

which the Law Society will dovetail into the university curriculum for the four years' students. As he will continue to pay the same fees as hitherto, this is, I think, a most unfair treatment of a class of students, from which the records of the past show that it is at least as advisable as from any other to draft the future lawyer.

3. The period which will be spent under articles is ridiculously short. Those of us who have been articled for a term of three years know how difficult it was to gain in that time an insight into the practice of the profession, and no one has ever heard even a five years' man assert that he had learnt more than was requisite to conduct a solicitor's business, with some degree of confidence in his own skill. Will a two years' dabbling by a schoolboy of sixteen in the depths of international law and Roman jurisprudence open a royal road to the imbibing of this knowledge in two brief years?

4. The question should, perhaps, be looked at solely from the students' point of view, and it may not be a proper subject for consideration, that the solicitor can no longer expect to derive from his articled clerk the assistance which he now enjoys from a student in his third, fourth, or fifth year. At the same time, we must bear in mind that the advantage is a mutual one, and the student who can floor his principal on the "Institutes," but render him no assistance in "the running of a suit," will not have the chance of deriving from his seniors those practical lessons which are so much more thoroughly taught and so much more easily learned by participation with a skilled practitioner in his actual work.

5. What I have said in regard to the short space allotted to acquiring a knowledge of practice, applies with still greater force to the study of the subjects, a knowledge of which should be acquired by a barrister before call. I do not understand that it is, nor do I well see how it could be, proposed to lessen the number of those subjects. If then the most diligent application to study for five, or in the case of more matured and trained intellects, for three years, barely suffices to acquire a knowledge of the elementary doctrines of law and equity, the learning of real property and the principles of evidence, as set out in the numerous text-books on the curriculum of the Law Society, is there any reason for hoping that this knowledge will be more thoroughly mastered in the short period of two years? or can we expect that the student who finds it hard enough to read the work required for call in five years will be able to read both that and the work required for a degree of LL.B. in four years?

6. Then, too, is not the natural order of study completely reversed by the proposed scheme? Can a boy of sixteen, fresh from school, intelligently pursue a course of reading in civil law, constitutional law and history, and international law, without some of the elementary training, which it is proposed to postpone until the last two years of his course? It seems very much like requiring mathematical students to devote their first year to the calculus, and their third to algebra.

7. Then after all, what is gained by inducing the students to crowd into a four-year cram what should be the subjects of double that period of matured intelligent study? By the rules of the Society (s. 5, ss. 10), a person can be