ronto on 27th June. 1894, and, at the request of Mr. Ritchie, consideration had been deferred. Ordered that Mr. Ritchie be written to and Mr. McDonald asked to account for the causes which led to the withdrawal of the complaint, and also to state in detail what has transpired since the matter came before Convocation on 27th June. 1894. The letter of Mr. Gordon Waldron. of 22nd March, relating to the complaint of Mr. D. D. Reid and Marion Reid, his wife, against Mr. John M. Godfrey, having been read, the report made by the Discipline Committee having been adopted by Convocation on the 18th February, 1898, and six members of the Discipline Committee now being present, it was with their concurrence ordered that the letter of `. Waldron be referred to the Discipline Committee for report.

The report of the Legal Education Committee of Nov. 16, 1897, as to Honours at the Law School and compulsory attendance at lectures, which Convocation had ordered to be taken into consideration this day, and of which special notice that the report would be then considered, was then taken into

consideration. The report is as follows :--

The Principal reports to the Committee on the subject of Honours in the At present, those who compete for Honours read only the same work as pass students, but are required to write at a second examination upon the same work. The Principal thinks that there should be some further differentiation between Honour and Pass men in this year at all events. He suggests two methods: (1) Requiring extra or substituted subjects for Honour men. (2) Requiring from Honour men an essay or thesis upon some legal subject. The Principal favours for the present the latter of these methods, apparently because, without a rearrangement of the School course, the former would add an undue burden to that now borne by Third 'ear men, and because in his view such rearrangen. A is not practicable while attendance at the School during the first year is left an optional matter. He points out very forcibly that the student who has not been well grounded in the work of the first year is not only himself insufficiently equipped for the second and third years' work, but operates as a drag upon the whole class and during the whole The lecturers are not able to be as progressive as they might otherwise be the ground work neglected during the first war has to be made good during the second and third years, and subjects scread over three years that might well be disposed of in two, leaving for the Third Year extra subjects now left untouched, or substantial improvement and advance in some direction.

Your Committee invites the attention of Convocation to the whole subject. It reports in favour of a differentiation of he our from pass men in the third year at least. It prefers the scheme of extra or substituted subjects to that of an essay or thesis if such a rearrangement of the course can be made as to render the former scheme practicable. It appears to the Committee that it will be difficult if not impossible to effect such rearrangement if the Principal's advice with regard to attendance during the first year is not accepted. Your Committee thinks, however, that if such an important change is to be made it should originate with Convocation, especially in view of the careful discussion the subject received when Convocation adopted the policy

which it is now suggested should be changed.

The Procipal's letter to the Chairman of the Legal Education Committee accompanies this report, viz.:

FORONTO, 18th Sept., 1807.

DEAR SIR,-- I desire to submit for the consideration of your Committee

the following matters in connection with the School . --

1. Honours in Third Year. These are at present gained merely by answering additional questions in the different subjects; the books read by Pass and Honour men are the same. As a practical matter it is often difficult to decide what questions are the hardest, and it is not infrequent to find that he Honour papers are considered by the men to be easier than the Pass; this