

## GRADUATES IN LAW.

At the last meeting of the Benchers of the Law Society, the following motion was introduced by Hon. Mr. Crooks:—

'Any person having successfully passed the examination now prescribed for the degree of bachelor of laws in the University of Toronto, by its present or any future curriculum, with equivalent requirements, and having obtained such degree, and having also successfully passed an examination before this Society, in the subjects of the statute law, and the practice and pleadings of the courts, and in criminal law, may be called to the bar, or admitted as an attorney or solicitor, upon payment of the usual fees; in the case of a barrister, after four years from his admission as a student of this Society, and in the case of an attorney or solicitor, after having duly served under articles of clerkship for the term of four years, which period may have elapsed either before or concurrently with the passing of said examination for such degree. This rule shall not affect any other provisions of the rules of the Society with respect to graduates.'

Further consideration of the motion was deferred till the meeting which is to be held next month, in order that Benchers might fully consider it.

But in the meantime *Queen's College Journal* is very indignant over the matter, and amongst other things, says:

'We believe this proposition in its one-sided and partial application met with but little favor, though it appeared as if, were the privilege extended to all Universities in Ontario, a similar notice thus changed might carry. \* \* \* We hope the friends of those Universities that have the misfortune to be public benefactors without drawing perforce from the public purse, will render the non-passing of the motion as originally put a certainty.'

But will the *Journal* pardon us for suggesting:— That all Universities in Ontario have not faculties in law and do not hold regular examinations for the degree of bachelor of laws. The calendar of Queen's university, for instance, shows that that institution has neither curriculum nor examinations in law, and that the whole number of graduates on whom the degree of LL.B. has been conferred is *five*, and these all in one year (1863) and probably under abnormal circumstances.

That those Universities that have the misfortune to be public benefactors without drawing perforce from the public purse, were not asked to put themselves in that unfortunate position, and they are at liberty to withdraw from it whenever they may see fit to do so.

That those Universities that have the misfortune &c., had better first settle whether they hold examinations in law, and whether such examinations, if held, are of a character to satisfy the Law Society, before they render the non-passing of the motion a certainty.'

## NOMS DE PLUME, Etc.

TO THE EDITOR.—As an occasional reader of your columns I would beg to ask you the meaning of the last two pages of your issue of 10th January. As it fills the most important half of your paper, I presume that it is an advertisement. Now, I waded carefully through all the article, painfully on my guard lest it should prove an advertising catch, and that the whole thing should turn out to have reference merely to Treble's perfect fitting shirts, or Pearce's purgative pills. But no, among the obscure allusions and fantastic jumble

of names and phrases, I could find nothing tangible until I arrived at the large 'P,' placed conspicuously at the bottom of it. Now, who is, or what is 'P'? Is it some new and strange article, which for the next month will greet us upon fences and gate posts and in the columns of the WHITE AND BLUE, until, when the public mind is maddened with curiosity and suspense, it will at last, like *Kaoko* or *Vegetine*, make known its virtues? Or is it true, as a friend suggests, that this nightmare vision has emanated from the diseased mind of some freshman, and that you inserted it to show the abnormal mental condition produced by Milligan's plum dodgers, combined with Residence cocktails? This, no doubt, is the true explanation. It is a strange, but not pleasant study. I never before witnessed such a mass of undigested scraps and half masticated jokes, as has been evolved by the literary retchings of this misguided youth. In quantity and variety it surpasses even the contents of the great Fitzpayne Manly's celebrated sausage machine. You have, indeed, given us a phenomenon, but I would advise you, Mr. Editor, not to allow your columns to be again inundated by the Niagara torrent of this 'P.' In the future kindly give us notice of any indications of 'intellectual secretions,' or other gastric disturbance in this unfortunate fleshy.

A READER.

## COLLEGE EXAMINATIONS.

Allow me, to place before the readers of this paper, a grievance which has been borne by the students of University College, I suppose, since its foundation. It is as follows:— In the examinations in classics the matter for translation is not printed and consequently copies of the text have to be handed round to each candidate. I will now merely state my own experience during the past examinations. After waiting for about 10 minutes an immense book which covered more than half the desk, was handed to me and I was told that it would be taken away in half an hour. There was on the paper a piece to translate two pieces to scan, a dozen words to parse and derive, and some construction to explain—all to be done in half an hour. I set to work and got to the end of the first piece of scansion when the book was taken away and I was told that I would get it back again. I got it back for five minutes only, and when I did I forgot to do the scansion which I had left out, and several other parts, the consequences of which I expect will be that my name will be where it shouldn't when the returns come in. I am however quite confident that if the piece of translation had been on the paper, as it should have been, that I could have got through the exams. I am sorry to have to give such a detailed account but I think this matter can not be too forcibly impressed on any one, even the College Council itself. I would like if any person could tell me why they do not manage their examinations on the same principle as the University. I think that if it is a matter of dollars and cents that the men in this department would most gladly get up a subscription to pay the difference of printing. I must again apologise to readers on account of the length of this letter, but still I hope it will receive attention.

REFORM.

## A THREE YEAR COURSE IN ARTS.

All connected with Toronto University are fully aware of the fact that the real curriculum course in arts is four years. At the same time it must be admitted that this period can be reduced to three under certain conditions; yet those adopting the three year course will ever be a small minority as things now exist. It may be asked, since a three year course is within the reach of the students, why do they not avail themselves of the privilege if this be a real advantage? In the first place I shall endeavor to answer this question, and then show that a change to the shorter course would be to the interest of all concerned.

The reasons why so few adopt the three year system are nearly these: (1) The great majority of the high schools and collegiate institutes train almost entirely with a view to sending their pupils up as candidates to Toronto University; and the popular entrance examination at present is the junior, and so they make a speciality of it, being that in which they are most likely to gain a reputation for skill in teaching. (2) From this cause senior matriculation classes are not so carefully and thoroughly prepared. In fact, few of our high schools make a speciality of the higher examination.

(3) Under these conditions a man wishing to enter at the senior matriculation must either content himself with a less efficient preparatory training or study under private guidance, or be self-taught.

In spite of these hindrances, there seems to be a growing feeling in favor of the shorter course; and that this is true, is manifested by the number who enter at the end of the first year, even under the unpromising circumstances just alluded to.

Now, glance for a moment at the British universities, and most will be found to demand only a three year course: Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow and London.

Apart, however, from any desire to be like others, it appears to me that were the first year's work of the curriculum delegated to the high schools and institutes, it would tend greatly to raise the tone of our much boasted Ontario education, both as regards the high schools and institutes and University College. The following reasons might be given in favour of the change:

1. It would raise the standard of the high schools and institutes, by giving them more advanced work to do; and would act as an incentive to the various school boards to increase and improve their accommodation and teaching appliances.
2. It would improve the position of the teachers by making their duties more important and dignified.
3. It would improve general high school education throughout the country, by affording an opportunity of gaining some familiarity with first year work without being required to attend college.
4. It would improve the status of University college in at least two ways. (1) by separating the ground on which the professors are expected to lecture entirely from, and raising it above the more preliminary seats of learning; and (2) by freeing the professors from one year's lectures, they would be enabled to divide their time and attention among the three remaining years, greatly to the advantage of the latter.

F.