

persons who took an interest in law to do the same. He strongly condemned the system of cramming. The one good thing about cramming was that it cultivated a habit of close attention, without which a man would not be good for much in the legal profession. To master his subject the student must get hold of general principles, and he could not do this by cramming. He would be the last person to say that a man could become a lawyer by attending lectures. One might as well say that a man could become a shoemaker by studying the anatomy of the foot. The principles expounded in the lectures must be applied in the offices of legal practitioners. Unless they combined the two things they could not expect to make headway in their profession. It was said that the law was 'going down,' that it was not what it used to be, and that it was hardly worth entering upon. He believed that was an entire mistake. There never was a time when so much was done to render the law free from technicality and to make good sense and reason and love of truth prevail. Technicality after technicality was being brushed away with a rapidity only known to those who closely observed the process. If one went into a court of law and listened to an argument he would seldom find himself bewildered now by technicalities. What he would see was a desire first of all to get at the facts, and then to apply the law. Subtleties were laughed at now that would have been listened to twenty-five years ago. What was the ground for saying that the law as a profession was not what it used to be? So far as he knew, it was that owing to recent changes it was found that a great deal of work which used to be done by rising barristers could now be done by solicitors' clerks. The public, he thought, were entitled to the benefit of this discovery. But apart from this he saw no sign whatever that the law was in any sense going down. On the contrary, he saw signs everywhere that it was becoming a nobler and nobler profession; and it could not fail to progress in that direction so long as there was a desire to discredit technicalities and pursue truth and justice, come what might. He wished to give the young men he saw before him the benefit of a long experience not only as regards their studies but as regards their conduct in life. First of all he would say, let them throw their whole soul into their profession. A man who did not do that was not worthy of it. To succeed in the law a man must make it part of his religion. He did not know of any instance where a man who had done that had failed. Another thing was that they should never do anything when they were angry. If they wrote a letter when they were angry it would probably recoil on their own heads. If at the bar they lost their temper, they not only disarmed themselves, but put a double-edged sword in the hands of their opponents. They must never advise a client till they had a full knowledge of the material facts in the case, and they ought never to advise an appeal the day they were beaten. He regarded the study of the law as part of a liberal education, whether the student meant to go in for the law as a profession or not. Every young man ought to know something of the laws of the country in which he lived. And the more democratic the country became the more essential was this. In particular he recommended the study of the history of the country since the Reform Bill of 1832, since which time England had become more and more democratic."