

of a stenographer,—I mean no disrespect to the stenographer.

Yet all these factors taken together, scarcely tell the whole story. A surprisingly large percentage of the pre-Law-School men were University graduates, or college trained men. They made up for the absence of the Law School by academic training and study that first fitted them to pursue their legal studies logically and thoroughly, and to begin at the sources of things and trace the growth and application of this principle and that, and so acquire a broad groundwork of learning on which to build the work of all the years that followed. It must have taken great qualities of perseverance, steady application and vision to become a lawyer in those days. Then came the law school. It must have appeared at the first as a sort of competitor of the University, as an Institution that would dispense with the practical necessity of a University career to become a lawyer. At any rate, today, a vast percentage of students enrolled at Osgoode Hall have never seen a University except from the outside. No one would pretend that the two years' clerkship which they serve in a law office under modern conditions is equivalent in value to the contribution of a University career. And yet this period of service, plus attendance at lectures for roughly twenty-two hundred hours scattered through a period of three years, and a partial reading of which is prescribed during these lectures, is supposed to change a boy fresh from High School (the entrance standard has very recently is that in the limited time at their disposal, the lecturers must of necessity centre the interest largely on what is strictly and actually present-day law, and give the historical features rather meagre treatment. This, it is submitted, contributes to the superficial spirit of the age, already referred to. And in the eight years since the writer left the law school, the task of the lecturer must have become more and more difficult, for that period has witnessed voluminous legislation on a multitude of subjects which did not trouble us much in 1913, and there seems to be still more to follow.

If there is any moral to be drawn, it is, firstly, that the method of teaching law should be what Professor McKay of McGill University recently described as directing the students to "the sources",—a method doubtless involving more time than the present method of topical treatment according to various