eld

ith

181

ng

ed

that the present system of Legal Education in Ontario is inadequate and far behind the systems prevailing in other countries and narticularly in many of the United States. A very enthusiastic interest in this matter was shewn by men of different shades of oninion on the subject in the course of a somewhat lengthy discussion which took place. One of the recommendations contained in the report of the Legal Education Committee presented by Mr. Maclennan, convener, was that the time has come when the teaching in the Law School should be done by Professors who will give their main attention to the Law Lectures and the examinations of students, and who shall not engage in general practice. In the discussion of this proposition the financial question naturally became involved and it was pointed out on the one hand that for the year 1920 the receipts from the Law School, according to a financial report which is on record, were something in excess of \$136,000, while the expenditures upon the Law School were something less than \$34,000, shewing an apparent surplus for one year of \$84,000. It was also pointed out on the other hand that the School had for many years before the War been carried on at a loss, but at the outbreak of the War an accumulated fund from the Law School of \$110,000 was available on which to draw for the purposes of re-organizing the School on a more up-todate basis, and while it was the feeling of the Association that the financial aspect was one which would require careful investigation and consideration, the principle enunciated in the above recommendation of the Committee was, on motion duly seconded, approved by the Association.

Other matters discussed under the heading of Legal Education were the revision of the curriculum and the adoption of a uniform curriculum to be used by all the Common-Law Provinces, and provision for post-graduate courses. This recommendation was also approved. Another phase was the question of the attendance at the Law School and service in an office, and a good deal of discussion took place as to whether it was not preferable that the period of attendance at lectures should precede instead of follow, as it now does, the period of service in a law office.

The attendance of the members of the profession at these meetings was not all that could have been desired. The lack in this respect was but a fresh instance of the difficulties which those who seek to serve the interests of the Association in office have ever experienced in inspiring that degree of interest and response on the part of the members as a whole which, even on a selfish, if not any higher basis, might reasonably be expected.