

to modify the scheme of the Joint Committee so as to include the suggested changes, their respective Universities would come in under the arrangement, stated their inability to pledge their Universities to such a course.

4. The Committee further report that they are informed by the Secretary that he did as directed by Convocation, transmit to every County Law Association a copy of the report of the Joint Committee, and of the resolution of Convocation of the seventeenth of February last, with a request that the same be brought to the notice of the members of the Association, and that in response he has received the appended communication from the Law Association of Frontenac, but no other.

5. The Committee do not deem it necessary to make any further suggestions. All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) CHARLES MOSS, *Chairman*.

March 29, 1888.

APPENDIX.

COMMUNICATION FROM QUEEN'S COLLEGE.

Queen's University, Kingston, Canada, March 10th, 1888.

J. H. Esten, Esq., *Secretary, Law Society of Upper Canada* :

SIR,—I received yours of the 22nd ult., enclosing report on the establishment of a Law Faculty under the joint management of the Law Society and the University of Toronto, and requesting me as Principal of Queen's College and University to make suggestions on the report.

Permit me to observe : First, that having looked over the scheme proposed, I find that nothing is said regarding the object to be gained by the innovation, and that nothing is said regarding the nature or extent of the examinations which candidates must pass. For example, the Preliminary Examination may mean the present Junior Matriculation, or Senior Matriculation, or it may mean something less than the Junior or more than the Senior. It is, therefore, difficult to offer criticisms. I would respectfully ask for more light. Secondly, as the terms of the proposal are to form the basis of an alliance between the Law Society and any University in Ontario, I submit, that if such alliance be thought desirable, the basis be considered by a joint committee, representing the Law Society and the Universities. To such joint committee Queen's would doubtless send a representative. The action of the Society in sending me the report for suggestions indicates that this is its view.

So much *in limine*. Coming to the merits of the question, I would simply ask: (1) Is it wise to shorten the time now required from candidates for the profession of law? The great mass of candidates will always prefer a short course, no matter how bad it may be. If a man can get a University Degree and the Degree of Barrister-at-Law, and admission as a Solicitor in four years, how many will take the present course of seven years? Can a man be as well prepared for any profession in four years as in seven? (2) Why should the Law Society and any University aim at a concurrent Academic and Professional course? The Law Society can best assist a University by requiring university standing from candidates, or by giving the present or even more encouragement to take the Degree of B.A. A University can best assist the Law Society by giving the most complete culture to those who intend to be candidates for the legal profession. Let each do its utmost to make improvements in its own department.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) GEORGE M. GRANT, *Principal*.