

The Legal News.

VOL. IV. FEBRUARY 26, 1881. No. 9.

HINTS FOR STUDENTS.

The inaugural address delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay at the opening of the Law Faculty of Lennoxville University (noticed in the Legal News, p. 346 of Vol. 3), has been issued in pamphlet form, from the press of the Gazette Printing Company, and will no doubt be of interest to students in general as well as to those for whom it was more immediately intended. After a graceful allusion to the founder of the University, the late Bishop Mountain, the learned judge proceeded to offer some practical suggestions to students about to enter upon a course of legal study. They were reminded of the importance of wise selection among the enormous number of books published, in order that their reading may be profitable. On this head Judge Ramsay related his own experience:—

"In my days of studentship, over thirty years ago, there was no regular teaching. Anything we learned was picked up by the practice we saw in an office and the books we chanced to read. I was dismayed at the endless rows of dingy books, then rarely enlivened by the gay morocco backs of the *nouveau droit*. I had, however, the advantage of being the pupil of the present learned Chief Justice of the Superior Court, and to him I applied for advice as to what I should read. He told me of "Pothier's Obligations." From the moment I opened it, the dread of the dryness of law disappeared as by enchantment, and starting from one word rolled forth a perfectly clear explanation of the whole scheme of legal rights and liabilities."

In addition to the works of Pothier, Judge Ramsay advised that attention should be given to the Roman law, and proceeded to urge upon students the necessity of cultivating a good style of pleading, oral as well as written. "Don't leave it to chance, whether the judge shall understand you or not, but so put your case that whatever difficulties may beset him in coming to a conclusion, he can have none as to what your pretensions are."

The learned judge combated the pretension that a lawyer must be satisfied of the innocence of his client before he gives him professional aid.

"It is a result of experience that the administration of justice must be carried on upon exact principles, consequently with great technicality. To do this, skilled persons, to represent the parties, are required. The advocate, therefore, becomes a part of the organization for the discovery of truth, and if he were to take upon himself to refuse his assistance to the accused, because he believed him to be guilty, he would be depriving him of the protection the law accords, without authority. For the chance of doing what he thought was substantial justice in a particular case, he would aid in the destruction of a useful system. It is not, however, to be supposed that the lawyer is justified in every act that might perchance be beneficial to his client. He must not transgress the limits of truth. While he may fairly put on facts proved the interpretation most favorable to his client, honor forbids him to misstate."

In conclusion the speaker urged his hearers who were about to enter on the study of the law, not to lose an instant of the valuable time at their disposal, but from the first diligently to turn to account the great advantages now offered to them.

THE SUPREME COURT.

At a meeting of the bar of the Montreal section on the 18th instant, Mr. Girouard's bill, referred to in our last issue, found only 24 supporters in a total vote of 66. The discussion placed the weak features of the proposed enactment in a strong light. Perhaps if the promoter of the bill had been present, he might have adduced some reason more weighty than anything that was advanced in favor of the limitation of jurisdiction; but the feeling of the majority of the profession is evidently to preserve the Supreme Court, to extend its usefulness, and promote its efficiency, rather than to abolish the tribunal, or restrict its jurisdiction.

This is in accordance with the view which we ventured to express nearly a year ago (page 145 of vol. 3), and it is unnecessary to occupy space with the subject at present. There is no complaint from the Maritime Provinces or the North West. Quebec, which perhaps derives less immediate advantage from the Supreme Court than any other Province, has pronounced, through its most influential body, in favor of the tribunal, and Ontario, we are confident, will be no less reluctant to see it interfered with.