

it hard enough to read the work required for call in five years, will not be able to read that and the work required for LL.B. in four years. Graduates in arts, in rapidly increasing numbers, read both for call and LL.B. in three years now, and that, too, without help or guidance in their reading, and they all allege that they do not study nearly so hard as they did in their arts course. Any student of fair ability can easily pass his first intermediate examination with six weeks' reading. That has been done time and again, and the other examinations, though more difficult, are often disposed of creditably in less than double that time. The average law student reads little, except when an examination is near at hand, most of his five years is consumed in putting in his time under articles. Moreover, if it be the intention that the standard for matriculation into the proposed law faculty shall be so low that the average sixteen year old boy fresh from school can enter, then failure is indelibly stamped on the whole scheme from the outset. To make any such course beneficial, the matriculation examination must be at least as high as the senior matriculation or first year examination in arts. It is indispensable that the preliminary training received by the student before entering upon the course for LL.B. should be as thorough as possible. To overlook this would be to put a premium on ignorance.

The most formidable objection is one which, if real and insuperable, must be fatal. It is urged that few will care to take an arts course extending over four years, and then an LL.B. course requiring as much longer, when two of the main objects, admission to practice and the possession of a degree, can be obtained in four years. Any change sure to diminish the number of those who graduate in arts before commencing the study of law, is a change in the wrong direction, and will find no advocates. The desirability of obtaining the knowledge, the habits of study, the skill in making new acquisitions, and the strength and maturity of mind to be derived from such a course of study is universally conceded. The point at issue then is, does the new scheme tend to deter men from taking an arts course? and, if so, is that tendency so inherent in the warp and woof of the measure that it cannot be removed without the destruction of the whole fabric? It is well to observe that at present the arts man must spend seven years in study, as against the five spent in the more ordinary way. Yet the number of those taking the arts course as a preliminary is increasing. If two years longer do not deter him from so doing, must it of necessity follow that three will? But then it is urged he will take merely the LL.B. course, and so save four years. If the matriculation standard for the LL.B. course is put, as it ought to be, at least as high as the first year examination in arts, then the difference is still but three years. The benefits of the arts training are as great as ever, the number of those attending lectures in arts will undergo no diminution; really the great majority of such students do not decide until graduation is at hand what their future profession is to be. The question comes to be, then, whether the young graduate of a university, influenced by the certainty of obtaining assistance in his legal studies similar to that of which he was able to avail himself in his arts course, and with the further incentive of another degree at the end of the curriculum, will not be willing to spend an additional year in study for the sake of the