

University of Michigan Law School

University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

Articles

Faculty Scholarship

1918

Admission to the Bar

Edwin C. Goddard

University of Michigan Law School

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles/1122>

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Goddard, Edwin C. "Admission to the Bar." Mich. L. Rev. 16 (1918): 217–31.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW

VOL. XVI.

FEBRUARY, 1918

No. 4.

ADMISSION TO THE BAR

THIS article is written in the belief that the hour is here when some changes in admissions to the bar should be urged and urged again, when some things often thought and discussed in certain assemblies should be openly and frankly talked over with the profession at large.

"Learn to do by doing" is a principle that in our country has been honored in the observance in the legal more than in any other learned profession. The farmer, the mechanic and the lawyer were supposed to be in a class in this regard. The farmer was usually born to the business, and if crops suffered while he was learning the damage was small and impersonal. The mechanic could be apprenticed and gradually work into his business. Sometimes this was possible for the lawyer, but more often he practiced on his clients and they paid for his blunders while he was learning how. So from Patrick Henry and John Marshall to Abraham Lincoln and men still living who are eminent at the bar, we have a long line of distinguished lawyers who never attended a law school. Indeed until recent years there were few law schools to attend, and the number of students in them was almost negligible. Beside these men of ability and distinction of whom we hear so much the system produced also a greater number of pettifoggers who never learned their business and who did much to bring into disrepute the profession to which they had been inadvisedly admitted. They had to live, and they earned their living by such devices as they could, large numbers fortunately drifting into other lines of employment, but many also resorting to dishonorable and even criminal practices from which the public has suffered much, the reputation of the profession even more.

Between the above extremes was the great body of the profession, some broad, able and successful, others narrow, technical and bungling, even when well intentioned, a menace to the administration of

justice between man and man, and especially to such a development of procedure in the courts as is calculated to secure justice to the suitor instead of conformity to technical rules and forms. The people took no interest in the training of the lawyer to whom were intrusted the dearest interests of life and property. If they paid any attention they were inclined to prefer to give everyone a chance, as though the right to practice law was one of the fundamental rights of man, subject to no restriction for the protection of society.

Time was when the practice of medicine was largely a trade. It has often been assumed that the people were unwilling to permit the untrained healer to practice on their lives and so enacted the present stringent laws compelling the doctor to prepare for his work by a long and exacting professional training. The fact is that the people had little to do with lifting the practice of medicine to a profession. The laws effecting this change have been enacted mainly in response to agitation by the profession itself, doctors, more than others, realizing the need of thorough training before license to practice on human health and lives. Today in most states the applicant for a license to be a doctor, dentist, or pharmacist, is required by law to have thorough preliminary training in the schools. There is not yet a single state that requires such training of the would-be-lawyers. And yet nearly every state now requires a preliminary examination for admission to the bar, and has a board of bar examiners who give reasonably severe examinations in writing. Some boards grade these examinations on a fair standard, many set their standard to the level of the poorly prepared applicants for admission, a few have pushed standards as high as present conditions justify.

Just as the great advance in training required before an applicant can be examined for admission to the medical profession has been due, not to the people at large, but to the interest and activity of the profession itself, so whatever advances have been made in requirements for legal training have been due to agitation by members of the bar, especially through the various associations including the American Bar Association and notably through the efforts of the Boards of Examiners for admission to the bar. This is no doubt due to the fact that the lawyer, and especially the law examiner, more clearly than other men, sees how much of the just criticism of bench and bar is due to the presence in the profession of so many ill equipped men who are allowed by law to offer their legal services to the public. Their questionable, dishonorable, and even criminal, practices have lowered the whole tone and ethics of the profession, and

their narrow vision and training in the mechanics of the practice have too often made the trial of a cause a sparring in legal hair-splitting and technicalities, instead of a real trial of the rights of the parties. In this sort of sword play, practice in handling the rules of evidence and procedure seems more effective in securing results than a thorough knowledge of the law. But the inevitable tendency of such a contest is to give preference to the shadow over the substance of justice and to award victory to him whose fine sense of honor will not embarrass his use, fair or foul, of any weapon in his legal armory. That this is only a tendency, and that the courts can, but not always do, thwart such attempts to defeat justice, in no way lessens the need of measures to keep out of the profession men who must rely on such methods for success.

In taking measures to end this our profession has lagged far behind the medical, and this notwithstanding the fact that the legislatures that must prescribe the remedies are made up largely of lawyers who should be alive to the need. This has perhaps been one reason why we have lagged, for many of the legislators have been lawyers who were never students in a law school, and naturally they might be expected not to show zeal to change the conditions under which they came to the bar. It seemed like branding with inferiority their own credentials. In view of the number of our present bar, many of them eminent in the profession, who were never enrolled in a law school, but who see clearly on this matter it may well be wondered that we have made such progress as we have. Some still protest and point to Lincoln as one who would have been barred from admission under present rules. The answer to this is simple. Lincoln would not have been barred. He would gladly have embraced such opportunities, as are now in easy reach, but then did not exist, to gain equipment which it required him years of practice and many failures to acquire. It is not too much to suppose that he would have been a much greater lawyer than he was. If neither side of such question can be proved, it is still true that scores and hundreds of men similarly circumstanced are today in our law schools, to their own advantage and still more to the advantage of the profession and the public, and it is still true that not a single state of this Union requires legal training in the schools as a preliminary to the bar examination. Fortunately, the requirements at the examinations are already such in some of the states that nearly all candidates are driven to resort to the law schools for their preliminary training.

Little time need be spent in urging that every man coming to the bar should have at least three years of training in the law school.

That is very generally admitted as an academic question. It has been approved as a positive requirement in the Standard Rules for Admission to the Bar, proposed by the committee and approved by the Section of Legal Education of the American Bar Association. It was emphatically indorsed by the Committee on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar in its report to the Saratoga meeting of the American Bar Association last September. In discussions on the subject it seems to be no longer seriously disputed that our statutes should require this, so that as matter of discussion it may be assumed the case is made for denying examinations to candidates who have not had such training. And yet in practices not a single state makes such a requirement. This seems to be due in large part to a good natured indifference, on the part of the profession at large, to the whole question. The old idea that everybody had a right to take a try at practicing law, and the public might be trusted to do the examining, is still abroad. This is shown by reports of bar examiners in our oldest states of ten, fifteen, twenty failures on the part of the same candidate to pass the bar examinations! Such cases pass for jokes and there seems to be no thought of protecting the public from such unfit candidates by refusing them re-examinations. Why should a man who by two, or at most three, examinations has shown his unfitness to become a lawyer, be given further opportunity by his importunity to appeal to the sympathy, and wear on the patience of bar examiners to see if, like the unjust judge of scripture, they may not give him his admission for his much asking? It is something that some examiners have refused to yield, even after twenty attempts, but the discouraging feature is that there should be such an easy tolerance toward trifling with a matter of such importance to the public. The writer knows, and doubtless every reader knows, men permitted on the roll of attorneys, who have no knowledge of the law, but who have a certain skill before juries and in dealing with witnesses that enables them to win causes on prejudice and emotion. They usually are engaged largely in cases with a criminal tinge, and not infrequently one such man is able to degrade justice and bring the profession into disrepute in a whole circuit. The public, knowing little of the reasons for this apparent success, take their causes to him because they think he will win their case, and they charge up the many known miscarriages of justice to the whole legal profession.

Perhaps the most discouraging feature of the movement to raise to a high level the ability and fitness of the bar is the apparent indifference of the bench. If there has been any considerable interest

in the training of the lawyer manifested by the bench it has not received wide notice. Judges are awake to the need of trained doctors, and already the books have a good supply of cases in which the courts have firmly upheld laws passed to make sure that men shall not be admitted to the medical profession without adequate preparation. In one leading case¹ Mr. Justice FIELD, in upholding a law governing qualifications for admission to the medical profession, said:—"Few professions require more careful preparation by one who seeks to enter it than that of medicine * * * * * The physician must be able to detect readily the presence of disease, and prescribe appropriate remedies for its removal. Everyone may have occasion to consult him, but comparatively few can judge of the qualifications of learning and skill which he possesses. Reliance must be placed upon the assurance given by his license, issued by an authority competent to judge in that respect, that he possesses the requisite qualifications. Due consideration, therefore, for the protection of society may well induce the state to exclude from practice those who have not such a license, or who are found upon examination not to be fully qualified." Substitute the "practice of the law," and the "lawyer," for the "practice of medicine," and the "physician," and the language of Justice FIELD is equally apt.

There are a few, very few, cases in the books as to qualifications for admission to the bar. What may well pass for an early case in this field, *Matter of Cooper*,² 1860, is of some interest. The Dean of Columbia College Law School, Theodore W. Dwight, filed an interesting historical brief, in the course of which he refers to Smith's History of New York, as authority for the statement that the colonial governors of New York, who for a time at least appointed all attorneys, usually took advice from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but, alas, the governor seems to have "licensed all applicants, how indifferently soever recommended." These governors have had their counterpart in courts in more recent years. In that case there seems to have been complaint that Columbia College required a certain definite period of study and a formal examination. This, God save the mark, was claimed to be unconstitutional! For the constitution of New York at that time provided that "Any male citizen of the age of 21 years, of good moral character, and who possesses the requisite qualifications of learning and ability, shall be entitled to admission to practice in all the courts of this state." This mentioned no definite period of study. Judge SELDEN, in approving the Colum-

¹ *Dent v. W. Virginia*, 129 U. S. 114.

² 22 N. Y. 67.

bia way, thought this fully equivalent, as a test of legal acquirement, to the ordinary examination by the court. And he points out that if the act of the legislature admitting Columbia students should have abridged in the slightest degree the right to be admitted if properly qualified, however short may have been their period of study, it would be clearly invalid. If one may believe the many stories current as to the sort of examination given in open court when admissions to the bar came by that route, it requires no stretch of the imagination to agree with Judge SELDEN that study at Columbia for a definite period was fully equivalent as a test. And his feeling that any abridgment, however slight, of the right to be admitted, if properly qualified, was unconstitutional may have been due in part to an extreme reluctance still much in evidence and scarcely to be found in connection with any other calling requiring skill, to put any hindrance, however slight, in the way of anyone who wishes to try his hand at the practice of the law. An earlier New York case, *In re Pratt*,⁸ is interesting in this connection. An examining committee of three had been appointed to examine and report upon the qualifications for admission to practice, as attorneys and counsellors of the Supreme Court, of Pratt and several others. In reporting in favor of admitting Pratt only, the committee felt that such an extraordinary proceeding as rejecting the others called for a written report. This so impressed the court that each of the justices of the sixth district requested the committee to forward the report to the reporter for publication in HOWARD'S PRACTICE REPORTS. The report reads: "The duties of an examiner in such cases, at all times delicate and responsible, become painful when, in their discharge, they are required to declare that candidates who have applied for admission are not qualified." In the opinion of the committee "the examination prescribed should be full, complete and thorough, and applicants be rigidly admitted" or else the public should be advised that the courts are no longer responsible for the qualifications or integrity of those who are entrusted with their process, and practice as attorneys and advocates." The report insists that it is a delusive idea that the modern system of practice can be acquired without study, or mastered without training. There must be not only knowledge of the modern but an understanding of the old system, and this cannot be acquired by a few months casual and superficial reading. Indeed as a prerequisite there must be a well grounded English education, and a mind well stored with general knowledge and information, followed by a course of pro-

⁸ 13 How. Pr. 1.

fessional reading with system, patience and perseverance. The committee are not unmindful or ignorant of the labor thus imposed upon the candidate for legal honors, but they deem it as well due to the applicant as to the public, however great the difficulties may be for those who without pecuniary means are struggling to procure an education and admission to the bar. They endorse Sir Edward Coke's statement that "the study is abstruse and difficult, the occasion sudden, the practice dangerous." The report concludes: "An attorney at law stands in a most interesting and responsible relation to society, and has no apology for ignorance. The last and dearest interests of individuals in every walk of life are daily confided to his keeping. The life, the liberty, character and material interests of clients depend constantly upon his integrity and skill. His license is evidence that the courts regard him as competent to discharge his duties by reason of approved integrity and learning, and the generous confidence which society has at all times extended to the profession demands that those only possessing these qualifications should, under any circumstances, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this court." We may note with satisfaction that the court approved this report of the committee and the sentiments therein contained.

This extended notice of a case arising before the Law School of the University of Michigan was established, when indeed there were not more than two or three law schools worthy the name, and very few students in them, is here introduced not merely because this committee so many years ago, so clearly set forth the state of the case, but also because they suggest one reason why their principles are even now acted upon effectively in only a few of our states. It is that general feeling in the profession even on the part of those who realize the serious consequences, of painful reluctance to refuse admission to any and every one who wants to practice law.

Those examiners, in the almost complete absence of law schools, wanted to insist upon a fixed and extended time of clerkship in a law office, which would furnish evidence of at least abundant opportunity for attaining the requisite qualifications. Are we not in position now, after sixty years of progress, with convenient access in every part of the country to too many, rather than too few, law schools, to insist by law that every candidate for admission to the bar shall have taken an extended and thorough training in a law school? If there were now the same opportunity as formerly for all candidates to secure a clerkship in a law office of the right sort, and if such clerkship were something more than the office of messenger

boy, much might be said for adding at least a year of apprenticeship. But whatever be the prescribed training this much should be plain, that no sympathy for a struggling lawyer, no sentiment of friendship or good will, above all no busy indifference, should prevent each member of the profession from taking a lively interest in protecting the profession and the public from the bungling incompetence of ill equipped practitioners. The supply should be cut off at the source. Lawyers above all others should never forget that the so-called right in this free country of every man, however humble his origin, to opportunity for self development and earning a livelihood is always strictly subordinate to the higher right of society to protect itself. Sympathy and good will may be more wisely and virtuously shown by providing, to the utmost, opportunities for the needed training, but it is sadly misplaced in weakly turning loose on society one who has had no adequate preparation for the service for which he purposes to charge the cost of his living. This should be beyond all lands the country in which every man, rich or poor, favored or self-dependent, has the freest and fullest opportunity to get ready for what he wants to do in life, and then there will be not more reason, but less why the unready man should not be licensed to appeal to the public for business he is not prepared to care for. Bench and bar can perform a great service by a vigorous insistence upon this principle as governing admission to the bar. With our law schools on every hand and in reach of all, the man who will not get adequate training, or whom God never intended to handle legal problems, should find the door of admission firmly closed in his face and its guardians should not need to apologize for their firmness. The duty to reject in such a case should not be delicate or painful. It is better for the candidate himself. Knowing he cannot enter he will not be content with inadequate preparation, and if he was never intended for a lawyer he will turn to some other calling in which a useful life may be awaiting him. With all due respect for the ability and undoubted success of many a practicing lawyer who was not ready when he began practice, the writer submits that even these would have had larger possibilities with adequate preparation, and their clients, particularly the early ones, would have profited thereby. In these days what possible excuse remains for failure to take the opportunities so freely offered in every part of the country to prepare first?

The excuse for this long insistence on what might seem self-evident truths is found in the very general slackness or indifference of bench and bar, except in a very few of our states. The zeal of our

medical brethren may well be copied. It is perhaps needless to add that it is not pretended that before actual experience in practice any one can be fully prepared. Neither the law schools nor any other training can furnish complete equipment. The impossible is not sought. The best training leaves enough to be acquired. Years of practice even leaves the ablest lawyer still imperfect, still in process of preparation for his life work. The point urged is that now we have reached a condition where the least that should be offered before one looks for clients is a thorough course of study in a good law school, and *the statutes should absolutely require so much from this time forth*. The next sessions of the legislatures should be besought to do this much to make law, like medicine, a learned profession.

The next inquiry is what should this prerequisite law school training be? It is the purpose in this paper to discuss this from but a single view-point. When admission to the bar was as of course, upon little or much cursory reading, the man who had read law in an office under a capable attorney who had given close attention to the reading had a real advantage. Office study might then have been commended as relatively better than the average training. Correspondence schools, with fully worked out lines of study under careful direction, marked a further step of progress. They may still profitably be used by one who wants some Chautauqua information on the law. But the day for office study or correspondence courses as preparation for a life work as a lawyer is gone, and this seems to be very generally assumed as needing no argument.

When most men came to the bar examinations by self-help, or office study, or correspondence courses, even a two year law school was a big advance, and the so-called night schools, in which busy practitioners and bright, but impecunious, young lawyers shared the work of giving instruction to a band of earnest, mature students at the close of a day they had spent earning their living, no doubt in their turn served a very useful purpose in materially raising the standards of admission to the bar. Their graduates were so much fitter than candidates who had read alone or in offices that only a few of the latter could stand the competition, and now in most states few try the examinations without first having some work in some sort of a law school. Thus the casualties of competition have quite largely driven men to the law schools before any statute has made such a requirement. The fine spirit of service with which many a busy and successful practitioner has practically given his time in order to assist the struggling neophyte is beyond all praise. Incidentally the night school in some of our great centres of population

has become so popular that the proprietor has found it a gold mine, and therein lies a danger. It is not always easy to see past the handsome profits of the proprietary school to the best interests of the profession, especially when one sees the undoubted spirit of earnestness and, considering the working conditions, the results of such instruction. The faculties of these schools are usually men of influence and it is difficult to secure any legislation to which they are opposed. If the problem at this point is to be wisely dealt with such men must have broad vision and unselfish devotion to what may appear to be the best interests of the profession and of society, whose welfare is so closely bound up with the character and ability of the bar. In the upward move the night school has rendered beneficent service. It has many advantages to commend it. Bluntly and frankly let us consider whether preparation secured in this way should be deemed adequate as preparation for admission to the twentieth century American bar.

At the outset it may be stated that this is no question of study by daylight or by mazda lamp. It may be admitted by way of demurrer that if the students were to sleep eight hours by day there is no reason in the nature of things why a night school might not offer the same advantages as does the so-called day school to him who sleeps by night. It is not the kind of light that is involved, but the amount of it that is devoted to the study of law. Moreover the so-called day classes that meet from four to six in the afternoon in some of these schools are not to be distinguished from the night classes meeting from seven to nine. The real question is shall the student devote all his working hours for three school years to the study of law, or shall he devote the usual working hours to earning a living, and study law as an avocation after hours, for three or even four years. The question is not entirely simple. The undoubted seriousness of purpose of men, who, after working all day will give their nights systematically to hard study, counts. A pamphlet has been published by the officers of one large non-proprietary law school to prove that its night students do better work than its day students. If this be correct, as these officers have convinced themselves it is, the limits of this paper do not permit an examination of the possible reasons therefor, or the deductions to be made therefrom. On the general question of night schools this much will here be assumed. Whatever advantage may inure to students from contact with men actively engaged in the practice, and doubtless after a certain period of legal study has been passed this may be very great, the best law schools of the country have all found that their instructors could not reach the required efficiency in the class room

and continue the usual professional life of the active practitioner. In faculties where both classes are represented the instructor giving his whole time to teaching has gradually but surely displaced the active practitioner. The latter has been unable to stand the competition and has had to choose whether he would give up practice and devote himself to teaching or the reverse. The few apparent exceptions to this rule have not been enough to affect the result, and are in most cases apparent and not real exceptions. The successful practice of the law requires substantially the full time and energy of the ablest men. The successful teaching of the law is a full man's job, and it is now so different in kind from the work of the practice that it is difficult, if not impossible, for the same man satisfactorily to do both at the same time. Either he must cleave to the one and give up the other, or he must leave the one and devote himself to the other. Often the successful practitioner does not possess teaching ability, and there are very successful law teachers who were indifferent or poor lawyers. On this there is perhaps no general rule. It is no doubt a great advantage to a law teacher to have had successful practice for at least, possibly also at most, a few years, but first of all he must be able to teach. Not every lawyer of good natural teaching ability can after many years of practice successfully change his work and adapt himself to teaching. Some of the best teachers in the law schools have had little or no practice.

The importance of all this in this connection is that nearly all teaching in night schools is done by men whose main energies are devoted to the practice. Teaching is an aside. They have neither the time nor strength to do for the work of teaching what they would do if they were to give up their practice and give themselves wholly to the scholarly and pedagogical sides of the law. Neither do they give to instruction in any subject of the law anything like the number of recitation hours given in our best law schools. Unless, then, the faculties of most of our night schools be admitted to be vastly superior to the faculties of our best law schools, day schools let us call them for lack of a better term, the night school is at a great disadvantage on the instructional side.

On the student side the disadvantage is not less. It should hardly need argument to prove that students well prepared for the work can and will accomplish far more efficient results when they devote full time and energies to law study and live in a legal atmosphere than when they do a full day's work before taking up study. The study requirements of our best schools are so exacting that they call for the full working time of strong students. It would be physical-

ly impossible for students of equal strength to do a day's work and then cover these requirements. Moreover while there are many well prepared students who enter certain night law schools, yet the great majority of students enrolled in night schools are far less fully trained, though many of them have a maturity that has its value. If it be claimed that this experience and maturity more than off-set the fuller intellectual preparation of students in other schools, the answer is that in the school with which the writer has long been connected, careful observation for many years shows that when these mature students of experience, to a limited extent and in exceptional cases, are admitted as special students, only a minority are able to compete with the average student who has fully met entrance requirements.

If experience proves that the preparation for the law is much more adequate in schools requiring the full time of its students, the question resolves itself to this: Is the three or four years study in our night schools any longer adequate as preparation for admission to the bar? Or the question might be: Are three years of undivided devotion to the study of the law too much to require before admission to the bar? The answer is clear. So great has been the development of the subjects of the law that already our schools are beginning to consider requiring four years of study. In the three years now required in all law schools no student can study all, even of the important subjects. To cover all the courses being offered at Michigan would require six years of study and nobody claims the work in any course is too extensive or too thorough. No law schools any longer expect to teach every branch of the law, or all the law in any subject, but it is now very generally admitted that three years of nine months each in which the student devotes his full time to law study, is too short rather than too long a period of preparation. The student who devotes less than full time needs more than three years, more than the four years now offered in some of the night schools. Have the night schools then, played their part, and should they be forthwith compelled by statute to require of their students full time or go out of business? The writer does not feel that the profession would suffer if that were done. But orderly and gradual progress appeals to the lawyer and is in the end perhaps best for society. It is therefore urged here that there should at once be a requirement of not less than four years study in those schools not requiring full time from the student, and that they should all begin preparing for a change so that in a few years they may call for the full equivalent of what is now required in our best three year law schools. It should not be many years till this change is accomplished.

It may be contended that legislative requirements are unnecessary. That we may set an examination thorough enough for an adequate test, and if a student can pass the test we need not concern ourselves with how he got his preparation. Here it may be admitted that there is no handy, ready-made test, easy of immediate application, no graduated scale that will automatically register the possibilities of the candidate as a lawyer. All things considered the written examination is doubtless the best single test that has been devised. A much better one is furnished by preceding this by the series of tests passed by a student in the three years of his law study. No one will pretend that even this is infallible; though observation shows that it does not miss so often as has sometimes been suggested. But one peculiarity of a legal test as compared with a medical, is that it is much easier to pass the legal test with seeming credit upon a very superficial cram, especially if the candidate has put himself for a short time under an expert crammer. The clinical and laboratory work that must be done by the would-be doctor and the preliminary study required before he can do this work, are so varied and complex that no candidate could hope by a few weeks of study without clinics or laboratories to make a creditable showing on an examination for admission. We shall hardly admit that the knowledge and skill needed by a capable lawyer are less, or less important to the public, than are essential in the case of the doctor. For this reason, among many, the statute should require, as part of the evidence to be furnished by the legal candidate, proof of adequate study, as to both scope and time, in a law school. Moreover to trust to the examination alone is subject to the objection that the undoubted tendency is to let down the examination to the level of the average candidate. This is the more serious because of the reluctance of lawyers to refuse admission to men anxious to enter. The better the equipment of the class to be examined the more likely the examining board will be to set a proper standard for passing. Only a few such boards have been firm enough to refuse admission to a very high percentage of even poorly equipped applicants. There are notable exceptions and they are growing in number.

One important means of securing a high level the country over has not yet been much considered. There should presently be a standardized, but not fossilized, admission requirement. The Committee on Uniform State Laws of the American Bar Association may well turn its immediate attention to the preparation of a Uniform Act for Admission to the Bar. Once such an act were proposed it would be immediately adopted by some states. Each state add-

ed to the list would increase the pressure on other states to seek admission to the sisterhood of states. This would be especially true if the principle of comity were set at work so that one who had been admitted to the bar in one state would thereby secure recognition in any other state having adequate standards. Is there any reason why an association of lawyers should not feel that this matter of great concern is one that should at once demand their best attention?

Finally, if three years of training in a law school already seems inadequate for a proper study of the important branches of the law, then it must be admitted there should be no interference with the full three years and especially with the last year of this study. At present there is a very serious interference, due to the dates for bar examinations. There is the most surprising variety in the various states in this regard, but the most popular month is June, usually early June. It is submitted there should be no examinations in June or even in early July. Under such an arrangement the student during his last half year in the law school divides his time and interest between his school work and preparation for the all important bar examination, and the school work does not receive even its share in the division. This becomes simply calamitous for students attending law schools whose school year does not close until after the bar examinations. Often there is actual conflict between the law school finals and the bar examinations. Examinations should not be held before August or early September and these dates will answer every purpose for the student and at the same time give him ample time for special work, after graduation, in preparation for the test of the bar examiners. At this point there is dire need of team work between the schools and the examiners.

To summarize, it is submitted that. 1. The time is now here when men should come to the bar only by way of a three year course in a law school. Legislation should provide for this: 2. Schools not requiring the full time of their students should extend the course to at least four years, and begin to plan on such a change in the not distant future as will require the full equivalent of the work now required by the best law schools engaging the full time study of the student. It is believed this will be found to involve giving up the idea that a man can at the same time do a man's work earning a livelihood and in addition do full justice to preparation to be a lawyer. 3. Every candidate should after this prerequisite school work, pass on a high standard a fair written examination before a board of bar examiners. This examination should take place at least two

months after graduation from the law school. One who fails on a first may be given a second, but never, except on extraordinary conditions, a third test of his fitness to enter the profession. 4. The requirements should be so standardized in the various states of the country, that the principle of comity may gradually be so far acted upon that one who has passed the test for admission to the bar in one state may thereby become entitled to admission on motion in any other state adopting these standards. It is to be hoped that the day is near when it shall be fully recognized, not merely that the way to an adequate preparation for admission to the bar is long and difficult, but that the protection of the public requires that no one be permitted to practice till he has traveled that way and acquired that equipment. Not until then will our noble and highly necessary profession do its full duty by the people it serves.

EDWIN C. GODDARD