

COPY.

September 5th, 1924.

The Principal,
McGill University,
Montreal.

Dear Mr. Principal:-

I am receiving some enquiries concerning the provision for common law teaching in this Faculty, and it is not easy to reply to them, since there appears to be a direct conflict between the policy of the University as declared in the report adopted by Corporation and the policy as expressed in the new Announcement of the Law Faculty. In the report presented to Corporation last April the following passage occurs:

"The members of the Faculty wish to add to this, however, that while recognising that this recommendation will render it unnecessary to have a professor devoting his whole time to Common Law teaching, they, nevertheless, deem it desirable that at least one member of the full-time staff should be a recognized specialist trained in English Law competent to give instruction in some of the subjects common to both systems and especially in comparative law, and who would also be available to offer instruction in distinctively common law subjects to such students as may from time to time desire it".

On the other hand the Announcement (p.10) unequivocally states that the Faculty only professes itself able to teach common law "in so far as it is in force in Quebec" which is the most explicit declaration of pure provincialism that we have ever permitted ourselves to make. It is furthermore significant that the references to national aims which formerly appeared have been - whether by accident or design I know not - omitted from the current issue.

It seems to me to be of considerable importance that the policy of the University in this matter should be defined in a manner consistent with the claims and traditions of McGill, and I am therefore venturing to ask for your guidance in replying to these inquiries.