

schools. I fully concur in the following observations of the committee. Their soundness will not be questioned, I think, by any one who hears me :—

“The mind of the lawyer is the essential part of the machinery of justice; no progress or reform can be made until the lawyers are ready. Their influence at the bar, on the bench, and in legislation is practically omnipotent.”

The following observation seems to me to be specially weighty and important :—

“The progress of the law means the progress of the lawyer, not of a few talented men who are on the outposts of legal thought, but the great army of the commonplace who contribute the majority of every occupation. What the lawyers do not understand or what they pronounce visionary or impracticable will not be accepted by the legislatures or courts of the country.”

It is no part of my purpose to offer any views upon the methods of law instruction, much less upon the different or competing methods. Doubtless the method of teaching law or how it can best be taught is an important subject, but it is not all-important. It is wise to discuss and consider it, but it would not be wise to let it engross our whole or even chief attention. What Pope said of forms of government may, I think, be said with much more justness of methods of teaching—“that which is best administered is best.” The man whom nature designed to be a teacher of law will, despite all theories, teach it after his own manner. He will impress his own personality upon his work. It is the man, not the method, that tells. The crucial test is whether the teacher can inspire a living interest in the student and get from him the best work that in him lies; for, after all, the student must himself do the work and the thinking which shall accomplish him in the learning and mystery of his profession. Vastly more important, therefore, than the methods of teaching is the course of instruction or the branches to be taught. This general subject is very fully and, I need not say, ably discussed in the report of the committee on Legal Education, of this association, submitted in 1892. After reviewing the course of instruction in the law schools of this country (and it is substantially the same in all of them), the committee says :—

“It is evident that the course of study, with a very few exceptions, is confined to the branches of practical private law which