

University would be better advised to abandon legal teaching. If the final result of the present Bar proposal is to require a uniform four-year course of the old type, with concurrent office attendance, then the University might well say to the Bar--"You are asking us to assume a task and a position which we do not consider compatible with the true purpose and spirit of a university. We cannot accept, even though our refusal would mean handing over legal instruction entirely to the French universities or any other agency which the Bar might employ."

Personally, I feel that the best course for the University to take if the Bill goes through is to maintain its three-year curriculum. Our students would then continue to receive their B.C.L. degrees at the end of three years, but they would have to work for a year in a law office before taking their Bar examination. If the Bar adds further lectures to the approved University course, we should try, if the increase were not too great, to absorb them in the present programme. If this would mean clogging the system with lectures, we might have to add a few to be taken while the student is attending the office. We should thus still have three years during which our curriculum could be based on full-time University work. The addition of a few lectures in a fourth year, if it should become necessary, might be treated as a mere accommodation enabling students to satisfy Bar requirements.

*Respectfully submitted,*

*P. E. Coakley 5/11/30*