

laws directing the mode of practice in the District Courts of said State; provided, the judge may alter the times limited or allowed for different proceedings in the State Courts, and make by rule such other provisions, to adapt the said laws of procedure to the organization of the United States Courts, and to avoid discrepancy between such State laws and the laws of the United States.

The object of this act has been almost completely nullified by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

That court was compelled to admit, that the terms "civil causes," used in the process act of 1824, would include cases at law or in equity, but it held, that the acts of Congress in the general legislation of the country, have always distinguished between remedies at common law and in equity; and to effectuate the purpose of the Legislature, the remedies in the courts of the United States are to be at common law or in equity, not according to the practice of the State Courts, but according to the principles of common law and equity, as distinguished and defined in that country from which we derive our knowledge of those principles; and since there are no courts of equity cases, the federal courts in the State are bound to proceed according to the principles and usages of courts of equity, and the rules prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Louisiana had not then, and has never had, a representative of her legal system on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States. This decision, which was not given without a vigorous protest from Mr. Justice McLean, renders it absolutely necessary for a Louisiana lawyer, who desires to practice in the Federal courts, to study the common law in order to ascertain what is a common law case and what is a case in equity. When he finds out that his case is one in equity, he must become familiar with chancery practice in order to prosecute it with success. 13 Pet. 368 and 406; 9 Pet. 656; 12 Pet. 339; 15 Pet. 14; 12 Pet. 474.

If his case is a common law case, he can adopt the Louisiana practice of pleading, but he must be careful in the trial of the case, to resort to the common law method of proceeding, for the Supreme Court has held:

1st. That if the record contains the evidence, but no bills of exceptions, and nothing raising any point of law, distinct from the evidence, the Supreme Court cannot revise the judgment on writ of error. 2 How. 362.