

one of the main features of the scheme is to reduce the time of study required before one can enter the (once-learned) profession of the law from seven years, (as now demanded of those who desire a liberal education, and so go to a university first), or five years (as now required of those who only wish to know "the three R's." and law), to four years, or rather to two university years, and two years of grace, about thirty-six months in all.

We think the aim of all who have the welfare of the profession at heart should be to lengthen the time of study, and to increase the amount of knowledge required for admission into the ranks of practitioners; so vast is the field of legal knowledge, that a graduate trained to study can scarcely become acquainted with it in his three years' course, while the youth, fresh from the high school, who gives five years to it feels, when he looks at the "final" examination papers, how precious little he knows of the subjects.

Then, too, it is proposed "to swap horses" in crossing the narrow stream of four years; and half the time the student is to be fed by the *Alma mater* of Toronto, and half the time by the Law Society. We are told that infants fed upon milks from different cows are apt to have their digestive organs injured.

The scheme submitted is very meagre (the only thing perfectly clear is the "fees," these are touchingly alluded to in five of the eighteen paragraphs of the report). There is to be a "preliminary examination," under the authority of the University, but what the subjects are to be is not said. The University is to give instruction in jurisprudence, having regard to court law, constitutional law and history, and international law. Is it to teach these and nothing more to the aspirant for LL.B.? Or, are the classics, and the philosophies, and theologies, so essential to a liberal education, to be also taught? How many doses a week of court law and international law is an infant student to take each week? Then, again, on what are the lectures of the Law Society to hold forth during the third and fourth years? Without information on these, and divers other points, how can any County Law Association pronounce definitely on the scheme proposed unless, indeed, the members can, Cuvier-like, construct the whole of an antediluvian monster whenever they are presented with a big toe.

We think, on general principles, that it is bad to try and lessen the numbers of those who are willing to take a course in arts before they study law, by holding out to them this easily won LL.B. We think, too, that the Law Society is old enough to stand alone, and rich enough to pay all professors and teachers it may need to instruct its youthful members; we deprecate the idea of its forming any alliance with any other teaching body, and we say that it should not lower its dignity by becoming the mere handmaid of Toronto University. If, however, the Benchers are getting old and weary of their duties, common justice demands that the same rights and privileges should be given to the other universities as are proposed to be bestowed upon Toronto University, and that the last clause of the report should be "The Law Society *shall*, upon similar terms, enter into this scheme with any University in Ontario that may desire it."

BARRISTER.