

where they be assigned by us. (6) And the same Power of admitting Attorneys we prohibit and deny to the Clerks and Servants of the said Barons and Justices; (7) and do ordain, that if the Attorneys be admitted hereafter by any of the Persons aforesaid, their Admission shall be of none effect. (8) Reserved alway to the Chancellor for the time being his Authority in admitting Attorneys, according to whose Discretion they shall be admitted; (9) and to our Chief Justices, as heretofore hath been observed in the Admission of Attorneys. (10) We will also that this our Ordinance shall take effect and begin at the *Utas* of the Trinity next ensuing. Given at our Parliament at *Carlisle* the fifteenth Year of our Reign.

Who may allow attorneys in every Court: Rast. 96.

**161** \*Lord Coke, in 4th Inst. 76, speaking of the vulgar objection of the multiplication of suits in the common law Courts at Westminster more than in former times, assigns as one of the particular reasons therefor the multitude of attorneys. But he adds that the number of them are set down, and that they ought to be learned and virtuous, and says he, "as I understand, the judges have at this time this matter in consideration." With us there is of course no limitation as to their number. And their admission and qualifications are regulated by the Code, Art. 11.<sup>1</sup> "In former times there were frequent disputes in the province between the two houses respecting the power of the proprietor or governor of appointing or removing attorneys. In 1708 the lower house sent the following message 'This house are very sorry the honorable council should hearken to the cunning subtle insinuations of any designing person and not look into the Statutes empowering Courts to admit Attorneys, 15 Edw. 2, ch. 1, and 4 Hen. 4, ch. 18, and many others, which will inform them the Courts have the only power.' In the Act of 1715, ch. 48, the power was acknowledged

<sup>1</sup> Code 1911, Art. 10 (as now amended).

Admission to the bar is regulated in the main by the Act of 1898, ch. 139, (secs. 3, 5 and 6 of said article), which created a state board of law examiners, to which all applications for admission are referred.

The Court of Appeals held that women were not entitled to be admitted under this Act. *In re Maddox*, 93 Md. 727. But this privilege was given them by the Act of 1902, ch. 399, (sec. 4 of said article).

The right to practice law is not a natural inherent right but depends upon and may constitutionally be regulated by statute. The limitation of the privilege to white male citizens, as was formerly the case in Maryland, is not repugnant to the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The power of regulating the admission of attorneys in the courts of a state belongs to the State, not the Federal Government. *In re Taylor*, 48 Md. 28; *In re Maddox*, *supra*.