

question whether it should be called the Department of Commerce or the Faculty of Commerce does not affect this principle, which is upheld by maintaining intercourse between the students of both Commerce and Arts, and by laying down courses which both should take in common.

I am of opinion that it ought to be made easy for students in Commerce to proceed to a degree in Arts, particularly when so many of our students afterwards become interested in Law, and the Quebec Bar refuses to recognize for their purposes our Commerce degree. It may be interesting to note that Dean Lee, when he was at the head of the Faculty of Law, was very desirous of establishing reciprocal studies between that Faculty and our School. I have no doubt that if Dean Lee had remained with us, this measure would have been carried into effect to the great benefit of our students as far as Law studies were concerned.

Another development of our post-graduate work might be in the direction of Technology. Two or three years ago Dr. Eve and other members of the Science Faculties criticised our School because it had made no advance in this direction. I was in a position to point out that the responsibility did not lie with the School of Commerce. It may now again be thought that Technology should figure among our graduate studies, and bearing this in mind, I suggested Dr. Johnson as one of the members of the committee you suggest.

In conclusion, I would recall that the McGill School of Commerce has met with great success, that it has been imitated in other Universities in Canada, and for the simple reason that it is nearly always inadvisable and dangerous to meddle with something that has achieved success, we should proceed with the utmost caution in adopting any changes that may be proposed.

I do not think it would be wise to speculate now as to what still further changes time might call for in the development of the School.