr. Hodges 34 8 10 0
„ „ Green 26 6 10 0
„ „ Garth 38 9 10 0
„ „ White 41 10 5 0
At the feast	...	
	139	£34 15 0

Total £48 1 11

We have perused and allow of this Account,
Josh. White,
Ja. Garth.

	£	s.	d.
To Dinner	21	0	0
To 3 doz. Claret, 3 Bottles	9	15	0
To 3 doz. Hock, 11 Bottles	11	15	0
To 1 doz. Maderia	2	8	0
To 1 doz. Port, 7 Bottles	1	18	0
To 1 doz. Lisbon, 1 Bottle, 1 Gill	1	6	3
To Punch		12	0
To Brandy		2	6
To Bristol Water		2	6
To Tobacco		2	8
To Lemons and Oranges at Dinner		4	0
To Olives—at night		3	0
To Oranges and Sugar		1	6
To Strong Beer		10	0
To Paid Porter		2	0
To Fruit, Chesnutts, Biscuits, Olives, Allmonds and Raisons	2	2	0
	52	3	11
To Wine returned		5	8
	£46	15	11

Received March 1st, 1768, the
contents in full of this bill,

Jos. Smith.

Servants 1 1 0

THE LAW SOCIETY.

	£	s.	d.
1784 To Dinner	16	16	0
Febry 27 To Butleridge	3	0	0
To Candles		4	6
To Coals for the Hall		6	6
To Oyl		1	0
To Pens and Paper		1	0
To S. Beer		9	5
To Glasses Broke		2	0
To Lemons at Table		2	0
To Fruit &c.	1	5	0
To Sugar		2	0
To Bread and Beer for Supper		2	3
To Chees and Butter		1	0
To Tobacco		1	0
To Hock, 32 Bottles at 5/6	8	16	0
To Port, 41 do ... 2/6	5	2	6
To Lisbon, 3 do ... 2/6		7	6
To Maderia, 16 do ... 5/-		4	0
To Sherry, 10 do ... 3/6	1	15	0
To Brandy		2	6
To Punch		4	6
	£43	1	8

1st March, 1784.

Received of Mr. Edwd. Bowman the contents of this Bill.

William Greenly.

Servants

£1 5 0

1st Course.		2nd Course.	
		Tongue and Udder.	
This table to be served first.		four qrs. of Lamb.	
ffish.		Asparagus.	Tongue and Udder.
ffowles.		Marrow Pudding.	
Greens.	Ffish.	Roast Lobsters.	Lamb.
Ham.		Beef.	Asparagus.
Hash't Calves Head.	Fowles.	Sallad.	Marrow Pudding.
	Greens.	Lamb.	Roast Lobsters.
	Ham.	Asparagus.	Beef.
ffish.	Greens.	Apple Pye.	Sallad.
ffowles.	ffowles.	Tongue and Udder.	Apple Pye.
Greens.	Hash't Calves Head.	Apple Pye.	Apple Pye.
Ham.		Lamb.	Sallad.
Greens.	ffish.	Lamb.	Beef.
ffowles.	Hash't Calves Head.	Asparagus.	Roast Lobsters.
ffish.	Greens.	Sallad.	Marrow Pudding.
Hash't Calves Head.	Ham.	Beef.	
Ham.	Greens.	Roast Lobsters.	
Greens.	Greens.	Marrow Pudding.	Asparagus.
ffowles.	ffowles.	Asparagus.	Lamb.
ffish.	ffish.	Lamb.	
		Tongue and Udder.	Tongue and Udder.

- 1st Course.
- 7 Dishes of Salmon and Smelts.
 - 8 Dishes of Ffowles.
 - 5 Hams.
 - Greens.
 - 4 Dishes of Hash't Calves Head.
 - 4 Lamb Pastys.

- 2nd Course.
- 5 Dishes of Roast Tongue and udder.
 - 5 four Quarters of Lamb.
 - 6 Dishes of Asparagus.
 - 4 Dishes of Roast Lobsters.
 - 4 Chumps of Beef and Sallad.
 - 4 Marrow Puddings.
 - 4 Apple Pyes.
 - 7 Standards of Jellys and Whip.
 - Sylibubs. ffruit.

Feast 27th february, 1784.

Mr. James Walker }
 Mr. Wm. Hamilton } Stewards.
 Mr. Thos. Green }
 Mr. Joseph Lyon }

	£	s.	d.
Received by 156 Tickets and dis- posed of	39	0	0
Received by 2nd Collection (60)	15	0	0
Paid as on the other side	54	0	0
	45	14	8
Remains	£8	5	4

Number of Tickets disposed of.

By Messrs Walker	31	...	7	15	0
" " Hamilton	38	...	9	10	0
" " Green	47	...	11	15	0
" " Lyon	34	...	8	10	0
At the feast and from new mem- bers	6	...	1	10	0
	156		£39	0	0

	£	s.	d.
By Mr. Greenly's Bill	43	1	8
To the Servants and Waiters ...	1	5	0
To the Butler of Cliffords Inn ...	10	6	
To the Porter of do.	10	6	
To the Kitchen Maid	5	0	
Paid Coachire to and from the Hall	2	0	

Carried to the other side £45 14 8

We approve of this account,

Will Hamilton.
 Thos. Greenly.
 Joseph Lyon.
 James Walker.

Salmon.	Tongue and Udder.		Tongue and Udder.	Salmon.	Tongue and Udder.
² fowles could.	² Ducklings.	Salmon.	² Ducklings.	² fowles.	2 Ducklings.
Ham.	Roast Lobsters.	² fowles and Bacon.	Roast Lobsters.	Ham.	Roast Lobsters.
Hash't Calves Head.	Marrow Pudding.	Hash't Calves Head.	Apple Pye.	Hash't Calves Head.	Marrow Pudding.
Salmon.	Tongue and Udder.			² fowles.	
Chicken Pye.	² Ducklings.			Chicken Pye.	Beef.
² fowles.	Roast Lobsters.				
Salmon.	Beef.			Salmon.	Apple Pye.
Ham.	Apple Pye.			² fowles.	Tongue and Udder.
² fowles.	Tongue and Udder.			Hash't Calves Head.	2 Ducklings
Chicken Pye.	² Ducklings.			Ham.	Marrow Pudding.
Salmon.	Roast Lobsters.			Chicken Pye.	Roast Lobsters.
Hash't Calves Head.	Marrow Pudding.			² fowles.	² Ducklings.
Ham.	² Ducklings.			Salmon.	Tongue and Udder.
² fowles.	Tongue and Udder.				
Salmon.					

Sideboard for Glasses, etc.

INDEX.

- ABSENCE of Counsel from Courts in which they held Briefs, ciii**
Account of the Society's Funds, 238
 — of the receipts and disbursements in connection with dinners and feasts, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349
Acknowledgments of fines and recoveries, 15, 74, 75
Actual service to be done by articted clerks, 29, 33
Addresses of Solicitors and their Town Agents, 28
Administration or probate to be taken out to cover the testator's estate and any property of which he may be trustee. Hardship of this pointed out, 209
Admission fee payable by members of the Society, 101, 162
 — of Attorneys and Solicitors, iv, 8, 157
 — of Attorneys and Solicitors, Oaths on, 48, 288
 — as Solicitors of clerks in Court, attempt to obtain and to be allowed to take articted clerks, 9, 13, 14, 16, 34, 35, 295, 299, 323, 324
 — of Jewish Solicitors, Oath on, 288
 — of unqualified persons as Attorneys and Solicitors, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 80, 81, 120, 121, 129, 130, 147, 148, 149, 166, 169, 177, 179, 181, 214, 226, 227, 289, 329
Advertizing by a conveyancer, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215
Affidavits as to due execution of Articles of Clerkship, 34, 48, 49, 50, 51, 128, 129, 137, 138, 139, 140
Afternoon attendance of Masters in Chancery, 134
Age and infirmity of Masters in Chancery, 134
Agents in Town, Addresses of, 28
 — Parliamentary, lxxxiv, 214
Alexander Daniel, enquiry as to striking his name off the Roll, 51, 56
Alienation Office, mode of computing fines in, 196, 197
Alteration of hours of attendance at Seal Office, 116, 117, 118, 119, 326
Alteration of hours of Clerk of Doquets in the King's Bench, 124, 125, 127
Annual Certificate duty, 308
Apology by Counsel for censure on a Solicitor, 114
Appointment of Secretaries, 18, 71, 158, 162, 164, 184, 230
Arrears of subscriptions, collection of, 94, 105, 137, 139, 140
Arrests, vexatious, 25, 26
Articted Clerk hanged for robbery, 307
Articted Clerks to do actual service, 29, 33
 — engaging in other employment, 21, 51, 80, 129, 181, 306, 307
 — friendly hints to, by John Felton, 48, 61, 62, 63
 — proposed Society of, for discussing legal subjects, 201, 204, 206, 207
Articles of Clerkship, Affidavits as to due execution of, 34, 48, 49, 50, 51, 128, 129, 137, 138, 139, 140
 — indemnity against omission to file, 48, 49, 50, 51
 — of Turnkey of Gaol cancelled, 306
Attendance by the Clerk of Doquets in the Court of King's Bench, 124, 125, 127
 — of the Clerk of Errors, Exchequer Chamber, 130, 131, 132, 133
Attorneys to act as Notaries, Bill to enable, 208
 — as Militiamen, lxxvi, 123
 — call to the Bar of, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113
 — censure of by a Barrister, lxxv, 114
 — illegal practices by, 51, 65, 145
 — laws regulating, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 315, 319
 — oaths on admission, 48, 288
 — proposed college for, 311
 — reasons against increase of, 35, 300, 323
 — regulation of, 315
 — preparation of deeds by, xiii, xiv, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277
 — returns of persons admitted, 22

- Attorneys, unqualified persons acting as, xi, 30, 33, 34, 128, 302, 304, 305
- Bail by Jews only, to be received for Jews, 121
 — mode of taking, putting in, and justifying, 120, 121
 — no application made to the authorities owing to difficulties arising thereon, 75
 — on Writs of Error, 67
 — proceedings by scire facias, 69
 — sham or hired, to be prevented if possible, 67
 — to be exempt from the payment of debts, 67, 69
- Bankruptcy, law of, 124, 125, 127, 129, 139, 149
- Bar, call of Solicitors to, lxxiii, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113
 — call to, of a member of the Society, 76
- Barristers absenting themselves from Courts in which they held briefs, ciii
 — acting for the Society without fees, 45, 48, 80, 85, 132, 191
 — conducting Solicitor's business, 101, 103, 104, 173, 174, 180, 183, 184
 — seeing clients without the intervention of a Solicitor, 173, 174, 180, 184
- Barrister's censure on Attorneys and Solicitors, lxxv, 114
- Barton's "Elements of Conveyancing" in which is deprecated the practice of conveyancers doing Solicitor's work, 180, 182, 183
- Benefit of Suitors, matter relating to, considered by Committee, 5, 26
- Benevolent fund for the relief of decayed Solicitors, 205
- Bets or wagers amongst members of clubs, xcvi, 194
- Bill of Craveings by the Secretary, 122
- Bills of costs, various, 134, 149
- British Museum, thanks to in connection with the Scriveners' case, 98
- Broken-down tradesmen and other loose and disorderly persons carrying on business in the names of solicitors, 30, 33, 34
- Brown, William, complaint against, 128
- Business at a General Meeting, and a list of the healths proposed at the dinner afterwards, 344
 — of Solicitors conducted by Barristers, 101, 104, 173, 174, 180, 183, 184
- Bye-laws of the City of London, attempt by the Scriveners' Company to compel Solicitors practising in the City to become freemen and members of the Scriveners' Company, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56.
- Call of Solicitors to the Bar, lxxiii, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113
 — to the Bar of a member of the Society, 76
- Cambridge Statutes by Danby Pickering, purchase of, 103
- Censure by Barrister on Solicitors, lxxv, 114
- Certificate duty, 308
 — of conviction of Wreathock, 82, 83
 — of replication, refusal of one of the six clerks to sign, 42, 45
- Certificates of Solicitors not taken out in time, application to Parliament for indemnity, 190, 191, 327
- Chancery fees to Solicitors, bill for regulating, 197, 198
 — Masters, attendance in the afternoon of, 134
 — Masters in 1775, 128
 — Practice, delay and expense, 155, 156, 157
 — Barristers and Solicitors consult as to the best means of improving, 155
- Chancery Lane, Penny Post Office, 117, 118
- City of London, attempt to compel attorneys practising there to become members of the Scriveners' Company, xiv—lxx
 — only Freemen allowed to exercise any art, trade, mystery, manual occupation on handicraft within the boundary of the City of London, xv, 36
- Clerks in Court seeking admission as Solicitors, and to be allowed to take articulated clerks, 9, 13, 14, 16, 34, 35, 295, 299, 323, 324
 — bill as to fees of, 197, 198
- Clerk of Errors, Exchequer Chamber, hours of attendance of, 130, 131, 132, 133
 — of Errors, Exchequer Chamber, enquiry as to conduct of, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147
 — of the Doquets in the Court of King's Bench, 124, 125, 127
 — of Rules, 160, 161
- Clerks (Articled), irregular employment of, 21, 51, 80, 129, 181, 306, 307
 — proposed Society of, for discussing legal questions, 201, 204, 206, 207
 — of the House of Commons seeking authority to act as Parliamentary Agents, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225
 — friendly hints to, by John Felton, 48

- Clerks in Court, trying for admission as Solicitors, 9, 13, 14, 16, 34, 35, 295, 299, 323, 324
 — service of, 29, 33
- Clerkship, Articles of, affidavit as to due execution, 34, 48, 49, 50, 51, 128, 129, 137, 138, 139, 140
 — Articles of, entered into by Turnkey of Gaol cancelled, 306
- Clients seen by Barristers without the intervention of a Solicitor, 173, 174, 180, 184
- Clifford's Inn Hall, as place to hold dinners in, 126, 127, 130
- Collection of subscriptions in arrear, 94, 105, 137, 139, 140
- College of Attorneys and Solicitors proposed, 311
 — of Notaries, xii, xiii
- Colston, Mr., proposed gratuity to, in compliment for his services in connection with the Scriveners' case, 106, 107
- Colston, Mrs., gratuity to, 138
- Committee, irregular attendance of members of, 11, 30, 136
 — members of, fine for non-attendance, 173, 184
 — rota of members, 173
 — to take into consideration matters relating to the benefit of Solicitors and the honour of the profession, 6
- Commission of errors on the judgment of *respondeas ouster* on demurrer in the Scriveners' case, 80, 81
- Commissioners in Bankruptcy, 125
 — under the Land Tax Act, attempt to get Solicitors qualified to act as, 6, 7
- Common Law Courts, memorial to the Lord Chief Justice to increase Solicitors' fees in, 203, 210, 211, 225, 227, 228
- Common Pleas, Court of, registration of Solicitors in, 116, 117, 119
 — list of fees in, 331, 332
- Complaint against a Solicitor whose name was not given, complainant ordered to attend before the committee with the person complained of, 5
 — against William Brown, 128
 — against Jonathan Dean, 147, 148
 — against John Edkins, 148, 149, 150
 — against Charles Cotterell, 152, 305
 — against John Jackson, 304
 — against Lawrence Times, 129, 130, 131
 — against Robert Simpson, 129, 132, 134, 306
 — against William Wreathocke, 77, 78, 82, 83
- Computing fines in the alienation office, 197
- Conference between Solicitors and Clerks in Court, 34
- Consultation between Barristers and Solicitors as to the improvement of Chancery practice, 155
- Contempt of Court, Solicitors committed to the Fleet for, 78
- Conveyancing by attorneys, xiii, xiv, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277
- Conveyancers doing Solicitors' work deprecated by Charles Barton in his book on the "Elements of Conveyancing," 180, 182, 183
- Conviction of Solicitor for highway robbery, 77, 82, 83
- Corps of Volunteers called the Law Association to serve in case of invasion, proposed, 189
- Costs in Common Law, memorial to the Lord Chief Justice to increase Solicitors' fees, 203, 210, 211, 225, 227, 228
- Costs of the Scriveners' case, extra subscriptions to meet, 58, 87, 94
 — of the Scriveners' case, taxation of, 106, 107, 109, 110
 — of Writ of Error, taxation of, 67, 75
- Cotterell, Charles, complaint against, 152, 305
- Counsel acting for the Society without fees, 45, 48, 76, 80, 85, 132, 191
 — conducting Solicitors' business, 101, 103, 104, 173, 174, 180, 183, 184
 — employed in the Scriveners' case, 40, 43, 54, 56, 76, 91, 98
 — in the Scriveners' case, thanks to, 40, 60, 64, 74, 76, 85, 87, 98
 — in Scriveners' case, presentation of plate to, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102
 — retainers of, in Marine Insurance cases, ix, 28, 29, 31, 32, 312
 — seeing clients without the intervention of a solicitor, 173, 174, 180, 184
 — within the Bar absenting themselves from Courts in which they held Briefs, ciii
- Court, admission as Solicitors of clerks in, 9, 13, 14, 16, 34, 35, 295, 299, 323, 324
 — Letter, writers of, xii
 — officials did not charge fees against the Society, 85
 — rule of, as to acknowledgment of fines, 15
- Craveings of the Secretary, Bill of, 122
- Cups presented to Counsel in Scriveners' case, 99, 100, 101, 102

- Custom (immemorial), Solicitors' fees based on, lxxix, 163
- Davy, Sergeant, apology from, to the Society for censuring Solicitors, lxxv, 114
- Dean, Jonathan, complaint against, 147, 148
- Debate, rules of, 136
- Debating Society for the discussion by articulated clerks of legal questions, 201, 204, 206, 207
- Debts, bail, to be exempted from the payment of, 67
- Bill for the recovery of small, 8, 10
- Deeds, preparation of, by Attorneys and Solicitors, xiii, xiv, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277
- Defence of action taken by the Scriveners' Company against Solicitors entrusted to Mr. William Mason, 54
- of actions by the Scriveners' Company, extra subscriptions to meet expense of, 58, 87, 90, 91, 92, 94
- Delays and expenses of proceedings in Chancery, 155, 156, 157
- Detection and discountenance of malpractice, 1
- Dinners, accounts of receipts and disbursements of, 160, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349
- charge for tickets, 110, 113, 167, 175, 189, 198, 200, 211, 213, 229
- tickets not transferable, 18, 19, 113
- in Clifford's Inn Hall, 126, 127
- menus for, 349
- gratuities to servants, 158, 159
- plans of tables, 347, 350
- members refusing to take tickets for, struck off the list, 171
- Discharge of members of the Society to be called as witnesses in the Scriveners' case, 96
- Discountenance by the Society of malpractices on the part of Solicitors, 1
- Doquets, Clerk of, in the Court of King's Bench, hours of attendance, 124, 125, 127
- Duty, annual, on certificates, 308
- Easy proof of acknowledgment of fines, 15
- Edkins, John, complaint against, 148, 149, 150
- Ejectment, rules in, fees on, 155
- "Elements of Conveyancing," by Charles Barton, in which he deprecates conveyancers doing solicitors' work, 180, 182, 183
- Ellenborough, Lord; reply of, as to fees of solicitors, lxxxiii, 203, 210, 211, 212, 225
- Employment, irregular, of articulated clerks, 21, 51, 80, 129, 181, 306, 307
- Entrance fees payable by members, 101, 135, 144, 151, 162
- Error office, Exchequer Chamber, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147
- Writ of, Bail, 67, 68
- Writ of, issued for the purpose of delaying execution, 68
- Writ of, taxation of costs of, 75
- Errors, Clerk of, in the Exchequer Chamber, attendance of, 130, 131, 132, 133
- Erskine, Lord, standing toast for his services in connection with the application of the Society for increased fees, lxxxii, 203, 205
- Evidence in the Scriveners' case, several members discharged from membership for the purpose of giving evidence in the Scriveners' case, 96
- Exchequer Chamber, attendance of Clerk of Errors in, 130, 131, 132, 133
- Execution of Articles of Clerkship, affidavits as to, 34, 48, 49, 50, 51, 128, 129, 137, 138, 139, 140
- Exemption of bail from the payment of debts, 67
- Expense of, and delays in proceedings in Chancery, 155, 156, 157
- Expiring laws, application to continue an Act as to Attorneys and Solicitors, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37
- Extra subscriptions to meet costs of the Scriveners' case, 58, 87, 94
- Farrer, James, refusal to act as Steward, 158, 159
- Fees of Attorneys and Solicitors based on immemorial custom, lxxix, 163
- Bill for regulating, 197, 198
- of Attorneys and Solicitors in the Courts of Law and Equity, application of the Society for increasing, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxx, lxxxi, lxxxii, lxxxiii, lxxxiv, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 175, 176, 178, 180, 184, 186, 192, 194, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205
- in Common Law, 203, 210, 211, 225, 227, 228, 331, 332
- List of, in the Court of King's Bench, 332
- payable by members on admission to the Society, 101, 135, 144, 151, 162
- not charged against the Society by the officials of the Court, 85

- Fees not charged by Counsel acting on behalf of the Society, 45, 48, 76, 80, 85, 132, 191
 — to six clerks for copies of pleadings, 42
 — of Clerk of Rules, 160, 161
 Feigned issue in the Scriveners' case, 43
 Felton, John, Friendly Hints to Articled Clerks, 48, 61, 62, 63
 Fiat of Attorney General necessary in order to obtain certificate of the conviction of a Solicitor, 82, 83
 Fines imposed on members of the Committee for non-attendance, 173
 — and recoveries, acknowledgment of, 15, 74, 75
 — method of computing in the Alienation Office, 196, 197
 Fleet Prison, Solicitor committed to, for Contempt of Court, 78
 Fothergill, Henry, Elected Prolocutor, 127
 Freemen of the City of London only to exercise any art, trade, mystery, manual occupation or handicraft within the City, xv, 36
 Freedom of the City of London, New By-laws as to, 45, 46, 48
 — of the City of London, Attempt to compel attorneys practising in the City to become Freemen, xiv—lxx
 Friendly hints to young gentlemen who are, or intend to be bound by articles to Attorneys or Solicitors, by John Felton, 48, 61, 62, 63
 Fund for the relief of decayed Solicitors, 205
 — special for the general good and service of the Society, 11, 12, 162
 Funds of the Society, Accounts of, 238, 239, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349
 General good and service of the Society, fund for the promotion of, 11, 12, 162
 — Meeting, business at, and healths proposed at the dinner afterwards, 344
 Gratuity and compliment to Mr. Colston in connection with the Scriveners' case, 106, 107
 — to the widow of Mr. J. Colston, 138
 — to shorthand writer in Scriveners' case, 106
 Greenwood, John, application to strike his name off the Roll of Solicitors, 80, 81, 84
 Hanging of an articled clerk for robbery from his master with whom he was a menial servant but at the same time articled to another Solicitor, 307
 Healths proposed at dinner after the General Meeting, 344
 Highwaymen in partnership, viii, 77
 Highway robbery, Solicitor convicted of, 77
 — Solicitor sentenced to death for, 83
 Hired or sham Bail to be prevented, 67
 Hobert, Lord Chief Justice, xiii
 Hodgson, James, irregular admission of, 20, 21, 22
 Honour of the Profession, matters relating to, to be considered by Committee, 5
 Hours at the Seal Office, alteration of, 116, 117, 118, 119, 326
 — of attendance of Clerk of Errors in the Exchequer Chamber, 130, 131, 132, 133
 — of Clerk of doquets in Court of King's Bench, 124, 125, 127
 House of Commons Clerks' attempt to obtain permission to act as Parliamentary Agents, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225
 House of Commons, Speaker of, to be attended at 9 a.m. with regard to Land Tax Bill, 7
 Hurly, William, an articled clerk hanged for robbery from his master in whose house he was a menial servant. He was at the same time articled to another Solicitor, 307
 Hume, Campbell, complaint against, with regard to his retainer in a Marine Insurance case, ix, 28, 29, 31, 32, 312
 Immemorial customary fees, lxxix, 163
 Increase of the number of Attorneys and Solicitors, reason against, 35, 300, 323
 — in the fees of Attorneys and Solicitors in the Courts of Law and Equity, application for, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxx, lxxxi, lxxxii, lxxxiii, lxxxiv, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 175, 176, 178, 180, 184, 186, 192, 194, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205
 — of the number of Solicitors to be checked, 35
 Indemnity for Solicitors who had not taken out their certificates in time, application to Parliament for, 190, 191, 327
 Infirmary of Master in Chancery, 134
 Inns of Court, call of Solicitors to the Bar, lxxiii, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113

- Inscriptions on plate presented to Counsel in the Scriveners' case, 100, 101, 102
- Insurance, Marine, retainers of counsel, ix, 28, 29, 31, 32, 312
- Interest on amount recovered under judgment, 67
- Invasion of England, "Law Association" corps of Volunteers to serve in case of, 189
- Investment of the funds of the Society, 63, 71, 171, 190, 213
- Irish stamps, purchase of, 138, 232
- Irregular admission of Attorneys and Solicitors, 17
- admission of James Hodgson, 20, 21, 22
- attendance of members of the Committee, 30
- Issue, feigned, in the Scriveners' case, 43
- Jackson, John, complaint against, 304
- Jews only to be bail for Jews, 121
- Jones, Landon, sentenced to the pillory and struck off the Roll, 19, 20, 22
- application to strike off the Roll, 77
- Jordan, Samuel, complaint as to his practising as a Solicitor in the name of Mr. Butler, 33, 302
- Judgment, interest on amount recovered allowed to complainant, 67, 68
- of respondeas ouster on demurrer in the Scriveners' case, 80, 93
- Jury of non-freemen, trial of Scriveners' case before, 97
- Juries, bill for more effective summoning of, 2, 3
- Justifying bail, mode of, 120, 121
- King's Bench, clerk of doquets in, 124, 125, 127
- list of fees in, 332
- hours of attendance of the clerk of the doquets, 124
- registration of Solicitors in, 116, 117, 119
- Land Tax Act, attempt to get Solicitors qualified to act as Commissioners under, 6, 7
- Lapse of time after admission, application against Solicitor dropped in consequence of, 22
- "Law Association" corps of Volunteers to serve in case of an invasion, 189
- of Bankruptcy, 124, 125, 127, 129, 139, 149
- Society, members of, to be communicated with as to the expediency of establishing a Society of Articled Clerks for the discussion of legal questions, 201, 204, 206, 207
- Laws regulating Attorneys and Solicitors, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 315, 319
- List of fees in the Court of Common Pleas, 331, 332
- of members of the Society, 1770—1780, 233, 340
- London, City of, new Bye-law as to Solicitors becoming freemen of, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56
- Freemen only to exercise any art, trade, mystery, manual occupation or handicraft within the City, xv, 36
- Loose and disorderly persons and broken tradesmen acting as Attorneys and Solicitors, 30, 33, 34
- Loss of minute books of the Society and other papers, xcix, 236, 237
- Loughborough, Lord, memorial to, lxxix, 178
- Malpractice, detection and discountenance of, 1
- Marine Insurance cases, retainers of Counsel in, ix, 28, 29, 31, 32, 312
- Mason, William, instructed to defend actions brought by the Scriveners' Company against Solicitors, 54
- Master of the Rolls and the admission of Clerks in Court, 9, 14, 16
- Masters in Chancery in 1775, 134
- attendance of, in the afternoon, 134
- Mayor's Court, action in by Scriveners' Company against solicitors, 88, 93, 94
- Meetings, General, business at and healths proposed at dinner afterwards, 344
- Members of Committee, fines for non-attendance, 173
- rota of, 173
- of the Society called upon for half-a-guinea each towards paying off the debts of the Society, 241, 242, 243, 244
- of the Society, fee payable on admission, 101, 135, 144, 151, 162
- of the Society, lists of, 233, 340
- of the Society struck off the list for refusing to take tickets for the dinner, 171
- Menial service to be rendered by articled clerks, 29, 33
- Militiamen, solicitors as, 123, 124
- Ministers from foreign Courts, protection by, of their servants, 23, 25

- Minute books and other papers of the Society, loss of, xcix, 236, 237
- Misconduct of Solicitors, alleged by Barrister, 114
- Mortgages, stamps on transfers of, 209
- Name of Solicitor complained of, not given complainant, ordered to attend before the committee with the person complained of, 5
- Nisi Prius, Bill for regulating trials at, 2, 3
- Notaries and Scriveners only to prepare deeds, xiii, xiv
- Notaries, Bill to enable Solicitors to act as, 208
- College of, xii, xiii
- Number of Solicitors, to be prevented from increasing, 35
- Nuthall and Hume Campbell, ix, 28, 29, 31, 32, 312
- Oath by Jewish Solicitor on admission, 288
- Oaths to be taken by Attorneys or Solicitors, 48, 288
- Officials of the Court did not charge fees against the Society, 85
- Parliamentary Agents, lxxxiv, 214
- Clerks of the House of Commons endeavouring to obtain authority to act as such, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225
- Partnership between Highwaymen, viii
- Pecuniary assistance, application for, by Thomas White, 321
- application for, by Thomas Searle, 193, 196
- Penny Post Office for Chancery Lane, 117, 118
- Petitions for Private Bills, time for presenting, 214
- Pickering's Cambridge Statutes, purchase of, 103
- Pillory, Daniel Alexander sentenced to, 51, 56
- Landen Jones struck off the Roll, 19, 20, 22
- Plans of tables for dinners, 347, 350
- Plate presented to Counsel in the Scriveners' case, 99, 100, 101, 102
- Pleadings, copies of, fees to six clerks, 42
- Porter, Clifford's Inn, gratuity to, 158
- Post Office for Chancery Lane, 117, 118
- Practice in Chancery, delays and expense, 155, 156, 157
- consultation between Barristers and Solicitors for improving, 155
- Presentation of Petitions for private Bills, time for, 214
- Presentation of pieces of plate to the Counsel engaged in the Scriveners' Case, 99, 100, 101, 102
- Prisoners being Solicitors not to act, 65
- Private Bills, time for presenting Petitions, 214
- Privilege, Writs of, sued out by the Solicitors in the Scriveners' case, 38, 40, 43, 50, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 66, 70, 73, 76, 87
- Writ of, Shorthand notes of the arguments taken by Mr. Thomas Cooke, 85, 87
- Probate or administration to be taken out to cover not only the testator's estate but any property of which he may be trustee, 209
- Procedendo applied for in the Scriveners' case, 38, 40, 43
- Profession, matters relating to the honour of to be considered by the Committee, 5
- Prolocutors of the Society, 31, 97, 113, 127
- Proof, more easy, of acknowledgment of fines, 15
- Protection by Ministers of foreign Courts of their servants, 23, 25
- Quorum of Committee to consist of five members, 5
- Recorder of London, trial of Scriveners' case before, with jury of non-free-men, 97
- Recoveries and fines, 74, 75
- Recovery of small debts, Bill for, 8, 10
- Refusal of James Farrer to act as Steward, 158
- Registration of Solicitors in the Court of Common Pleas and King's Bench, 116, 117, 119
- Regulation of Attorneys and Solicitors, laws relating thereto, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 315, 319
- of Solicitors' fees, in Chancery, bill in Parliament for, 197, 198
- as to the presentation of petitions for private bills, 226
- of Scriveners by Act of the Common Council, xxxi
- of trials at nisi prius, 2, 4
- Relief, application for, by Thomas Searle, 193, 196
- applicaton for Thomas White, 321
- proposal to establish fund, 205
- Replication, certificate of, refused by one of the six clerks, 42, 45

- Restoration of members of the Society discharged to act as witnesses in the Scriveners' case, 99
- Retainers of Counsel in Marine Insurance cases, ix, 28, 29, 31, 32, 312
- Robbery on the highway, Solicitor convicted of, and sentenced to death for, 77, 83
- Roll, application to strike a Solicitor off in consequence of irregular admission, dropped on account of lapse of time, 22
- Landon Jones struck off, after being sentenced to the pillory, 19, 20, 22
- of Solicitors, application to strike off the names of John Greenwood and John Sliper, 80, 81, 84
- Application to strike off the name of William Wreathock, 77, 78, 82, 83
- of attorneys in the Court of Common Pleas and King's Bench, 116, 117, 119, 131, 134, 305, 306, 308
- Rota of members of the Committee, 173
- Rule of Court as to acknowledgment of fines, 15
- Rules, Clerk of, 160, 161
- in ejectment, 155
- of debate, 136
- Scriveners, Act for regulating introduction of, xxxi
- and Notaries only prepared deeds in the year 1657, xiii
- action against Fotherby Baker, 60, 61, 63, 66
- action against John Smith, 97, 98
- attempt to alter the Bye-laws of the City of London, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56
- Scriveners' case, action against Mr. Alexander, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 50, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 66, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 81, 85, 87, 88, 91
- case, further actions against Solicitors, 57, 60, 88, 89, 91, 93, 94, 95
- case, action in the Mayor's Court against Solicitors, 93, 94
- case, Commission of Errors to be tried before the Judge's delegate at the Guildhall, 80, 81
- case, taxation of costs of, 98, 106, 107, 109, 110
- case decided in favour of solicitors, 98
- case, discharge of members of the Society to be called as witnesses in, 96, 99
- case, extra subscriptions from members to meet costs of, 58, 66, 87, 94
- Scriveners' case, Counsel waive their fees, 48, 76
- case, gratuity to shorthand writer in, 106
- case, judgment of respondeas ouster on demurrer, 80, 93
- case, restoration of members of the Society discharged to act as witnesses, 99
- case, presentation of plate to Counsel in, 99, 100, 101, 102
- case, Counsel employed in, 40, 43, 54, 56
- case, thanks to Counsel in, 40, 60, 64, 74, 76, 98
- case, thanks to Mr. Mason, solicitor, in, 98
- case, thanks to witnesses, 98
- case, thanks to shorthand writer, 98
- case, report of trial of before Recorder and jury of non-freemen, December 11, 1760, 97, 246—286
- Company and the Law Society, xii—lxx
- Company, application for new Bye-laws as to Freedom of the City of London, 45, 46, 48
- Company, attempt to compel City Solicitors to become members of, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47
- Company, bill for regulating, passed by the Common Council, 50, 51, 52
- Company, History of, xii
- Seal Office, alteration of hours at, 116, 117, 118, 119, 326
- Searle, Thomas, application of, for pecuniary assistance, 193, 196
- Secretaries to the Law Society, 18, 71, 158, 162, 164, 184, 230
- Secretary's Bill of Craveings, 119, 122
- Service, actual and menial, to be rendered by articulated clerks, 29, 33
- Sham or hired bail to be prevented, 67
- Shorthand writer in Scriveners' case, gratuity to, 106
- writer in Scriveners' case, thanks to, 98
- notes of the arguments on the hearing of the Writ of Privilege in the Scriveners' case taken by Mr. Thomas Cooke, 85, 87
- Simpson, Robert, complaint against, 129, 132, 134, 306
- Six clerks, refusal of one to sign a certificate of replication, 42, 45
- fees for copies of pleadings, 42
- Sliper, John, application to strike his name off the Roll of Solicitors, 80, 81, 84
- Small debts recovery Bill, 8, 9, 10
- Smith, John, and the Scriveners' Company, xvi, 97, 98

- Society, account of the funds of, 238
 — fund for the promotion of the general good and service of, 11, 12
 — list of members of the, 1770—1780, 233, 340
 — members called upon to contribute towards paying the debts of the Society, 122, 136, 157, 241, 242, 243, 244
 — of articulated clerks for discussing legal questions, 201, 204, 206, 207
 — restoration of members discharged to act as witnesses in the Scriveners' case, 99
 Solicitor sentenced to death for highway robbery, 83
 — complaint against, no name being given, 5. The complainant was ordered to attend before the Committee with the person complained of, 5
 Solicitors and Attorneys, admission of, 8, 157
 — and their agents, town addresses of, 28
 — allowing broken-down tradesmen and other loose and disorderly persons to practise in their names, xi, 30, 33, 34
 — returns of persons admitted, 22
 — admission of Clerks in Court as, and allowing them to take articulated clerks, 9, 13, 14, 16, 34, 35, 295, 299, 323, 324
 — advertising, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215
 — malpractices discountenanced by the Society, 1
 — as militiamen, 123, 124
 — attempt to get them qualified to act as Commissioners under the Land Tax Act, 6, 7
 — call of, to the Bar, lxxiii, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113
 — censured by a barrister, lxxv, 114
 — complaint against James Hodgson not proceeded with on account of lapse of time, 20, 21, 22
 — college for, 311
 — costs in Common Law, memorial to the Lord Chief Justice to increase, 203, 210, 211, 225, 227, 228
 — laws regulating, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 315, 319
 — fees of, based on immemorial custom, lxxix, lxxxiii, 163
 — oaths on admission, 48, 288
 — preparation of deeds by, xiii, xiv, 273—277
 — reasons against increase of, 35, 300, 323
 — surreptitious admission of unqualified persons as, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 80, 120, 121, 129, 130, 147, 148, 149, 166, 169, 177, 179, 181, 214, 226, 227, 289, 329
 Solicitors' fees, application for an increase of, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxx, lxxxii, lxxxiii, lxxxiv, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 175, 176, 178, 180, 184, 186, 192, 194, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205
 — business conducted by Barristers and conveyancers, 101, 103, 104, 173, 174, 180, 183, 184
 — barristers seeing clients without their intervention, 173, 174, 180, 184
 — Bill for regulating, 197, 198
 — committed to the Fleet for contempt of Court, 78
 — Friendly hints to, book by Mr. Felton, a barrister, 48, 61, 62, 63
 — fund for relief of decayed members of the profession, 205
 — who had not taken out their certificates in time, application to Parliament for indemnity, 190, 191, 327
 — Jewish, oath on admission of, 288
 — not to act as such while prisoners, 65
 — number of, to be checked, 35
 — practising without a certificate, fined £50, 287
 — registration of, in the Court of Common Pleas and King's Bench, 116, 117, 119
 — retainers of Counsel in marine insurance cases, ix, 28, 29, 31, 32, 312
 — work of, done by Barristers, 101, 103, 104, 173, 174, 180, 183, 184
 — retainer by, of Counsel, ix
 — Writ of Privilege in the Scriveners' case argued, 76
 Sparry, William, supposed surreptitious admission of, as a solicitor, 23, 25
 — John, application to strike his name off the Roll, 64
 Speaker of the House of Commons to be attended at 9 a.m., with regard to Land Tax Bill, 7
 Stamps, Irish, purchase of, in England, 138, 232
 — on transfers of Mortgages, 209
 — as an item in costs of litigation, 212
 Standing toasts at dinners to be "Lord Erskine for his services in connection with the increase of solicitors' fees," lxxxii, 203, 205
 Statutes, Cambridge, by Danby Pickering, purchase of, 103, 121

- Stewards from 1759 to 1772, 231
 Steward, refusal of James Farrer to act as, 158
 Striking off the Roll the names of Solicitors, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25
 — application against Daniel Alexander, 51, 56
 — application against Landon Jones, 19, 20, 22
 — application against John Greenwood and John Sliper, 80, 81, 84
 — Sparry's case, 64
 — application against William Wreathocke, 82, 85
 Subscriptions in arrear, collection of, 94, 105, 137, 139, 140
 — payable by members, 136, 151, 152, 162, 213, 228, 240
 Suitors, matters for the benefit of, to be considered by the Committee, 5
 Summoning juries, 2, 3
 Taxation of costs, 67, 144
 — in Scriveners' case, 106, 107, 109, 110
 — of Writ of Error, 67, 75
 Table, Dinner, plans of, 347, 350
 Taking Bail, mode of, 120, 121
 Term fees, 144
 Thanks to Counsel and others engaged in the Scriveners' case, 40, 50, 60, 64, 74, 76, 85, 87, 98
 Tickets for the dinners of the Society, v, 18, 19, 110, 113, 157
 — fac-simile of, xcix
 — members refusing to take, struck off the List, 171
 Time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills, 214, 215, 226
 Times, Lawrence, complaint against, 129, 130, 131
 Toast, standing, at the Societies to be, "Lord Erskine for his services in connection with the increase of Solicitors' fees," 205
 Town agents and Solicitors, addresses of, 28
 Tradesmen, broken, and loose and disorderly persons acting as Attorneys and Solicitors, xi, 30, 33, 34, 35, 37, 302
 Transfer of the Society's dinner tickets not allowed, 18, 19
 Transfers of mortgages, stamps on, 209
 Transportation of a Solicitor for highway robbery, 83
 Trevanian, Mr., of Cheltenham, thanks to, with regard to rule as to acknowledgment of fines, 15
 Trial of the Scriveners' case, December 11, 1760, 97, 246
 Trials at Nisi Prius, Bill for regulating, 2, 3
 Trustee deceased, probate or administration had to be taken out to cover not only his own estate, but also any property of which he may be trustee, 209
 Turnkey of gaol, his articles of clerkship cancelled, 306
 Uncertificated Solicitor practising, fined £50, 287
 Unqualified persons, admission of, as Solicitors, 11, 17, 19, 80, 120, 121, 289, 293
 — acting as Attorneys and Solicitors, xi, 30, 33, 34, 35, 37, 302
 — determination of the Society to apply to the Judges, and if necessary to Parliament, to prevent their admission, 80
 — acting as conveyancers, 180
 Vexatious arrests, 25, 26
 Volunteer corps, plan for, 189
 Wagers or bets between members of the Society, xcvi, 194
 Whishaw, Mr., appointed Secretary, 18
 White, Thomas, application for relief of, 321
 Winch's reports, xiii
 Witnesses in the Scriveners' case, discharge of members of the Society to be called as, 96
 — restoration of members discharged, 99
 — thanks to, 98
 Work of Solicitors conducted by Barristers and conveyancers, 101, 104, 173, 174, 180, 182, 183
 Wreathocke, application to strike his name off the Roll, 77, 78, 82, 83
 — William, committed to the Fleet for contempt of Court, 78
 — William, sentenced to death for highway robbery, 82, 85
 Writers of Court Letter, xii
 Writ of privilege in the Scriveners' case, 38, 40, 43, 48, 50, 57, 60, 61, 63, 66, 70, 73, 75, 85, 87
 — shorthand notes of the arguments taken by Mr. Thomas Cooke, 85, 87
 — in the Scriveners' case disallowed, 87
 — of error, bail on, 67, 68
 — taxation of costs of, 67, 75
 Writs, hours of attendance for sealing, 116, 117, 118, 119
 — of error, issued to delay execution, 68
 — of error, practice as to, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147



AF ALG PKr
The records of the Society of
Stanford Law Library



3 6105 044 101 355

