

The real question is what can a university really do for the education of the lawyer? For my <sup>own</sup> part while, I believe, that Court Procedure, for example, may be made just as interesting and just as educative as any other subject. I do not believe that a university Law School can teach the student to practice. On the last analysis practice must be learned by practice. The most that the university can do is to so teach and train the student that he may reasonably expect to begin to practice as soon as possible with marked distinction and success, provided always he possesses the necessary powers of assiduity and application. I am not referring now in any way to the old hackneyed, stupid distinction between training and instruction. Both are necessary and abundant opportunity for independent study and reflection is much more important than either. In any case, no proud profession can possibly afford to overlook the claims of sound and finished scholarship, and the chief duty of a university is, I should say, to see that these claims are handsomely recognized. In any case, so far as the work on the Common Law side at McGill is concerned, it is absurd to suppose that we can teach the student all the details of local statute law and procedure in the numerous jurisdictions from which they enrol and in which they expect to practice in the future. Their home schools cannot do that. The only real point is that the home school is in a little better position to pretend to do so than McGill. The best that we can do for these students, then, is to offer them a sound, comprehensive, thorough, scholarly course preparatory to the further study and practice of law at home. How easily this can be done, even with our present meagre equipment, I shall show later on.

I have always held that the law student should have two years of full-time office practice before coming up for admission or call, and I am inclined to think that the profession will agree with me in this almost unanimously. I do not think either that the university summer vacation is worth haggling over. Whether these two years are put in consecutively or not, or whether they are taken before or after a full-time three years study course in the University Law School, is a matter of indifference, be they two full years of honest, diligent, responsible, preliminary practice. That, it seems to me, is the only way in which we can recognize the the obviously sound claims of those who believe in practical training. But two years of office practice puts a compulsory degree in arts completely out of court. Four years in Arts, three years in Law, and two years of office practice, nine years in all - the way is too long. The whole course is too miscellaneous and scatter-brained. No other profession calls for so long a period of desultory miscellaneous work. Something must be done to forshorten and intensify. What is needed is not so much more arts education, as more sound, comprehensive advanced education in the law itself. After all, this sorry screed composed of high and noble ideas, let me now offer my practical suggestions. These suggestions are the following:-

1. That the group of departments which I have described as public service studies of distinctly Canadian interest and importance, viz: Canadian, British and Imperial History, Economics,