

The Bar has informed us that it would probably require that time be allowed in the day for attendance at offices. We shall escape the effect of this if we are allowed to retain the mode of preparation consisting of three years university work plus one year in an office. If we were to set up a four-year curriculum on a plan similar to that contemplated by the French universities, we should be driven back to the position of a part-time school dealing with students whose attention would be divided between the university and the offices. We should have to contend again with all the evils which our reform of 1925-26 was designed to eliminate. It may be recalled that that change was made with the hearty approval of some of the most eminent practising lawyers in Montreal, who were convinced that the old system had made a farce of office attendance, and was seriously handicapping the University. Students had come to the office with insufficient preparation to be of any real use, they had consequently got little work of any instructional value, and had fallen into the habit of neglecting the office. At the University, on the other hand, they had used office attendance as a pretext for escaping any work beyond that of listening to lectures. There were, of course, exceptions, but common practice was as I have described. Rather than go back to that position, which was that of <sup>a</sup>mere teaching subsidiary to the Bar Association, I feel bound to say in all seriousness that the