

## LAW STUDENTS' DEPARTMENT.

test, however, of the value of oral instruction to a law student would be to supply lectures, the attendance at which should be purely voluntary, and the benefits from which should not consist in prizes or the shortening of the period of service, but merely in the assistance in their studies which the students felt themselves to be receiving. If the time could be better spent in reading, or if the pleasures of other engagements outweighed the benefit received, then the lectures would be delivered to empty benches. If, on the other hand, they were found to be useful, the advantage would probably be a sufficient incentive to the expenditure of the time and effort necessary to a large attendance.

This test has been supplied during the present winter by The Osgoode Literary and Legal Society. A course of lectures was arranged and proceeded with for some time without the promise or expectation of any rewards other than advancement in legal education. The result was an attendance far beyond the capacity of the examination room at Osgoode Hall. Even standing room was, on some occasions, not to be found; and late comers found themselves sometimes unable even to get near enough the door to hear what was being said. The Law Society afterwards very properly proposed that if the Literary Society under certain regulations would at the close of the Session hold examinations, a sum of \$100 would be spent in providing prizes for the successful competitors. This proposition was accepted, but the fact remains that without this inducement the attendance was large and enthusiastic. If the students are the best judges in this matter, and their decision is such as has been indicated, further argument is unnecessary.

Then as to the other objection. Is there no fund for the foundation and support of some system of legal education? Nearly one half of the revenue of the Law Society is derived from fees paid by the law students. If the Law Society requires these fees for its other purposes, perhaps this fact would be without significance. But when it is known that the revenue of the Law Society is beyond its power of disbursement, it is a fact which forms a complete answer to this second objection.

Are there any other objections? It has been said that there is a jealousy of Toronto. This is not an objection, and would not be urged as

such, no matter how actively it might assert itself in forming opposition to any scheme which might be proposed.

It has also been said that the Ontario Bar has produced many men, accomplished and able, without any such scheme. This is no answer to what has been said. The statement must go further to be of any value, and show with what additional expenditure of time and labor these men reached their positions, and how many have failed to reach eminence because of the lack of such aids to legal attainment.

Are there any other objections? We know of none. Shall we then see some system introduced, or must the matter be left to the Osgoode Literary and Legal Society to cope with as best it can? We trust the former alternative will prevail, and commend the matter to the Ontario Government and the Law Society.

We understand that the name of W. White, in the list of gentlemen called to the Bar last term, should in order of merit have appeared immediately after that of P. Mulhern.

---

### FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

---

There are several ways of stating one's disagreement with the views of another. The following strikes us as peculiarly neat. It appears that a certain "Col." Tom Buford murdered Judge Elliott of Kentucky. The *Albany Law Journal* says: "It seems that the Colonel was insane. He is probably now enjoying a lucid interval which will last during the remainder of his useless and accursed life unless interrupted by more seasons of debauchery and bad temper, and a fresh grudge against somebody who may offend him."

---

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

---

A. G. M. — It was not contended in *Robins v. Clarke et al.* that the chattel mortgage was within the statute, in fact it could not be. This case therefore could be no authority in *Nisbet v. Cook* on the point you refer to.

J. and R. — We are indebted to you for two cases of interest which will appear in due course. We agree with you that one is right, but much doubt as to the other.