

Annual Review of Legal Education for 1937

**Published by
The Section of Legal Education
and Admissions to the Bar
of the
American Bar Association**

**Edited by
Will Shafroth
Adviser to the Council of the Section**

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
1140 NORTH DEARBORN STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS**

PREFACE

The present booklet is the third in the series of Annual Reviews of Legal Education published by the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association. For a number of years prior to 1935, an Annual Review of Legal Education was published by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching under the editorship of Mr. Alfred Z. Reed, distinguished staff member of the Foundation.

Again we acknowledge the assistance of The National Conference of Bar Examiners and of the various bar examiners and law school deans of the country who have cooperated by furnishing the information which has been requested.

Copies of this Annual Review are available without charge on request to the American Bar Association, 1140 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois.

*Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions
to the Bar of the American Bar Association.*

R. G. STOREY, *Chairman*,
Dallas, Texas.

CHARLES E. DUNBAR, JR., New Orleans, La.

ALEXANDER B. ANDREWS, Raleigh, N. C.

SYLVESTER C. SMITH, JR., Phillipsburg, N. J.

W. E. STANLEY, Wichita, Kans.

CHARLES H. ENGLISH, Erie, Pa.

R. ALLAN STEPHENS, Springfield, Ill.

JAMES E. BRENNER, Stanford University, Calif.

PHILIP J. WICKSER, Buffalo, N. Y.

MERRILL E. OTIS, Kansas City, Mo.

ROBERT L. STEARNS, Boulder, Colo.

June first, 1938.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEGAL EDUCATION AND BAR EXAMINATIONS— <i>Herschel W. Arant</i>	1
THE EVENING LAW SCHOOL— <i>Merrill E. Otis</i>	7
COOPERATIVE EFFORTS BY THE BAR, THE LAW SCHOOLS, AND THE BAR EXAMINERS — <i>John Kirkland Clark</i>	14
RECENT CHANGES IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND LAW SCHOOLS— <i>Will Shafroth</i>	21
List of States Classified According to Admission Requirements	26 to 28
Table Setting Out Detailed Admission Requirements in Each State (inserted at page 29)	
Recent Changes in the Law Schools	29
Advanced Legal Education	30
LIST OF LAW SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1937-38	34
STATISTICS	
United States Law School Attendance Since 1890	63
Table Showing Law School Attendance and Number of Law Schools, Divided Between Approved and Unapproved Schools, 1935, 1936 and 1937	64
Autumn Law School Attendance, 1936 and 1937, by States—Number of Lawyers According to 1930 Census	65
STANDARDS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION	66

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEGAL EDUCATION AND BAR EXAMINATIONS

BY HERSCHEL W. ARANT

*Dean, Ohio State University College of Law
President, Association of American Law Schools*

Lawyers are recognized as an indispensable part of our machinery for the administration of justice. Without their assistance, the courts have said they cannot properly adjust the conflicting claims that are presented to them. Since the courts are charged by society with the responsibility for the administration of justice and since they cannot successfully discharge it without specially qualified assistance, it has come to be generally recognized that the courts alone have the power to select and authorize those whose help it must have to serve as its assistants. The all but universal acceptance of this view is attested by the general rule that no one may engage in the practice of law until he has been licensed to do so by the courts.

The formal act of admission is always by the court. In our early history the admitting court occasionally conducted such examination as was considered necessary to determine the applicant's fitness to practice law. This practice, however, was never general and has not been followed in recent times. Examination of applicants for admission to practice is now everywhere delegated by the court to a board of examiners. But, in the discharge of its function, such a board exercises the authority of the appointing court, just as does a master appointed by a court to make any inquiry on its behalf.

During a considerable part of our country's history, the apprentice method was used in the preparation of lawyers, as it was in other fields, because it was practically the only method known; a young man "read law" in the office of a lawyer, or under the direction of a judge. This method doubtless had some advantages. It gave a young lawyer a knowledge of some of the important practical, if somewhat mechanical, matters connected with the practice of law, that schools are not generally equipped to give, and if he had been fortunate in the choice of his preceptor, he learned much of the fine traditions and ethics of the profession from observing their application in the practices of his teacher. The quality of the training, however, obviously depended in large part upon the amount of attention that the student received from his preceptor. The best lawyers, who would generally be the busiest ones, would often be poor preceptors, because they had so little time to devote to their students. Partly because of this and partly because uninterrupted systematic legal study came to be recognized as a more effective

method of preparation, law schools arose and have now almost completely taken over the preparation of lawyers.

In the beginning, the courts apparently concerned themselves but little about where or how an applicant for admission had studied. Whether he could pass the bar examination, often very simple and involving chiefly the ability to state memorized principles and definitions, appears to have been the only concern. This remained true for a considerable period of time after law schools became numerous. Indeed, as long as study of law in an office was recognized as a proper way to prepare for the practice of law, courts would have had difficulty in justifying a refusal to approve study in the office of any lawyer whose standing was such that his right to practice still existed. Yet it was well known that there were many such lawyers, whose ability and character were such that it was unfortunate for a young man to acquire his training under their tutelage, even if he acquired thereby the capacity to pass a bar examination. Since the advent of law schools, however, and the general recognition of their superiority as agencies for the training of lawyers, the courts in quite a few states have abolished the privilege of preparing for the bar examination by study in a lawyer's office, and require that the study be pursued in a law school. In many states, the courts have gone further and have prescribed requirements to which the law school's course of study must conform before it will be recognized as adequate preparation.

The power of the courts to prescribe the period of study, the kind of course that must be pursued, as well as the tests that shall be applied to determine the adequacy of the resulting training, is all now generally recognized.

As long as practicing lawyers and judges both trained and examined prospective lawyers, there was little likelihood that the training program and the examination would be out of harmony as to content or objective. Under the preceptor type of training, the study of law consisted mainly of the memorization of principles and definitions and this was true for a considerable period after law schools became common, for the reason that their faculties were composed mainly of practicing lawyers and judges. As long as this was so and lawyers and judges composed the examining boards, the bar examination continued to be chiefly a test of the applicant's memory of principles and definitions.

CHANGE IN THE TYPE OF EXAMINATIONS

With the rise of the case method, however, the objectives ceased to be primarily to impart definitions and principles of law and came to be more the development of the capacity to analyze cases, to reason logically and to distinguish between material and immaterial facts, which latter requires an appreciation of social bases or justifications of the rules applied in the cases

studied and in the hypothetical cases discussed in connection with them. The old type of examination would be an unsuitable test of the type of growth that the new method of teaching was seeking to produce and for a time applicants trained under that method were at some disadvantage in taking the old type of examination. But, with the spread of the case method of teaching and with graduates of case method schools becoming a larger and larger percentage of those examined and with the frequent appearance on boards of law examiners of men trained under the case method, it was to be expected that the type of bar examination would gradually change and the questions thereon more generally came to take the form of hypothetical cases requiring the applicant to select the appropriate principles and give reasons for his selection. This change has been gradual but general. In many states, however, where this type of question is now given on the bar examination, the examiners are prone to insist that answers accord with the decisions of the state in which the examination is held, thus placing undue emphasis on memory, as did earlier bar examinations. If the law schools are to prepare students to meet this type of examination, they must emphasize information as to local law at the expense to some extent of development of those other important qualities of mind which the case method aims to develop. It is manifestly unfortunate when a young man who has studied three or four years in a school approved by the Supreme Court of his state finds it necessary to resort to a special course of some kind to prepare himself to pass his bar examination. Yet this need exists where the bar examiners insist upon a knowledge of local law. With the possible exception of emphasis on knowledge of local legal procedure, it is believed that this attitude is wholly wrong. It can be justified only on the untenable assumption that intimate knowledge of the law of the state at the time of admission is necessary to qualify a lawyer to practice therein. Everyone knows that lawyers do not practice on the basis of the law they know when they are admitted. They rarely give advice or take action about any matter that is not routine in character without first consulting local statutes and decisions. Moreover, if the law of a state were knowable in detail and if knowledge of it in detail were indispensable to qualification for the practice of law, the published reports of any state would testify eloquently to the lack of qualification of the lawyers on one side of every reported case, and frequently also of the lack of qualification of the trial and intermediate appellate courts.

THE OBJECTIVE OF BAR EXAMINATIONS

The really important objective of a bar examination should be to determine whether the applicant has acquired the ability to attack a legal problem in lawyer-like fashion, that is, to take a statement from a client and determine which facts are important and which are not, ascertain from a client whether

material facts occurred whose significance the client did not appreciate, determine by examination of local statutes and decisions what principle is likely to be applied to the material facts which appear to have occurred. Involved in this process is, of course, the necessity of appreciating what facts are of social significance in a particular situation because such facts are always material. An applicant for admission can give abundant evidence on examination that he has these qualities without reaching the same conclusion on problems given him for solution which have been reached by the courts in his state.

The foregoing discussion may seem to assume that there is some more or less definite objective standard that can and should be applied in determining whether applicants are qualified for the practice of law. So far, however, this paper has only compared and asserted the superiority of modern methods of legal education over those of an earlier day and suggested that bar examinations should test the kind of growth and development that modern legal education seeks to produce. The question still remains as to how great an ability to analyze, reason logically and distinguish between material and immaterial facts should be required of applicants for admission to the bar. It scarcely needs to be stated that there is a great deal of difference from state to state in respect to this matter, and it is probably true that the bar examiners in no state have been as exacting as they might have been. This assertion appears to be justified by the general belief that the legal profession is badly overcrowded. No one asserts that there are more well qualified lawyers than the public needs, but almost everyone concedes that a great many lawyers are not well qualified and should never have been admitted. This position is conceded even by the rare person who denies that there are numerically more lawyers than the public needs. It seems therefore, that there is no escape from the position that the bar examinations have not served with complete effectiveness to screen out the unfit. Not only should an attempt be made to make the bar examinations the country over more effective but, if the profession really is overcrowded, they must be thought of as in some measure devices for regulating the size of the legal profession, for it is now generally conceded that too many lawyers are good for neither the profession nor the public which it serves.

Recognizing that bar examiners have many common problems and that it is against the public interest for a few states to have such low standards of admission that they attract those who are unable to obtain admission in states which have stricter standards, the bar examiners of the country formed a national organization about seven years ago. Since the advent of that organization, which meets at least once a year and now monthly publishes *The Bar Examiner*, there has been a forum for the discussion of the problems of those who exercise the courts' responsibility of selecting from those who have com-

plied with the prescribed period of study those who shall receive the license to practice. There is no doubt that this organization already deserves credit for substantial improvement in bar examination technique and results. Its existence, and the earnestness and intelligence of its efforts are comforting assurance of substantial improvement of the examining function.

WIDE DIFFERENCE IN LAW SCHOOLS

In this paper so far law schools have been referred to as if the training they give was all of a kind. This is farthest from the truth. There are perhaps as wide differences in respect to the type and quality of training offered in different law schools as there are between the training offered in law offices and that offered in the law schools. Unfortunately, it was discovered a good while ago that, under the standards for admission then enforced, it was possible to operate law schools as profitable financial enterprises and this possibility still unfortunately exists in most of the country. The volume of profit depends upon the size of the student body and the size of the student body is directly related to the scholastic requirements for admission and the scholarship standards the student must maintain in order to remain in school. In schools organized as private commercial enterprises, the minimum requirements for admission to practice in the state are generally the highest imposed for admission or graduation. Seldom is a student required to desist from the study of law because of poor ability or lack of industry as long as he pays the fees required. Such an attitude is rationalized on the ground that the young man deserves his chance, that it is the responsibility of the bar examiners to protect the public against admission of the unfit after the school has extracted all the money it can from the student. That the bar examiners cannot know from such examinations as they can give as much about the general fitness of an aspirant for the bar as can a law school which recognizes its responsibility to assist them in keeping out the unfit is conceded and by no one less grudgingly than by the bar examiners themselves.

The assurance of capacity which resides in the fact that an applicant has been able to complete a course in a school where good scholarship standards are enforced has been recognized in the requirements referred to above that are found in many of the states which deny the right even to take the bar examination to those who have not studied in a school whose physical equipment and course of study meet minimum requirements. In some states, it is not considered necessary to examine the graduates of certain law schools; graduation is assumed to assure adequate preparation for the practice.

The importance of the preparation period of an aspirant for the bar as a guarantee of fitness led almost forty years ago to the formation of a national organization of law schools known as the Association of American Law Schools, whose objective was stated to be the improvement of legal education

in America. During its entire life, its members have been attempting by exchange of ideas to improve their educational techniques, raise their formal and active scholarship requirements and extend the area in which the Association's standards prevail.

The American Bar Association, through its Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, has for an even longer time been trying to bring about a rise in the formal requirements for admission to the bar and to influence improvement in the standards of training that obtain in law schools. To accomplish the latter, it has for a considerable time maintained an approved list of law schools, which conform to what it believes to be reasonable minimum educational requirements.

THE LEAGUE OF OHIO LAW SCHOOLS

In Ohio, there are twelve law schools. An organization of these schools has been formed, which has as its objective so to improve the techniques and standards of all the schools that there will be none in which a student may not get a reasonable minimum preparation for admission to the bar. In its organic law it has emphasized the responsibility of the schools of the state as a whole to discover and eliminate the obviously unfit by providing that students who have been excluded from one law school for poor scholarship may not generally be accepted by any other school. This organization is only a few years old, and its potentialities for improvement of legal education cannot yet be fully estimated. It has, however, already to its credit substantial achievement in that it has practically stopped the migration of flunks from one school to another until they have studied long enough to have a chance at the bar examinations. Through its effort, the Supreme Court of Ohio, by rule, provided for the abolition of law office study after July, 1939, and that study of law in an Ohio school will not qualify one to take the bar examination unless it is pursued in a school which complies with the requirements for admission to the League of Ohio Law Schools. It may well be that this experiment will point the way to a solution of the overcrowding of the bar in a few states which have a great many more law schools than are needed to train the lawyers which should be added to the ranks of the bar.

It has been noted that the bar examiners have organized for the purpose of considering their common problems and improving their techniques and that the law schools had previously done the same thing. These organized efforts do not, however, alone guarantee a solution of the problem referred to at the beginning of this paper, namely, the lack of harmony in the objectives of the law schools and the bar examiners. That there can be such lack of harmony when law schools are so largely manned by teachers who do not engage in the practice and who, in many states, are not members of boards of

bar examiners, is obvious. In order to promote understanding with reference to matters of common interest between bar examiners and legal educators, conferences have been inaugurated, first in New York, and later in Ohio, at which conferences boards of bar examiners, legal educators, judges and committees on legal education of bar associations are invited. This is a new venture. The organizations in New York and Ohio are not alike in all their details, but they are identical in their aims and very similar in the procedure they have adopted to achieve their purposes. They constitute a substantial basis for optimism in the solution of the problem of an overcrowded bar, a problem that cannot be solved without understanding and close cooperation between those who train and those who finally select.

THE EVENING LAW SCHOOL

By MERRILL E. OTIS

United States District Judge; Honorary President of and Lecturer on Constitutional Law in the Kansas City School of Law; Member of the Councils of the Sections of Legal Education, and of Judicial Administration, American Bar Association

That an evening or part-time law school¹ may be maintained consistently with the high standards for legal education so earnestly upheld for so many years by the American Bar Association and with the standards, in some respects still higher, of the Association of American Law Schools, is a real possibility. This article is written to emphasize that fact. It is written from the standpoint of an evening law school, ambitious to come up to the highest standards and unwilling to continue to exist if it cannot do so. And it is written out of the experience of a part-time lecturer in an evening law school

¹In the Annual Review of Legal Education formerly conducted by the Carnegie Foundation, the basis of classification of law schools was full-time, part-time and mixed. A full-time school is one which is intended to consume practically all of the student's time, and offers a curriculum with generally 12 to 14 class-room hours of instruction per week. The full-time school by reason of the fact that it has the first claim upon the time of its students offers its class-room work mainly in the morning. The part-time school is designed to serve the needs of a class of students, who because of economic necessity or other circumstance, are unable to give their entire time and energies to the pursuit of their law study. Such schools offer courses consisting of anywhere from 4 to 8 or even 10 class-room hours of instruction per week. Because most of its students earn their own living, it must confine its teaching activities to the late afternoon or evening hours when the students are not otherwise occupied. A mixed school is a school which offers both full-time and part-time courses.

Since the Annual Review of Legal Education has been taken over by the Section of Legal Education of the American Bar Association, the classification is somewhat different. It is now based on the approval or disapproval by the Council of Legal Education depending upon whether or not the school has satisfied the minimum standards of legal education fixed by the American Bar Association. Thus formerly the classification was full-time, part-time and mixed. Now the classification is approved and unapproved.

who has had a little part in the effort made to satisfy the American Bar Association's requirements for approval.

The immediate objects of legal education are: (a) to secure from every generation a number trained in law sufficient to take the places of those who have become inactive and to satisfy the public need; (b) to see to it that those trained in law are those fitted for that training and that the training they are given is that best calculated to develop in them true scholarship and high ideals of service. These are the immediate objects. But these objects are incidental to a greater object, they are the paths leading to a goal, not always clearly seen, the attainment of a more perfect justice in relations among men. There can be no sympathy with any purpose inconsistent with that supreme and ultimate end of legal education.

Obviously there is nothing inconsistent either with the far away goal or with one or another of the immediate objects of legal education in the mere fact that instruction in law is given after rather than before 5 p. m. There is nothing inconsistent with the proper purposes of legal education that they who seek it must work for their subsistence while they study and can do that better and with greater compensation if they work by day. In this class in this land are many thousands of young men and young women with ambition, with talent, with high ideals. Their admission to the profession would strengthen the profession. Institutions of learning designed particularly for them certainly are justified if they can be maintained without lowering the standards of scholarship and professional morality. There are but few, it may be assumed, who do not desire that young men and women of this economic class shall have opportunity. These few say that there are enough anyhow who will study law. They say that he who does not have to earn his way will have more leisure to acquire legal knowledge and less temptation to disregard the ethics of the profession. They say that the great law schools, endowed or state supported, are sufficient to supply the needs of the profession and that any very extraordinary youth may succeed at last in attending such a school. And there is truth in all these things. In all these things also there is possibly a little of a sentiment which is unworthy of America.

EVENING LAW SCHOOLS AND AMERICAN IDEALS

We wish for America that those who make her laws—her senators and representatives in Congress—shall be the best qualified men available, best qualified from the standpoint of character and education and natural capacity. But who would favor a system of selecting senators and representatives which necessarily would shut the door of opportunity against the mass of men and women? In a dictator ridden land the parliament conceivably may be made up of men of a more efficient type than the parliament

of a democracy, but that efficiency is dearly bought which is attained through the sacrifice of the hope that every individual may cherish in a free land. Just so, we should strive for efficiency among lawyers, but if the greatest possible efficiency can be had only by committing legal education exclusively to those institutions which none but the more fortunate can attend, we have sacrificed that equality of opportunity which is the glory of America for that efficiency which is the glory of the dictatorial state. Because commercial law schools and the advocates of low standards for admission to the bar prate overmuch (and quite erroneously) of the Abraham Lincolns who could not meet high standards of admission, it does not follow that we should put up over the entrance to every law school the inscription, "Opportunity to Practice Law is only for the Sons and Daughters of the Well-to-do." There are two sufficient reasons why that should not be done: (1) The resulting injury to the spirits of the Republic's youth would far outweigh the good ensuing from the improvement that might follow in the quality of lawyers; (2) To advance standards far beyond general conceptions of their right position means that generally they will be ignored and so even a reasonable measure of progress be prevented.

The evening law school has a place. That is a fact which is entitled to more than mere lip service recognition, a recognition accompanied by conditions which it is known could not possibly be met. It is a fact which is entitled to sympathetic consideration. That consideration, however, must not be sympathetic to the point of yielding essential principles.

COMMERCIALIZED LAW SCHOOLS AN UNMITIGATED EVIL

A school conducted for private profit almost necessarily will degenerate into (or never rise above) the status of a mere diploma mill. Such a school will be the last to raise requirements for entrance, the last to enforce standards of scholarship whose application would weed out incompetents before they graduate, the last to join in a demand for higher requirements for admission to the bar which might present difficult obstacles for those whose tuition fees have fed its treasury. A school conducted for private profit may indeed turn out some fine, some splendid lawyers, but its influence, on the whole, is evil. Almost always it will be found opposing the efforts of the leaders of the bar to raise standards. How incongruous that is, that an educational institution should make itself an obstacle to progress in any field! There should be no tolerance of an evening law school conducted for private profit, whether by dividends to stockholders or in the form of exaggerated salaries which are not earned. There should be no effort to continue an evening law school inadequately equipped, with insufficient lecture rooms,

with an insufficient library, with a faculty inadequate in number or inadequate in preparation.²

THE A. B. A. LIBRARY REQUIREMENT

Unfortunately the average evening law school has an insufficient library. Rarely can one be found which satisfies the minimum requirements in this regard of the American Bar Association.³ In many instances the libraries are shamefully deficient. To illustrate, in a state in which there are twelve schools of law, two approved and ten unapproved, a survey committee, going into the state upon the invitation of the State Bar Association, discovered that not one of the unapproved law schools, most of which were evening law schools, met the library requirements. In nine out of ten of these unapproved schools the libraries ranged from a minimum of a set of *Corpus Juris* to a maximum of fifteen hundred volumes. The two approved schools in the same state had libraries of seventeen thousand five hundred volumes and eighteen

² Of the 185 law schools in the United States in the year 1937, 97 are approved by the American Bar Association and 88 are unapproved. Of the 97 approved schools, 77 are full-time schools and 20 are of the mixed type. Of the 88 unapproved schools, 7 are full-time schools, 16 are of the mixed type, and 65 are part-time schools. Thus it appears that the great majority of the full-time schools are approved and the great majority of the part-time schools are unapproved. Practically all part-time instruction is at night.

When we consider that there are no schools having only evening courses on the approved list, we cannot but wonder why this is. The answer is simple. The evening schools are largely sub-standard, that is, they do not comply with the minimum requirements of the American Bar Association.

There are 36 states requiring a minimum of two years of college study before admission to the bar and 13 jurisdictions with a lower educational prerequisite. In the first group, with the high educational standard, the 36 states support 42 evening law schools or an average of approximately 1.2 schools per state. In the second group, with a definitely lower educational standard, 13 states support 23 evening law schools or a percentage of 1.8 schools per state.

Forty states require a minimum of three years of legal training before admission to the bar, and 9 states require less than that amount. The 40 states with a high requirement support 46 evening schools, or a percentage of 1.2 schools per state. The second group of states, with the lower legal training qualifications, support 19 evening schools, or an average of 2.1 such schools per state. So that the relation between lower educational standards and the existence of the evening law school is again apparent.

But it cannot be said that the evening law school is exclusively a product of low educational standards. It is the product of two factors, (1) low educational standards, and (2) populous centers. Where either of these factors is found, evening law schools flourish. It is perfectly obvious that the existence of such law schools in populous centers—especially where those centers appear in states with high educational qualifications (and that is frequently the case)—is an evidence of a justifiable demand by an earnest, serious minded group of students who are willing to make substantial sacrifices in order to obtain a legal education.

³ The pertinent resolution of the Association and supplemental rulings of the Council of Legal Education are that an approved law school "shall provide an adequate library available for the use of * * * students" and that "an adequate library shall consist of not less than seventy-five hundred well selected, usable volumes, not counting obsolete material or broken sets of reports, kept up to date and owned or controlled by the law school * * *."

thousand volumes respectively. The contrast is most significant. The significance does not lie, of course, in the mere daily use of more books by average students where libraries are greater (perhaps there is not much more daily use of books where there are more books). The significant things are that the law student, surrounded in school by a multitude of books, early acquires an understanding that his is a learned profession, that the possibilities for research and study almost are inexhaustible, and that his law school is a place where scholarship is aimed at and is possible of achievement. If these values are largely spiritual (which the man who thinks of the profession as only another business may sneer at), nevertheless they are tremendously important values.

FULL-TIME TEACHERS

That requirement of the American Bar Association which the average evening law school finds it most difficult to meet involves the employment of full-time professors. The real reason, generally speaking, why they are not employed, is that to employ them is beyond the school's financial means. The reason sometimes is camouflaged with the contention that after all instruction by a practicing lawyer is superior to that of a man of lesser natural ability who has forsworn private practice for a professional career. It should be also said that many times that contention is made in all sincerity, by men who really do believe that the practicing lawyer is a better teacher than the lawyer who has made teaching his sole profession. We are dealing here necessarily with a question which can be answered only in the opinions of men. I tender my opinion for what it may be worth.

For ten years I have lectured in an evening law school on the subject of Constitutional Law and for three years on the subject of Federal Practice and Procedure. As Assistant Attorney General and as Chairman of the Public Service Commission of my state, as Assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States, as a federal judge for thirteen years, my practical experience in each of the two fields in which I lecture certainly far exceeds that of the average lawyer and probably exceeds that of the average judicial officer. Now and then I am enabled out of my experience to give more vivid illumination to some principle of law than I could give to it without having had that experience. It is perhaps true, on the other hand, that these personal experiences with the application of certain principles cause me to attach altogether too much importance to those particular principles. The fact of my personal experience, it may be, has thrown out of balance the instruction I give. If I had had practical experience with the application of every phase of every principle of law in each of my two fields, my knowledge of the subjects and ability to teach them certainly would have been amplified, but neither I nor any other has had any such experience as that. The practical

experience of the most successful practitioner has touched but little of the wide expanse of any field of law. Really his practical experience in any single subject is little more than that of the full-time professor who has never practiced. There is not much difference between no experience and next to none.

When, more than a quarter of a century ago, I myself was a student in law school, in the University of Missouri, my teacher in Constitutional Law was Dr. Percy Bordwell, now of the faculty of the Law School of the University of Iowa. I suppose he had had no practical experience whatever in that field and possibly none in any field. Certainly his experience in the field of Constitutional Law was nothing when compared with what I now have had. But, when I have delivered a lecture in this subject to an appreciative and even to an applauding class, and look back in memory to the manner and method of my preceptor of former days, I know that in every branch of the teacher's task his performance was superior. His understanding of the whole subject, as distinguished from some little part of it, was superior to mine. He was intent, moreover, not on a finished, polished lecture; he was intent on developing in the minds of his students an accurate comprehension of the principles of his subject. And he did not come to his classroom exhausted from the labor of a strenuous and trying day, he came with a mind fresh for the task before him. To him teaching was his primary duty, it is very secondary to me. I am convinced at last that the part-time teacher cannot and does not do the job so well as it can be done and is done by the full-time man.

I go again to my own law school days to illustrate what I have to say. By far the ablest man on our faculty was Edward W. Hinton. Later he was to have a distinguished career as a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago. We had him in the beginning of his teaching. And what a teacher he was! How he made clear subjects the most obscure! How he stimulated our thought! He had practiced the profession for several years before he began to teach and he continued to practice after he had begun to teach. My fellow students and I ascribed his great ability as a teacher to the fact that he had been and was a practicing attorney. But now I realize that our reasoning was superficial. All the practice of the country town in which Hinton had his office, if one man had had it all (and Hinton had but a little of it), was inconsequential. And certainly he had had no practical experience whatever in Common Law Pleading, but it was especially that course which he conducted with amazing genius. He simply was a great teacher and not a greater teacher because he had had a few dozen or even a hundred cases. Now I know these things. And my viewpoint is the viewpoint of the practicing lawyer who is a part-time teacher. Seeing the question from that viewpoint I say that the overwhelming weight of the argument is on the side of the law school whose faculty is made up chiefly of full-time men.

EVENING LAW SCHOOLS CAN MEET AMERICAN BAR STANDARDS

It is difficult but not impossible for an evening law school to comply with the reasonable requirements of the American Bar Association. It could not, of course, comply with a requirement that its students should not engage in remunerative labor. It could not comply with a requirement that it should not have classes after five o'clock in the afternoon. No such requirements have been made and they ought never to be made in the United States. But the reasonable requirements that have been made can be complied with. And here again I speak, not in academic fashion, but out of my own experience.

The evening law school with which I am connected had its beginning more than forty years ago. It was initiated to provide instruction in law for young men and women who otherwise could not obtain it. It never was operated for profit. Judges and practicing lawyers taught in the school, receiving meagre stipends for their services—sometimes. If in any year there was any surplus of income above necessary expenditures that surplus went into a building, library and equipment fund. No man ever has received a dividend of a penny. The policy of the school was controlled by its faculty. The faculty determined that the school should meet the requirements of the American Bar Association and that if it could not do so it should cease to exist.

The entrance requirements were raised to include at least two years of college work. The effect of that was to cut the enrollment almost in two and the income of the school in two. The library was brought up to standard. First one and then three and then four full-time men were employed and the services of many part-time men eliminated. The tentative approval of the American Bar Association was gained. And the school is rendering far better service than it ever had rendered in the past.

Yes, it is possible for an evening law school to meet at least the minimum standards set up by the American Bar Association and by the Association of American Law Schools. It would seem, however, that that can be done only in some comparatively large center of population where the number of those desiring the advantages of such a school and qualified to study law is sufficiently great to support the school without a lowering of standards. It would also seem that such a school should aim toward absorption by some tax supported or privately endowed institution, to the end that ultimately it will have other means of support than the tuition of its students. It is a narrow field that is left. In that narrow field there is not only room for but great justification for an evening law school.

COOPERATIVE EFFORTS BY THE BAR, THE LAW SCHOOLS, AND THE BAR EXAMINERS

BY JOHN KIRKLAND CLARK

Chairman of New York Board of Law Examiners

More than forty years have now passed since New York and several other states organized the process of admission to the bar on a uniform, state-wide basis. Prior to that time, the problem was handled by the several courts in a more or less informal manner. The number of applicants was much smaller, the communities themselves were much less crowded and, for the most part, the judges and the members of the bar had a more complete knowledge of the applicants than is possible today. The testing of their qualifications was, therefore, a much simpler task. Now, in every state, admission to the bar is in the hands of a state board.

With the introduction of a state-wide system of examination, a new problem of techniques arose which many of those appointed were not especially well qualified to develop. Typically, the appointees were busy, practicing lawyers who attempted, "on their own," to devise as intelligent methods of examination as they could—without any technical experience and, generally, without much knowledge of formalized legal education, which was only then becoming common, but which has since become almost universal.

In a number of the states where law schools had been established as a part of the state university, or where they had already built up reputations, the court rules or the statutes gave to the graduates of such institutions automatic admission to the bar. For almost twenty-five years, after the establishment of state boards of examiners for admission to the bar, the entire process was naturally in a state of flux.

It is difficult, today, to realize that it is only since the beginning of this century that law school training has become the accepted method for preparation for the bar. The success of the Langdell method at Harvard, its adoption at Columbia and its influence on legal education throughout the country, as Harvard and Columbia law school graduates became teachers in other law schools, had a tremendous effect especially upon the university law schools.

Experience soon demonstrated, also, that "part-time" law school training afforded those who established and conducted night law schools a chance to build up, rapidly, a very prosperous business, while, at the same time (frequently, and perhaps usually), giving their students much better training for practice than office apprenticeship had usually succeeded in doing. In these part-time schools, the students quite generally had the additional advantage of practical experience as law clerks by day while they took their

school work at night. Many of our ablest and outstanding leaders of the bar during the past twenty-five years received their training in these part-time schools. The great majority of the lawyers who were engaged in practice in 1900 and for some time thereafter, in all probability, got their training through the old office study system. It should be added that many schools with afternoon and evening classes have been conducted on a high plane and have responded with enthusiasm to the efforts of the American Bar Association to improve the standards of legal education.

Only those of us who recall the bitterness of the campaign for the adoption of higher standards for legal education and admission to the bar which were adopted by the American Bar Association at Cincinnati in 1921, and approved by the Washington Conference of Bar Association Delegates in 1922, can appreciate today what a struggle it has been to convince the bar as a whole that a requirement of law school training and adequate preliminary education is essential for the bar and the public.

EFFECTS OF COMMERCIALIZATION

By that time, the commercialization of part-time legal education had begun to bring about effects, through mass training, which experts in legal education felt were dangerous and unwise. The attack upon the principle (or lack of principle) of conducting institutions of higher education primarily for money making purposes caused a bitter controversy which continued for more than a decade thereafter. In fact, it is only during the last half dozen years that the bar as a whole has recognized that the student, the bar in general and the public have suffered when commercialism has been the controlling factor in the running of a law school. It is now, however, almost universally recognized that, to be properly conducted, the process of legal education must be primarily, if not solely, influenced by the desire to give the best possible training under the circumstances, uninfluenced by the profit motive.

The bar is fundamentally conservative. Our law is built upon a foundation of precedents. Conservatism is in the very nature and fiber of lawyers and it has therefore been a monumental task to educate the bar and, through its leaders, to enlighten the public as to the desirability, from every point of view—that of the individual lawyer, of the bar in general, of the bench, and especially of the public—that adequate legal training must be made a prerequisite to modern law practice.

The bar in this fight has profited by the example of the medical profession, which, as a result of the Flexner survey and the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars in a well-organized campaign, frequently

bitterly fought, had largely destroyed commercialism in the medical schools and had established high standards of medical education. In the campaign in medicine, however, the community interest was so obvious—the health and physical welfare of the community was so directly affected and the campaign was so well supported by the profession and by large grants of money—that the movement made rapid and effective progress. Even the general public readily comprehended that it was dangerous to have poorly trained doctors undertaking to render services.

The problem of the lawyers was made far more difficult than that of the doctors because of the public attitude toward lawyers and the implications of democracy in the practice of the profession. From our earliest days, lawyers have naturally, of course, been in control of our courts, but they have been also, almost uniformly, the controlling profession in public administration and in public life. Court room forensic training gave skill in public speaking which was effectively employed in public affairs by lawyers. The law, in this country especially, has always been looked upon as the natural avenue into public life. It was, therefore, much harder to convince the public that it had an interest in insisting that requirements should be adopted which might bar many from the practice of the law.

The success, especially in the stirring days of the middle of the nineteenth century, of lawyers who had little formal training but who became not only leaders at the bar but outstanding figures in public life, furnished the "Lincoln motif" as an effective argument against the adoption of higher standards of training for the bar. It is doubtful if, in 1900, this movement could have been successfully launched. The profession itself was largely unorganized; the majority of its members had received little, if any, formal education in the profession; the practice of the law was far simpler than it has become in the intervening years with the creation of new governmental agencies and the development of many new branches of law practice. In the last twenty years, however, the bar has gradually become more highly and effectively organized; the movement for an incorporated or integrated bar has made great strides; the law schools have steadily improved their standards of legal education; the boards of bar examiners have gradually learned more and more about the process of intellectual testing.

RESULTS OF THE CAMPAIGN FOR HIGHER STANDARDS

A current assay of the results of the work which has, for the past fifteen years, been carried on by the American Bar Association for improved standards of legal education, shows that there are now sixteen states where, for all practical purposes, law school study will not be recognized unless pur-

sued in a school maintaining the standards and on the "approved list of the American Bar Association"; there are seven more whose rules give a decided preference to students in schools so approved (allowing exceptions in the case of certain local schools); there are thirty-six states whose rules require two years of college education or its equivalent, and three years of law study is now almost universally demanded. Rules requiring four years of study in part-time schools have been adopted in more than half the states. The number of law schools shows some reduction. Out of a total of about 185 schools, there are ninety-seven on the "approved list" and over two-thirds of the law school students in the United States are enrolled in these institutions.

For some years, parallel progress has been made in improving the bar examinations and the admission process, and in raising the general level of legal education. There are now central boards of bar examiners in all of the states. Only nine states still admit graduates of certain schools on diploma without examination. However, it was not until 1931, when The National Conference of Bar Examiners was formed under the auspices of the American Bar Association's Legal Education Section, that the work of the bar examiners began to achieve any national unity and that any concerted attempt was made among the state boards to exchange information and join together in an effort to improve the technique of bar examinations throughout the country.

While bar examiners and law school faculties have been marching side by side down the road to higher standards, there has been little mingling between the two groups. In fact, in the early years, there was widespread jealousy and distrust between the boards and the law schools. Their attempts to solve common problems have been largely separate attempts with little cooperation on either side with the other group, and even with little knowledge of what the other group was doing. While the law schools were beginning to enlarge their curricula and undertake new and modern subjects, the bar examiners continued to examine on the same list of topics which they had used for years. The bar examiners had little or no information as to what the law schools were teaching and the law schools failed to realize that the bar examiners felt that present legal education was in many cases not practical enough. Some bar examiners were giving questions for which a student could be adequately prepared only by the old method of text book instruction (with which many of the examiners were solely familiar), even though the law schools in the state were very generally using the case method. Law school faculties did not know how the bar examinations were prepared, how they were marked or whether actually there was a possibility of favoritism toward particular schools.

THE BEGINNINGS OF COOPERATION

The time was, therefore, ripe for cooperative and coordinating efforts by the members of these several groups. Early in the 1930's under the leadership of the New York City Bar Association, lawyers and legal educators together with the bar examiners and members of the committee on character and fitness, in New York State, gathered informally in a group which designated itself as the New York Joint Conference on Legal Education. At almost the same time, under the leadership of the State Bar of California, that state established a similar group. In the intervening years, several other states have created like informal organizations. In New York, the group includes representatives of bar associations—the state association and the major local associations—representing the bar in general; the deans or other delegates from the law schools of the state; members of the board of bar examiners; and members of the several committees on character and fitness, as these are separate bodies.

Although the New York Joint Conference has power only to pass advisory resolutions, it has already made substantial contributions in bringing about a better understanding among the law schools of the state, and between the bar examiners and the law schools. It has also served a worthy end by enlightening lawyers generally as to what the schools and the examiners are doing. One of the fruits of its work has been the adoption by the Court of Appeals of the state of a rule requiring a four year course for the part-time students in the law schools. More recently, the suggestion has been made for the abolition of the June bar examination and discussion and investigation are being carried on by the conference on the subject of overcrowding of the bar; limitation of applicants; the postponement of June examinations; and further raising of the standards.

In California, the committee was created by the State Bar and is known as the Committee on Cooperation between the Law Schools and the State Bar. It was this committee which suggested the valuable survey of the twenty law schools of California which was made in 1933. This committee is also largely responsible for the adoption by the state legislature last year of a requirement of two years of college education for admission to the bar, except in the case of students beginning their law study after reaching the age of twenty-five years. The committee has a number of sub-committees divided into northern and southern sections and at the present time is studying such matters as pre-legal training, review or cram courses, approval of law schools, the character problem, drafting of bar questions, the study of adjective law in the law schools and aptitude tests.

Following the lead of these two states, The National Conference of Bar Examiners passed a resolution in 1936 suggesting the formation of similar committees or conferences in every state. The Association of American Law Schools took like action at its meeting in December, 1936. In September, 1937, the American Bar Association added its formal approval, recommending the inclusion in such conferences of "bar examiners, law school representatives and representatives of state bar associations." There are now a dozen or more states where such conferences are in operation, to the mutual advantage of the participants. Such groups will inevitably be of assistance in improving the entire system of preparation for and admission to the bar.

A PROGRAM FOR THE CONFERENCES

The work which can most advantageously be done by these conferences naturally depends upon local conditions. In some states, primary emphasis should be laid upon bringing the requirements for admission to the bar up to standard, in others, improvement of the bar examinations may require immediate attention. In still others, the problems concerning the character of applicants, their pre-legal training, the possibilities of a preceptorial system, such as Pennsylvania, and more recently New Jersey, have created, the elimination of commercial law schools, the increase of scholarships for legal training and questions as to the law school curriculum may be advantageously considered.

All of the subjects mentioned are worthy of discussion. However, perhaps a beginning may well be made, in any state, with a consideration of bar examinations. The chairman of The National Conference of Bar Examiners, in an address before the 1936 meeting of the Association of American Law Schools, frankly listed the sources of dissatisfaction with bar examinations on the part of law school teachers as follows:

1. Archaic subject content.
2. Provincialism or over-emphasis of *local* law.
3. Insufficient use of optional questions.
4. Inconvenient dates of examinations.
5. Insufficiency of time allotted for answering questions.
6. Unskilful drafting of questions.
7. Inadequacy of staff or technical equipment.
8. Lack of mutuality of understanding between bar examiners and law schools.

The first step to be taken to eliminate the lack of understanding referred to, should be a detailed exposition by a representative from the law school group of the contents of each of the law school courses in fields covered by

the bar examination. This will give a concrete idea of the scope and character of the candidate's training in that field. This may be followed by a detailed description by a member of the board of all steps taken by the bar examiners from the beginning of the preparation of the questions through to the final posting of the marks of each candidate. A discussion of the times when the examinations should be held and of the number of examinations a year which are necessary or desirable, has a logical place on the agenda.

Methods of preparing questions, methods of grading and analysis of the results of the examination and their comparison with the results which the same students achieved in law schools should prove valuable. The question of whether independent weight may be given to other factors than the mere grade received on the examination in determining the right of admission, is important. Finally, the suggestion of Professor Harold Shepherd of Cincinnati, chairman of the Committee on Bar Examinations of the Association of American Law Schools, that the law school men should submit to the bar examiners typical questions in each of the fields of examination, together with an analysis of the problem and the kind of answer which the law schools expect, would seem to have distinct possibilities as an aid to the bar examiners.

However important the subjects on the agenda of these meetings may be, the experience in New York has demonstrated that the most important factor in the accomplishment of the group has been the informal acquaintanceship by the members of each of the groups with the members of the others as to the nature and character of their work, and the development of the truly cooperative, sympathetic and friendly interest by each group in the work of the others. Even in the several groups, the better acquaintanceship of the several participants has resulted in real benefits. Thus, frequently, the process of informal discussion and the consideration of mutual problems has brought about much clearer and fuller understanding and has almost always resulted in substantial unanimity of opinion when a problem is fully understood by all.

With the formal approval of such cooperative efforts by the national organization of the legal profession, by the law school association and by the bar examiners, and the united recommendation for their formation and maintenance in every state, it is earnestly hoped that this work will receive wholehearted support as such organization is undertaken state by state. Thus, only, can the most effective work be accomplished in reaching the desired objective of the best legal training, the best selective methods of admission, and the ablest and best bar practicable.

RECENT CHANGES IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND LAW SCHOOLS

BY WILL SHAFROTH

*Adviser to the Council of the Section of Legal Education and
Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association*

Continued progress in the adoption of a two-year college requirement is the outstanding characteristic of the changes which have occurred during the last year in the standards of bar admission. A trend which is becoming definitely more noticeable each year is the tendency to refuse to recognize law school study unless it is pursued in a law school approved by the American Bar Association. Also of great interest is the rule of the Delaware Supreme Court which permits the bar examiners of that state to limit the number of registrations for law study. The provision reads:

"No person shall be registered as a student of law unless his registration is, in the judgment of the Board of Examiners, warranted in order that there may be a competent number of persons to practice as attorneys in the Courts of this State."

During the year there has been increasing discussion of this subject of limitation of the bar, particularly in New York and New Jersey. In no other jurisdictions besides Delaware has it been adopted, except in three or four of the smaller counties in Pennsylvania where it has served to prevent too great an influx from Philadelphia. In that state admission to the bar is still by counties, that is, the candidate for admission must be recommended to the state board of examiners by his local county board which serves as a committee on character and fitness. It is safe to say that the majority of the profession, while believing that the bar is overcrowded, regards any numerical limitation on admissions as "un-American" and "undemocratic." Nevertheless the opinion of the bar that we have too many lawyers has undoubtedly furnished a strong impetus to higher admission standards.

In this connection it is interesting to see that while law school enrollment has dropped two per cent during the past year, total new bar admissions are up from 8,627 to 8,934.

INCREASES IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

With Arizona, California and Nebraska in the two-year college column, there now remain but two states, Iowa and South Dakota, north of the Mason and Dixon line, which demand less than this amount of general education.

The extent of the movement is also indicated by the fact that there are only five states west of the Mississippi (the two last mentioned and Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma) which are content with lower standards. In Iowa, Oklahoma, and South Dakota the drive for higher standards is definitely under way and leaders in those states believe they will shortly be added to the great majority. When this is accomplished only a small group of states in the solid South and Maryland and the District of Columbia will remain as black spots on an otherwise white map.

California was the only one of the states acting to raise its requirements during the past year which used the legislative route. An act sponsored by the state bar association was passed in modified form providing that students beginning their law study after July 1, 1937, were required to have completed two years of pre-legal college work unless they had reached the age of twenty-five before beginning the study of law. As to the latter type of candidates there are no requirements whatsoever of general education. This measure was obviously the result of compromise in order to get the bill through and well illustrates one of the disadvantages of resorting to legislation. A further interesting section of the law provides that the applicant shall have passed, during the period of his law study, such preliminary examinations as may be required by the examining committee, "provided, however, that this requirement shall not apply to students of law schools accredited by the examining committee." Under this rule the bar examiners have exempted from the first-year examination students of those schools which have a percentage of success of thirty per cent or more for its applicants taking the bar examination for the first time during the preceding three years. The committee plans to gradually increase this percentage. The last report of the committee of bar examiners shows that seven California schools are under this percentage. Students not passing the first-year examinations will not receive credit for any law study subsequent to the first year until they have passed it. Obviously such a provision will constitute a very considerable deterrent to schools which fall below the required average. Students cannot be expected to welcome the prospect of two bar examinations instead of one and will naturally avoid schools where this burden will be placed upon them. Office students will also have to take and pass the first-year examination which will undoubtedly demonstrate to them that this method of preparation for the bar is very unsatisfactory and completely out of date. While intermediate examinations have been given by boards of bar examiners from time to time in other states, the results have been purely advisory and this is the first instance where such an examination must be passed as a preliminary to further law study. Its results will be watched with interest by all those who follow developments in this field.

The new Nebraska rules, which were promulgated on June 5, 1937, by the Supreme Court, provide for two years of pre-legal college education, and require that, where law school study is depended upon to qualify for the bar examinations, it must be pursued in a school approved by the American Bar Association. Until July 1, 1940, students from local law schools approved by the Supreme Court may take the bar examinations. Under the new rules, law office study is still permissible in Nebraska, but is subject to rigorous restrictions including intermediate examinations given at least once a year. The minimum period of law study is three years and where credit for law school work is sought by a student who has not graduated, he is required to show successful completion of ninety per cent of the credit hours necessary for graduation and must take at least four months' additional study either in a law school or as a registered office student.

REQUIREMENTS OF ATTENDANCE AT APPROVED SCHOOL

The action of the Arizona Supreme Court in requiring graduation from a school approved by the American Bar Association was foreshadowed when the State Board of Arizona directed its Board of Governors last year to draw such a rule and submit it to the Court, which approved the rule on December 11, 1937. The trend toward similar requirements in many other states has already been mentioned. Although New Mexico is the only other state and Hawaii the only territory where graduation from such a school is required, there are thirteen other jurisdictions (as shown by the table on page 28) where a similar result is approximated by a refusal to recognize law school study unless pursued in a school approved by the American Bar Association or having similar standards. In the past there has been a tendency to exempt local law schools from such conditions where their influence with the court or with the bar examiners was sufficient to bring this about. There are five states where the rules as to study in an A.B.A. approved school apply to all out-of-state schools, but make an exception in reference to local institutions.

The great importance of this development in admission requirements cannot be exaggerated. Ninety-seven out of 185 law schools listed in this Review are now on the approved list of the American Bar Association and they contain sixty-one per cent of the total number of law school students. With the increasing availability of approved schools, bar admission authorities are beginning to realize that there is no longer any excuse for countenancing inferior legal education. The result is that inferior schools are being forced to improve or to close their doors, and inferior students are being forced to seek states where the requirements are still low. This should speed the entire process as no bar is willing to see itself become a dumping ground for low-grade material from other states.

OTHER CHANGES IN ADMISSION RULES

Florida was the only state to increase the length of the period of law study and it did so by rule of its Supreme Court recently prescribed, which sets forth a requirement of three years in place of a previous lack of any requirement at all on this subject. Even this step, which was recommended by the American Bar Association fully forty years ago, was taken somewhat hesitatingly, if we are able to judge from the exceptions made in favor of college graduates who need only study law for a year and a half.

Some other minor changes in the requirements of general education and legal training were made during the past year. New York now requires four years of part-time study in place of three and the Illinois rule, which sets forth the total number of classroom hours and the number which may be taken in one year, makes it impossible to finish a part-time course in less than three years and a half. Connecticut will no longer accept an equivalent for two years of college education and Tennessee has eliminated the "equivalent of" a high school education. North Carolina has more carefully defined, for its students who are still qualifying under the old rules, what it means by the equivalent of high school education. In Idaho there has been a more careful definition of office study. As for changes in bar examination machinery, Delaware has dropped from two examinations to one, and in other states there have been some changes in examination dates, in registration rules, in fees, and in the length, duration and subject matter of the examinations. There have been some changes in reference to rules regulating admission of foreign attorneys, the principal ones relating to the adoption of an improved method of investigation of the record and character of this type of applicant.

CHARACTER INVESTIGATION OF FOREIGN ATTORNEYS

Mention has been made in previous Annual Reviews of the work of The National Conference of Bar Examiners which was organized under the auspices of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association in 1931. Three years ago the Conference began the investigation of the record and reputation of attorneys seeking admission in one state on the basis of a period of previous practice in another. This was first done for the state of California which previously had had a large annual influx of lawyers from other states. This service is performed for a fee of \$25 for each applicant investigated, and this cost is passed on to the applicant either in the form of an increased admission charge or by requiring him to make this payment direct to the Conference. This investigation work has gradually increased until now it is a major part of the Conference program. Over seven hundred such investigations have been completed and

twenty-three states subscribe regularly to this service. Until the rest of the states also make an equally thorough examination, there will still be a loophole for the irresponsible type of attorney whose record such an investigation invariably reveals. The following states now use the service of the Conference in this respect:

Alabama	New York
Arizona	North Carolina
California	Ohio
Delaware	Oklahoma
Florida	Oregon
Indiana	Pennsylvania
Maine	Texas
Minnesota	Utah
Missouri	Vermont
Nebraska	Washington
Nevada	West Virginia
New Mexico	

The value of a nation-wide investigation service of this kind can hardly be exaggerated. The experience of the Conference shows that there is a considerable percentage of these foreign attorneys, in some states as high as ten per cent, whose character as illustrated by their previous practice is not such as to warrant their admission in a new jurisdiction. However, as long as there are some places where they can go and be admitted merely by presenting a certificate from a judge and several attorneys, the bar against them is necessarily not as effective as it might be otherwise. The most important work which any board of admissions can perform is to exclude those of doubtful character. The difficulty has always been to get the facts. The National Conference of Bar Examiners reports the reputation of each foreign attorney in the communities where he has practiced, and this information is obtained through the cooperation of the local bar. Where the record appears doubtful, personal investigators are employed. Thus a full and comprehensive report is made available to the examining authorities. Both the public and the members of the bar in every state are entitled to the protection which such a thorough investigation affords against itinerant lawyers with tarnished ethics.

The following grouping of states according to their admission requirements indicates the rules which are in effect either presently or prospectively and which apply to substantially all applicants for admission in a particular state:

REQUIREMENTS OF GENERAL EDUCATION

Group 1: 28 states requiring two years of college or its equivalent before law study.

Alabama	Michigan	Ohio
Arizona	Minnesota	Oregon
Colorado	Missouri	Pennsylvania ⁴
Connecticut	Montana	Rhode Island
Delaware ¹	Nebraska	Texas
Hawaii	New Hampshire	Utah
Illinois	New Jersey	Vermont
Indiana ²	New Mexico	Washington
Kansas ³	New York	West Virginia
Massachusetts	North Carolina	

Group 2: 7 states requiring two years of college or its equivalent before admission but not necessarily before law study.

Idaho	North Dakota	Wisconsin
Maine	Virginia	Wyoming
Nevada		

Group 3: 1 state requiring two years of college before law study unless the applicant had reached the age of twenty-five before beginning such study.

California

Group 4: 4 states requiring high school education or its equivalent before law study.

Maryland	Oklahoma	Tennessee
	South Carolina	

Group 5: 7 states requiring high school education or its equivalent before admission but not necessarily before law study.

District of Columbia	Iowa	Mississippi
Florida	Kentucky	South Dakota
	Louisiana	

Group 6: 2 states with no educational requirements.

Arkansas
Georgia

¹ Requires before law study a college degree or passage of a general educational examination on certain specified subjects conducted by the University of Delaware.

² Except as to office students.

³ Effective July 1, 1940, college degree required from all students. For those qualifying by law school study, it may be earned by 3 years college in a combined course followed by 4 years law school or by 4 years college if followed by 3 years law school.

⁴ Requires before law study a college degree or passage of a general educational examination independently conducted by the College Board for the State Board of Law Examiners.

REQUIREMENTS OF LEGAL EDUCATION

Group 1: 40 states requiring a minimum of three years of legal training.

Alabama ¹	Louisiana	North Dakota
Arizona ²	Maine ⁷	Ohio ¹⁰
California	Maryland	Oklahoma
Colorado	Massachusetts	Oregon ¹¹
Connecticut ³	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Delaware ³	Minnesota ³	Rhode Island ³
District of Columbia	Missouri	South Dakota ¹²
Florida ⁴	Nebraska ³	Utah ³
Idaho ³	Nevada	Vermont ³
Hawaii ²	New Hampshire	Washington ⁷
Illinois	New Jersey	West Virginia ¹³
Indiana ⁵	New Mexico ²	Wisconsin ³
Iowa	New York ⁷	Wyoming ³
Kansas ⁶	North Carolina ⁹	

Group 2: 6 states requiring at least two years of legal training.

Kentucky	South Carolina	Texas ¹⁴
Montana	Tennessee	Virginia

Group 3: 3 states with no definite period of legal training.

Arkansas	Georgia	Mississippi
----------	---------	-------------

¹ Requires three years of study at a school approved by the American Bar Association or four years at an unapproved school.

² Graduation from a school approved by the American Bar Association is required.

³ Candidates qualifying for the bar examination by law school study must pursue their studies in a school approved by the American Bar Association.

⁴ Graduates of approved colleges or universities are required to have only one and one-half years of law study.

⁵ Candidates qualifying for the bar examination by law school study must pursue their studies in a school having standards similar to those of the American Bar Association.

⁶ After July 1, 1940, law degree required from all students qualifying by law school study (either 3 years of law school study following 4 years of college or 4 years of law school study following 3 years of college).

⁷ List of approved out-of-state law schools at present time corresponds with approved list of American Bar Association.

⁸ List of approved out-of-state law schools at present time corresponds with membership list of Association of American Law Schools.

⁹ List of approved law schools at present time corresponds with approved list of American Bar Association.

¹⁰ Law study must be pursued at a school approved by the League of Ohio Law Schools or by the American Bar Association.

¹¹ Law study must be pursued at a school approved by the Supreme Court. List of approved out-of-state law schools at present time corresponds substantially with approved list of American Bar Association.

¹² Candidates qualifying for the bar examination by law school study must pursue their studies in a school approved by the American Bar Association or belonging to the Association of American Law Schools.

¹³ Law study must be pursued at a school approved by the American Bar Association or belonging to the Association of American Law Schools.

¹⁴ 27 months.

REQUIREMENTS AS TO LAW SCHOOL STUDY IN APPROVED SCHOOLS

States requiring graduation from a school approved by American Bar Association.

Arizona	Hawaii	New Mexico
---------	--------	------------

State requiring three years of study in an A. B. A. approved law school.
West Virginia

States recognizing law school study as qualifying for the bar examinations only when pursued in a school approved by the American Bar Association.

Connecticut	Indiana	South Dakota	Wisconsin
Delaware	Nebraska	Utah	Wyoming
Idaho	Rhode Island	Vermont	

States recognizing law school study only when pursued in a school which is approved by the Supreme Court and which approved list at the present time corresponds with the approved list of the American Bar Association.

North Carolina

States recognizing law school study only when pursued in a school approved by the Supreme Court or other state agency, where list of approved out-of-state schools at the present time corresponds with the approved list of the American Bar Association.

Maine	New York	Ohio	Washington
-------	----------	------	------------

State recognizing law school study only when pursued in a school approved by the Supreme Court, where list of approved out-of-state schools at the present time corresponds with the membership list of the Association of American Law Schools. (All members of the Association of American Law Schools are approved by the American Bar Association except the University of Philippines.)

Minnesota

State requiring three years of law study at a school approved by the Supreme Court, where list of approved out-of-state schools at the present time corresponds substantially with the approved list of the American Bar Association.

Oregon

State requiring three years of law study at a school approved by the American Bar Association or four years at an unapproved school.

Alabama

CHANGES IN THE LAW SCHOOLS

Law school attendance in the autumn of 1937 again suffered a decline, the decrease this year being two per cent as contrasted with a decrease of four per cent last year. Total registrations in the fall of 1937 amounted to 39,255, a figure which is still nearly a thousand greater than the depression low of 38,260, reached in 1932. The decrease was practically uniform in approved schools and in unapproved schools, but total figures show that with the addition of three approved schools to the list, the total attendance at this type of institution increased nine per cent over 1936 and now accounts for sixty-one per cent of the total law school enrollment.

The total number of law schools has decreased from 190 to 185¹ but this does not account for any substantial portion of the reduction in attendance since the law schools which ceased to operate had only small student bodies while in cases of merger the old students are retained. The first-year class, which declined from 16,107 in 1935 to 15,102 in 1936, suffered a further decline in the current year to 14,312. A further decrease may be expected next year as several more important jurisdictions start the effective period of their present requirements of two years of college education before the beginning of law study. The two years of decreasing law school attendance has as yet had no effect upon the total number of new admissions to the bar, which during 1937 amounted to 8,934, an increase of 300 over 1936 and only slightly less than the total in 1935. The percentage of those passing the bar examinations increased two per cent to forty-eight per cent.

Ninety-seven schools are now on the approved list of the American Bar Association. Three were added to this list in 1937, provisional approval having been given to the University of Santa Clara, College of Law, Santa Clara, California, The Brooklyn Law School of St. Lawrence University, New York City, and St. John's University, School of Law, New York City. All but nine of these approved schools are members of the Association of American Law Schools, including Boston College Law School, The Hartford College of Law, Loyola University School of Law (Los Angeles), the University of Buffalo School of Law and the University of San Francisco School of Law which were elected to membership in the Association at the annual meeting last December.

¹ Change in the number of law schools is accounted for as follows: (1) The following schools have been eliminated from last year's list: Central University Law School, Chicago, Illinois; Abraham Lincoln University, Department of Law, Indianapolis, Indiana; Y.M.C.A. St. Joseph Law School, St. Joseph, Missouri; Benton College of Law, St. Louis, Missouri; Rio Grande Valley School of Law, Harlingen, Texas; The Longview Night Law School, Longview, Texas; and The San Antonio Public School of Law, San Antonio, Texas; (2) The following schools have been added to last year's list: Southern University College of Law, Miami, Fla.; and National College of Law and Commerce, Nashville, Tenn.

The number of full-time schools listed is 84, the number of mixed schools giving full-time and part-time instruction is 36, and the number of part-time schools is 65. This compares with 83 full-time schools, 34 mixed schools, and 73 part-time schools included in the Annual Review last year.

The number of schools demanding a degree for admission in all cases has been increased to seven by the addition of George Washington University Law School.² The number which have increased their entrance requirements from two to three years of college is now 32,³ three schools,⁴ having changed from two to three years in 1937, and the number of schools requiring a minimum of two years of college, as listed in the following pages, is 105, eight more than last year. Three schools now require one year of college and thirty-eight demand only high school graduation or less for admission.

There are now only five schools giving less than a three-year law course; four of these give a two-year course and one of them retains a one-year course.

The University of Washington School of Law has announced a full four-year law course for next year. A four-year course is also given at the University of Minnesota Law School. At the University of Chicago the law course is four years except for students who present a degree for admission, in which case they may finish in three years. The option of a four-year pre-legal and a three-year law course or vice versa for a total of seven years is offered at Northwestern and Stanford. At Louisiana State University the option is given of a 3-3 or a 2-4 plan.

Tuition fees have again shown a marked increase, thirty schools having announced such advances.

ADVANCED LEGAL EDUCATION

Of considerable long-run significance are current efforts of the American Bar Association to furnish practicing lawyers with information designed to bring them abreast of current developments both in new and old fields of law. The movement is showing tremendous vitality because of the desire which exists in so many practitioners to go back to school again and review and renew their contacts with legal education. This desire can only be satisfied by bringing the school to the lawyers and by organizing separate lectures and courses where authoritative lecturers, both teachers and lawyers, treat

² The other six schools are: U. of California, Yale, Georgetown U., Harvard, U. of Pennsylvania and U. of Pittsburgh.

³ U. of Southern California, Stanford, U. of Santa Clara, U. of Colorado, Catholic U. of America, U. of Denver, U. of Florida, U. of Illinois, Loyola U. at Chicago, Northwestern, Notre Dame, Indiana U., U. of Iowa, U. of Kansas, Washburn, U. of Michigan, Creighton U., Cornell, Columbia, Syracuse, U. of North Carolina, Duke, U. of Cincinnati, Ohio State, Western Reserve, U. of Oklahoma, Dickinson, William and Mary, U. of Washington, West Virginia U., U. of Wisconsin, Marquette.

⁴ Creighton U., U. of Cincinnati and Ohio State.

with subjects which form a part of the ordinary work of the general practitioner.

There are several different forms in which this has been done. For years many bar associations have tried to have on their meeting programs some speeches or lectures from which their hearers might derive practical benefit. It is only comparatively recently, however, that these efforts have assumed a particular form or had any real significance.

One of these forms is the so-called legal institute, the first of which was organized by the Cleveland Bar Association in that city in 1931 with Dean Roscoe Pound as the speaker. This short series of talks on equity was extremely successful with the result that the idea spread and the number of institutes grew. Usually they consist of three lectures on successive days on some subject of current importance in the law, by an authority in that branch. The institutes in the larger cities have been organized and financed by the local bar associations. The best lecturers available have been drafted to deliver these lectures and they have been given substantial compensation, which has been financed by a small admission charge. Ten of these institutes have been given in different cities during the past year and have become a permanent part of the program of these local associations.

A somewhat similar development is found in the practicing law courses, started in New York several years ago and now being carried on by various agencies in half a dozen other cities. These courses put the emphasis on the practical side and although primarily designed to give the young practitioner information he did not get in law school, also usually include some specialist topics.

Both of these developments are found principally in the larger cities. Their success has stirred the imaginations of some of the more active state bar associations, which are cooperating with law school faculties to encourage the smaller associations in their states to undertake programs of this kind. Subjects are suggested and speakers are furnished by the state associations, when desired.

These movements have been paralleling each other and their success means that this entire field of advanced legal education lies open and ready for intensive cultivation. The Section of Legal Education of the American Bar Association is organizing, encouraging, coordinating, and publicizing efforts which are being made in these directions with full recognition of the fact that if the public is to be faithfully and efficiently served, the lawyer's education must be a continuing process throughout his professional life.¹

¹ For further information in reference to this movement, see also 62 Rep. A. B. A. (1937) 964, 981; 22 A. B. A. Jour. (April, 1936) 231; 23 Ibid. (Oct., 1937) 777; 24 Ibid. (Jan., 1938) 11; (Mar., 1938) 200, 221, 248; (May, 1938) 345, 402.

LIST OF LAW SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1937-38

The following list of residential law schools is not a selected list of recognized institutions, nor is it confined to law schools chartered by their respective states or having degree-conferring privileges. It includes all residential law schools concerning which information was available, having more than ten students, giving a definite curriculum and teaching regular classes. Schools with less than eleven students were eliminated by reason of the fact that necessarily their existence with such an enrollment must be exceedingly precarious. In addition some law classes have been omitted, even though dignified by the name of a law school, where information has been received showing that there is no substantial equipment and the courses are conducted primarily by one man who gives part-time instruction to a few students. Delaware, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, Rhode Island and Vermont have no law schools and are therefore not mentioned in the following pages.

Symbols

The symbols used in Annual Reviews previously published are again employed. The roman numerals on the right-hand margin of each page following the name of the school, e. g., "II," indicate the minimum number of years of college preparation or their alleged equivalent required for admission to the school as a regular student, according to its own statement or its catalog. If these are preceded by an asterisk, college graduation is required. If no roman numerals appear after the name of the school, it does not require any college work for admission. As to such schools, no attempt has been made to indicate whether or not they require high school graduation.

Following the roman numerals is a letter to indicate the time when instruction in the school is given. The letter M denotes that classes are held preponderantly in the morning or early afternoon at such times as to pre-empt a large share of the working hours of the day. These are generally referred to as full-time classes, in contrast with those held principally at other times, which are called part-time. The letter A denotes that classes are held in the late afternoon from four o'clock on, and the letter E signifies that classes are held in the evening. Where more than one of these symbols appear, separate divisions of the school are held at the times indicated.

Following these capital letters is an arabic numeral, from 1 to 5, indicating the length of the law school course in years. In some instances where the sessions of the school are held continuously through the summer without vacation, a course occupying three calendar years has been designated by a "4," indicating that the course given is equivalent to four academic years. If this numeral is in (parenthesis), it means that the interval between entrance and

graduation in the school so designated can be shortened by attendance at the local summer session.

Where these symbols are enclosed in [brackets] this indicates the school does not confer degrees. In all other cases a degree is conferred.

Hours of Classroom Instruction and Length of Course

Below the symbols is a statement of the average number of hours of classroom instruction per week during the entire course which each student is obliged to take. This has been arrived at by dividing the number of semester hours required for graduation by the number of semesters, fractions less than one-third having been generally disregarded.

No attempt has been made to indicate the number of weeks in the school year except where the year extends beyond forty weeks. It is thus true that the number of classroom hours per week will not always be an absolutely accurate measure of comparison between schools, as the amount of classroom instruction may vary from thirty weeks in one school to forty in another.

Approval by American Bar and American Law School Associations

Below this designation of hours is a date preceded by the letter "s" indicating the year when the school became a member of the Association of American Law Schools, or the letter "c" indicating the year when the school was added to the approved list of the American Bar Association. This information is accurate as of January 1, 1938.

Fees and Attendance Figures

The fees listed include all regular annual tuition charges for students taking the full course plus special additional charges which need only be paid once, such as those for matriculation and for a degree.

Attendance figures are given by classes wherever that information is known and are shown in the order indicated by the small legend placed at the top of each page.

Listed Entrance Requirements Only Presumptive

The figures and information concerning each school are those furnished by the school authorities or obtained from its catalog. Particularly in reference to entrance requirements, there is no indication as to the strictness with which the provisions set forth are enforced or as to the extent to which exceptions are made to the announced requirements. The symbols only measure the extent of the "prima facie compliance" of each law school with the standards of the American Bar Association in reference to entrance requirements, type of school and length of course.

**LAW SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES ON THE APPROVED LIST
OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, 1937-38**

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

ALABAMA

Tuscaloosa	University of Alabama, School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$136.50; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 85 85 74 — — — Total 244</i>	c, 1926 s, 1928

ARIZONA

Tucson	University of Arizona, College of Law	II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$100 for residents, \$300 for non-residents;</i>	Hrs. 13
	<i>Degree, \$15 (unless candidate has received a</i>	c, 1930
	<i>previous degree at the University)</i>	s, 1931
	<i>Attendance: 49 31 22 — 1 1 Total 104</i>	

ARKANSAS

Fayetteville	University of Arkansas, School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$115 for residents, \$145 for non-residents;</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>Degree, \$10</i>	c, 1926
	<i>Attendance: 43 32 35 — — 4 Total 114</i>	s, 1927

CALIFORNIA

Berkeley	University of California, School of Jurisprudence	*IV M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$106 for residents, \$231 for</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>non-residents</i>	s, 1912
	<i>Attendance: 155 73 67 — 4 — Total 299</i>	c, 1923

Los Angeles	Loyola University, School of Law	II M3, II E(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$260 for Day students; \$210 for Evening</i>	Hrs. M 14
	<i>students; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15</i>	E 10
	<i>Attendance: Morning 18 13 12 — — — Total 43</i>	c, 1935
	<i>Evening 35 21 8 8 — — Total 72</i>	s, 1937
	<i>Total 53 34 20 8 — — Total 115</i>	

	University of Southern California School of Law	III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$300; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 13
	<i>Attendance: 113 83 78 — 3 5 Total 282</i>	s, 1907 c, 1924

**LAW SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES NOT ON THE APPROVED LIST
OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, 1937-38**

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

ALABAMA

Birmingham	Birmingham School of Law	¹ E4 Hrs. 11½
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$112; Degree, \$7.50</i>	
	<i>Attendance: 27 11 17 13 — 3 Total 71</i>	
Montgomery	Jones University, The School of Law	^{II} E4 Hrs. 5 ²
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$120; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	
	<i>Attendance: 9 9 7 4 — 17 Total 46</i>	

ARKANSAS

Little Rock	Arkansas Law School	E3 ³ Hrs. 16
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$155; Degree, \$10</i>	
	<i>Attendance: 32 20 — — — 3 Total 55</i>	

CALIFORNIA

Long Beach	Southwestern University, School of Law, Long Beach Branch	⁴ II E4 Hrs. 10
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$180; Degree, \$15</i>	
	<i>Attendance: 11 14 3 4 — — Total 32</i>	
Los Angeles	American University, College of Law	⁵ II M(3), ^{II} E(4) Hrs. M 16 E 7
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$187.50 for Day students, \$115.50 for Evening students</i>	
	<i>Attendance: Morning 3 7 6 — — — Total 16</i>	
	<i>Evening 8 3 18 7 2 — Total 38</i>	
	<i>Total 11 10 24 7 2 — Total 54</i>	
	California Associated Colleges, Welch College of Law	⁵ II M(3) ⁶ , ⁵ II E(4) ⁶ Hrs. 8
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$184 for Day students, \$136 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$8; Diploma, \$15.</i>	
	<i>Attendance: Morning 4 — 1 — — — Total 5</i>	
	<i>Evening 23 11 9 6 2 — Total 51</i>	
	<i>Total 27 11 10 6 2 — Total 56</i>	
	Metropolitan University, Law College	⁵ II M(4), ⁵ II E(4) Hrs. 9
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$145 for Day students, \$126 for Evening students; Degree, \$15</i>	
	<i>Attendance: Morning — — — 7 — — Total 7</i>	
	<i>Evening — 15 10 1 — 1 Total 27</i>	
	<i>Total — 15 10 8 — 1 Total 34</i>	

¹ Candidates for degree must have two years of college work.

² School year is 46 weeks.

³ The three-year course was initiated in September, 1937.

⁴ Applicants over twenty-five years of age not having two years of pre-legal college education or equivalent may be admitted as special students without limitation of numbers at the discretion of the dean.

⁵ Students who have reached the age of twenty-five years before beginning the study of law are not required to have two years of pre-legal college education.

⁶ Three years of college or equivalent required for graduation.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

CALIFORNIA—(Continued)

Palo Alto	Stanford University, School of Law	*IV M(3) or ¹ III M(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$360; Application, \$5</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>Attendance: 80 47 39 5 2 4 Total 177</i>	s, 1901
		c, 1923
San Francisco	University of San Francisco, The School of Law	III M3, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$186; Matriculation, \$2</i>	Hrs. M 13½
	<i>Attendance: Morning 17 16 17 — — — Total 50</i>	E 10
	<i>Evening 20 22 16 11 1 — Total 70</i>	c, 1935
	<i>Total 37 38 33 11 1 — Total 120</i>	s, 1937
Santa Clara	University of Santa Clara, College of Law	III M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$280; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 12
	<i>Attendance: 20 11 10 — — — Total 41</i>	c, 1937 ²

¹ For students taking an approved combined course in this or another University.

² Provisionally approved.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

37

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

CALIFORNIA—(Continued)

Los Angeles	Pacific Coast University, College of Law	¹ II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$175; Degree, \$20</i>	Hrs. 9
	<i>Attendance: 5 10 4 4 — — Total 23</i>	
	Southwestern University, School of Law	² II M3, ² II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$240 for Day students, \$180 for Evening students; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. M 13½
	<i>Attendance: Morning 26 31 33 — — — Total 90</i>	E 10
	<i>Evening 43 42 41 28 2 9 Total 165</i>	
	<i>Total 69 73 74 28 2 9 Total 255</i>	
	University of the West, Los Angeles College of Law ³	M(3), E(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$197 for Day students, \$150 for Evening students; Graduation, \$25</i>	M 13½
	<i>Attendance (1936): Total 71</i>	E 10
Oakland	The Oakland College of Law	⁴ II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$160; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 6
	<i>Attendance: 27 10 15 12 — — Total 64</i>	
Sacramento	McGeorge College of Law	¹ II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$130; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 8
	<i>Attendance: 8 18 3 9 — 2 Total 40</i>	
San Diego	Balboa Law College	⁵ E4 ⁶
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$100</i>	Hrs. 7½
	<i>Attendance: 16 14 8 5 — — Total 43</i>	
San Francisco	Hastings College of the Law (affiliated college of University of California)	II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$110</i>	Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 98 55 58 — — — Total 211</i>	s, 1901—16; 1920—27
	Golden Gate College, School of Law (Y. M. C. A.)	II E5 ⁷
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$128.50</i>	Hrs. 9
	<i>Attendance: 24 9 15 4 — — Total 52</i>	
	Lincoln University, The Law School	¹ M3, ¹ E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$200 for Day students, \$150 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. M 12
	<i>Attendance: Morning 6 — — — — — Total 6</i>	E 7½
	<i>Evening 9 12 14 6 — — Total 41</i>	
	<i>Total 15 12 14 6 — — Total 47</i>	
	San Francisco Law School	II E(4) ⁸
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$178.50; Matriculation, \$10; Degree or Certificate, \$10</i>	Hrs. 9
	<i>Attendance: 42 39 29 19 5 6 Total 140</i>	

¹ Same as note 5 on page 35.

² Same as note 4 on page 35.

³ No information received. Information given is that appearing in 1936 Annual Review.

⁴ Students who have reached the age of twenty-five years before beginning the study of law are not required to have two years of pre-legal college education unless they are candidates for a degree.

⁵ Two years of college education are required of candidates for a degree.

⁶ A four-year course may be completed, under certain conditions in three years.

⁷ So credited because the academic year extends through the summer.

⁸ The school year extends over an average period of 42 weeks.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

COLORADO		
Boulder	University of Colorado, School of Law Fees: Annual, \$117.50 for residents, \$165.50 for non-residents; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 50 20 34 — 1 — Total 105	III M(3) Hrs. 13 s, 1901 c, 1923
Denver	University of Denver, School of Law Fees: Annual, \$228 for college graduates, \$246.50 for non-graduates; Degree, \$12 Attendance: 32 33 15 — — — Total 80	III M3 Hrs. 14 s, 1901-21; 1929 c, 1928
CONNECTICUT		
Hartford	The Hartford College of Law Fees: Annual, \$250 for Morning students, \$200 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$15 Attendance: Morning 22 18 15 — — — Total 55 Evening 30 26 17 24 — 1 Total 98 Total 52 44 32 24 — 1 Total 153	II M3, II E4 Hrs. M 13 E 8 c, 1933 s, 1937
New Haven	Yale University, The School of Law Fees: Annual, \$460; Degree, \$20 Attendance: 121 136 122 — 14 — Total 393	*IV M3 Hrs. 13 s, 1900 c, 1923
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
Washington	The Catholic University of America, The School of Law Fees: Annual, \$375 for students residing on the campus, \$360 for Day students; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 20 10 8 — 48 5 Total 91	*III M3 Hrs. 12½ s, 1921 c, 1925
	Georgetown University, The School of Law Fees: Annual, \$305 for Morning students, \$205 for Afternoon students; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$15 Attendance: Morning 47 61 58 — — — Total 166 Afternoon 132 146 104 74 57 3 Total 516 Total 179 207 162 74 57 3 Total 682	*IV M3, *IV A4 Hrs. M 13½ A 10 s, 1902-07; 1925 c, 1925
	The George Washington University Law School Fees: Annual, \$240 for Morning students, \$176 for Afternoon students; Degree, \$20 Attendance: Morning 55 37 17 — 1 — Total 110 Afternoon 388 265 176 — 23 14 Total 866 Total 443 302 193 — 24 14 Total 976	*IV M(3), *IV A(4) Hrs. M 13½ A 10 s, 1900 c, 1925
	Howard University School of Law (Colored) Fees: Annual, \$134.50; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$7 Attendance: 28 25 17 — — 5 Total 75	II M3 Hrs. 12½ s, 1931 c, 1931

¹ College degree required except for students taking the combined course in this University. Beginning in September, 1938, a degree will be required of all students.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

39

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

COLORADO

Denver	Westminster Law School	II E3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$150; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$20</i>	Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 36 26 13 — — 5 Total 80</i>	

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington	Columbus University, School of Law	E3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$120</i>	Hrs. 11
	<i>Attendance: 340 233 196 — 44 — Total 813</i>	
	National University School of Law	E(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$166.50 for LL.B., \$198 for J.D.; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 12
	<i>Attendance: 349 270 286 — 58 — Total 963</i>	
	Southeastern University, School of Law	M3, A3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$103 for first semester, \$123 for each of remaining 5 semesters; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 12
	<i>Attendance: Morning 23 14 12 — — — Total 49</i>	
	<i>Early Morn.</i>	
	<i>& Late Aft. 238 192 133 — 28 — Total 591</i>	
	<i>Total 261 206 145 — 28 — Total 640</i>	
	The Robert H. Terrell Law School (Colored)	E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$85; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 10
	<i>Attendance: 44 29 15 13 — 2 Total 103</i>	
	Washington College of Law	M3, A3, E3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$145; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 11½
	<i>Attendance: Morning 27 17 18 — — 1 Total 63</i>	
	<i>Aft. & Eve. 143 147 109 — 16 9 Total 424</i>	
	<i>Total 170 164 127 — 16 10 Total 487</i>	

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

FLORIDA

DeLand	John B. Stetson University, College of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$210; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 16 19 18 — — — Total 53</i>	c, 1930
		s, 1931
Gainesville	University of Florida, College of Law	¹ III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$79.15 for residents, \$179.15 for non-residents; Degree, \$5</i>	Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 68 37 30 — — — Total 135</i>	s, 1920
		c, 1924

GEORGIA

Athens	The University of Georgia, School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$163 for residents, \$263 for non-residents</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>Attendance: 47 34 32 — — 2 Total 115</i>	c, 1929
		s, 1931
Atlanta	Emory University, The Lamar School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$225; Matriculation, \$5</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>Attendance: 20 18 12 — — — Total 50</i>	s, 1920
		c, 1923
Macon	Mercer University, Law School (Mercer Law School)	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$234</i>	Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 17 8 5 — — — Total 30</i>	s, 1923
		c, 1925

IDAHO

Moscow	The University of Idaho, The College of Law	II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$44 for residents, \$104 for non-residents; Degree, \$5</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>Attendance: 19 15 12 — — — Total 46</i>	s, 1914
		c, 1925

ILLINOIS

Chicago	Chicago-Kent College of Law	II M(3), II A(4), II E(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$181 for those completing the course in three years; regular students pay \$7.00 per semester hour; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. for 3 year course, 12½; for 4 year course, 9½
	<i>Attendance: Entering class Morning 54, Afternoon & Eve. 70, Total 124; 11 graduates; 387 others; Total 522</i>	c, 1936 ²
	De Paul University, College of Law	II M(3), II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$240 for Day students, \$175 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. M 13½
	<i>Attendance: Morning 122 68 134 — — 66 Total 390</i>	E 9
	<i>Evening 80 43 52 74 — — Total 249</i>	s, 1902-06; 1924
	<i>Total 202 111 186 74 — 66 Total 639</i>	c, 1925

¹ College degree required except for students taking the combined course in this University.

² Provisionally approved.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

41

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

FLORIDA

Jacksonville	Jacksonville Law School	E3 ¹
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$120; Diploma, \$10</i>	Hrs. 4½
	<i>Attendance: 15 8 7 — — — Total 30</i>	
Miami	Southern University, College of Law	E3½
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$192; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 9
	<i>Attendance: 15 5 — — — — Total 20</i>	
	University of Miami, Inc., School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$228; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 14½
	<i>Attendance: 29 19 19 — — 10 Total 77</i>	

GEORGIA

Atlanta	Atlanta Law School	E(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$110; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 10
	<i>Attendance: 52 46 36 — — — Total 134</i>	
	Woodrow Wilson College of Law	A2 ² , E2 ²
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$135; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 8
	<i>Attendance: 72 50 — — 15 5 Total 142</i>	

ILLINOIS

Chicago	The John Marshall Law School	II A3½, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, Afternoon, \$155; Evening, \$140; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. A 10
	<i>Attendance: Afternoon 70 37 12 — — — Total 119</i>	E9
	<i>Evening 67 123 115 — 32 69³ Total 406</i>	
	<i>Total 137 160 127 — 32 69 Total 525</i>	

¹ Thirty months.

² The regular two-year course continues for thirty-six weeks during the first year and forty-six weeks during the second year. It may be completed in one year under certain conditions.

³ This includes 57 registrants in a practicing lawyers class.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

ILLINOIS—(Continued)

Chicago	Loyola University, School of Law		III M3, III E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$240 for Day students, \$180 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15</i>		Hrs. M 13 ½ E 10
	<i>Attendance: Morning 19 24 33 — — — Total 76</i>		s, 1924
	<i>Evening 45 44 40 37 — 6 Total 172</i>		c, 1925
	<i>Total 64 68 73 37 — 6 Total 248</i>		
	Northwestern University, School of Law		III M(3) or *IV M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$408; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$20</i>		or III M(4)
	<i>Attendance: 101 65 88 — 7 1 Total 262</i>		Hrs. 14
			s, 1900
			c, 1923
	The University of Chicago, The Law School		IV M3 or II M4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$381; Degree, \$20</i>		Hrs. 12 ½
	<i>Attendance: 136 75 71 — 1 2 Total 285</i>		s, 1902
			c, 1923
Urbana	University of Illinois, College of Law		¹ III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$100 for residents, \$150 for non-residents; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i>		Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 117 85 66 — — 2 Total 270</i>		s, 1900
			c, 1923

INDIANA

Bloomington	Indiana University, School of Law		² III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$92 for residents, \$200 for non-residents; Degree, \$5</i>		Hrs. 13
	<i>Attendance: 68 49 51 — 3 — Total 171</i>		s, 1900
			c, 1923
Indianapolis	Indiana Law School		II M3, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$150 for Day students, \$112.50 for Evening students; Degree, \$10</i>		Hrs. M 14 E 10
	<i>Attendance: Morning 12 22 37 — — 1 Total 72</i>		c, 1936 ³
	<i>Evening 24 16 80 — — 6 Total 126</i>		
	<i>Total 36 38 117 — 17 7 Total 215</i>		
Notre Dame	The University of Notre Dame, The College of Law		III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$300; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i>		Hrs. 12 ½
	<i>Attendance: 41 28 46 — — 2 Total 117</i>		s, 1924
			c, 1925
Valparaiso	Valparaiso University, The School of Law		II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$193; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>		Hrs. 12 ½
	<i>Attendance: 7 14 10 — — 1 Total 32</i>		c, 1929
			s, 1930

¹ College degree required except for students taking the combined course in this University.

² Pre-law work must comply with certain prescribed standards.

³ Provisionally approved.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

43

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

ILLINOIS—(Continued)

Springfield	Lincoln College of Law	II E(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$130; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 9½
	<i>Attendance: 23 19 12 14 — — Total 68</i>	

INDIANA

South Bend	South Bend University Law School	II E4 ¹
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$150; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$20</i>	Hrs. 11
	<i>Attendance: — — — — — 12 Total 12</i>	

¹ Degree granted to students who have completed course only when they pass the bar examinations. No new students are being accepted.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

IOWA

Des Moines	Drake University, The Law School	II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$266; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 13 1/4
	<i>Attendance: 39 24 25 — — — Total 88</i>	s, 1900
		c, 1923
Iowa City	The State University of Iowa, College of Law	¹ III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$130 for residents; \$170 for non-residents; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 13 3/4
	<i>Attendance: 96 74 71 — — — Total 241</i>	s, 1901
		c, 1923

KANSAS

Lawrence	University of Kansas, School of Law	III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$60 for residents, \$170 for non-residents; Matriculation, \$10.00 for residents, \$20 for non-residents; Degree, \$7.50</i>	Hrs. 13 3/4
	<i>Attendance: 41 42 66 — — 6 Total 155</i>	s, 1901
		c, 1923
Topeka	Washburn College, School of Law	III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$180; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 13 1/4
	<i>Attendance: 33 51 31 — 1 7 Total 123</i>	s, 1905
		c, 1923

KENTUCKY

Lexington	University of Kentucky, College of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$100 for residents, \$126 for non-residents; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 13 1/4
	<i>Attendance: 36 40 38 — — 2 Total 116</i>	s, 1912
		c, 1925
Louisville	University of Louisville, School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$169; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 13 1/4
	<i>Attendance: 22 18 28 — — — Total 68</i>	c, 1931
		s, 1933

LOUISIANA

Baton Rouge	Louisiana State University, The Law School	III M(3) or II M(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$92 for residents of Louisiana \$152 for non-residents; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 13 1/4
	<i>Attendance: 54 44 39 — 2 8 Total 147</i>	s, 1924
		c, 1926
New Orleans	Loyola University, School of Law	II M(3), II E(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$175; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$25</i>	Hrs. M 14 1/4
	<i>Attendance: Morning 19 11 10 — — 2 Total 42</i>	E 10
	<i>Evening 16 11 5 5 — 3 Total 40</i>	c, 1931
	<i>Total 35 22 15 5 — 5 Total 82</i>	s, 1934
	The Tulane University of Louisiana, College of Law	² II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$230 for residents, \$240 for non-residents; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 13
	<i>Attendance: 46 46 36 — 4 — Total 132</i>	s, 1909
		c, 1925

¹ College degree required except for students taking an approved combined course in this or another University.

² Effective September, 1938 unless applicant is in upper half of class in pre-legal work, three years of college required.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

45

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

IOWA

Des Moines	Des Moines College of Law	¹ [E(4)]
	Fees: Annual, \$155; Matriculation, \$5	Hrs. 12
	Attendance: 22 17 10 9 2 3 Total 63	

KENTUCKY

Louisville	Jefferson School of Law	E3
	Fees: Annual, \$125; Degree, \$10	Hrs. 8
	Attendance: 75 51 42 — — 14 Total 182	
	Central Law School (Colored)	² M3
	Fees: Annual, \$80; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10	Hrs. 10
	Attendance: 5 3 2 — 1 — Total 11	

MAINE

Portland	Peabody Law Classes	[II M3]
	Fees: Annual, \$200	Hrs. 11
	Attendance: 11 12 6 — — — Total 29	

¹ Beginning in 1938, one year of college will be required for entrance; in 1939, two years of college will be required.

² Classes meet in the early afternoon.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

MARYLAND

Baltimore	The University of Maryland, The School of Law	II M3, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$200 for resident Day or \$150 for resident Evening students, \$250 for non-resident Day or \$200 for non-resident Evening students; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. M 13 1/2 E 10 c, 1929 s, 1930
	<i>Attendance: Morning 35 30 39 — — 1 Total 105</i>	
	<i>Evening 47 26 28 23 — 3 Total 127</i>	
	<i>Total 82 56 67 23 — 4 Total 232</i>	

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston	Boston College, The Law School	II M3, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$210 for Day students, \$185 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$5 for new students, \$1 for old students; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. M 12 E 9 c, 1932 s, 1937
	<i>Attendance: Morning 40 36 39 — — — Total 115</i>	
	<i>Evening 97 50 65 48 — — Total 260</i>	
	<i>Total 137 86 104 48 — — Total 375</i>	
	Boston University School of Law	II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$275; Degree, \$14</i>	Hrs. 13 1/2
	<i>Attendance: 147 121 119 — 3 13 Total 403</i>	s, 1900-08; 1916 c, 1925
Cambridge	Harvard University, The Law School of	*IV M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$420</i>	Hrs. 12
	<i>Attendance: 543 422 354 — 37 32 Total 1388</i>	s, 1900 c, 1923

MICHIGAN

Ann Arbor	University of Michigan, Law School	¹ III M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$140 for residents, \$200 for non-residents</i>	Hrs. 13 1/2 s, 1900 c, 1923
	<i>Attendance: 191 176 164 5 — 6 Total 542</i>	
Detroit	Wayne University Law School	II M3, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual for residents Day, \$148, Evening, \$113; for non-residents Day, \$175, Evening, \$133; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. M 13 1/2 E 10 c, 1936 ²
	<i>Attendance: Morning 26 — — — — — Total 26</i>	
	<i>Evening 46 31 30 28 — — Total 135</i>	
	<i>Total 72 31 30 28 — — Total 161</i>	
	University of Detroit, School of Law	II M3, II A4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$215 for Morning students, \$165 for Afternoon students; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. M 13 A 10 c, 1933 s, 1934
	<i>Attendance: Morning 20 30 33 — — — Total 83</i>	
	<i>Afternoon 21 16 10 13 — 3 Total 63</i>	
	<i>Total 41 46 43 13 — 3 Total 146</i>	

¹ College degree required except for students taking a combined course in this University or in certain other Michigan colleges.

² Provisionally approved.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

47

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

MARYLAND

Baltimore	University of Baltimore, School of Law	E3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$177; Matriculation, \$10; Graduation, \$25</i>	Hrs. 10
	<i>Attendance: 192 114 109 — — Total 415</i>	
	Mount Vernon School of Law	[E4] ¹
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$125; Matriculation and Library, \$7</i>	Hrs. 7
	<i>Attendance: 21 9 6 — — Total 36</i>	

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston	Northeastern University, School of Law	² E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$155; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 7
	<i>Attendance: 498 240 168 168 34 4 Total 1112</i>	
	Portia Law School (for women) ³	² M4, ² E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$160; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 6
	<i>Attendance: Morning 59 38 29 34 — 24 Total 184</i>	(Clock Hours)
	<i>Evening 72 26 27 18 7 — Total 150</i>	
	<i>Total 131 64 56 52 7 24 Total 334</i>	
	Suffolk University Law School	² M4, ² A4, ² E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$160 for first year, \$140 for other years;</i>	Hrs. 8
	<i>University fee, \$10; Registration, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	(Clock Hours)
	<i>Attendance: Morning 156 105 42 46 — — Total 349</i>	
	<i>Aft. & Eve. 394 250 145 91 — 23 Total 903</i>	
	<i>Total 550 355 187 137 — 23 Total 1252</i>	
Springfield	Northeastern University, School of Law, Springfield Division	² E5
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$157; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 7
	<i>Attendance: 54 28 21 15 — 44⁴ Total 162</i>	
Worcester	Northeastern University, School of Law, Worcester Division	² E5
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$157; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 6
	<i>Attendance: 75 32 15 17 — 33⁴ Total 172</i>	

MICHIGAN

Detroit	Detroit College of Law, (Y. M. C. A.)	II M(3), II A(4), II E(4)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$171 for Morning students, \$135 for Afternoon or Evening students; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$17.50</i>	Hrs. M 13 A 10 E 10
	<i>Attendance: Morning 32 — — — — Total 32</i>	
	<i>Aft. & Eve. 93 79 113 114 20 14 Total 433</i>	
	<i>Total 125 79 113 114 20 14 Total 465</i>	
Grand Rapids	Grand Rapids College of Applied Science, School of Law	II E(4) ⁵
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$150; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	
	<i>Attendance: 26 14 — — — — Total 40</i>	

¹ Application has been made to confer on graduates of the School of Law the degree of LL.B.

² Two years of college education will be required for entrance after February, 1938, at Suffolk Law School and in September, 1938, at the other schools indicated. ..

³ A two-year co-educational evening course is given for graduates.

⁴ Including 5th year students.

⁵ Degrees granted to students who have completed course only when they pass the bar examinations.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis	University of Minnesota, The Law School	II M4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$138 for residents, \$213 for non-residents; Degree, \$7.50</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>Attendance: 137 82 78 37 — — Total 334</i>	s, 1900
		c, 1923

MISSISSIPPI

Oxford	University of Mississippi, School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$167.50 for residents, \$217.50 for non-residents; Degree, \$5</i>	Hrs. 14½
	<i>Attendance: 47 46 34 — — — Total 127</i>	c, 1926-27; 1929
		s, 1922-26; 1929-30; 1932

MISSOURI

Columbia	University of Missouri, School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$80 for residents, \$160 for non-residents; Degree, \$5</i>	Hrs. 13
	<i>Attendance: 61 48 52 — — — Total 161</i>	s, 1900
		c, 1923
Kansas City	Kansas City School of Law	II M3, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$220 for Day students, \$165 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. M 13½
	<i>Attendance: Morning 15 16 — — — — Total 31</i>	E 10
	<i>Evening 58 26 31 36 15 — Total 166</i>	c, 1936 ¹
	<i>Total 73 42 31 36 15 — Total 197</i>	
St. Louis	St. Louis University School of Law	II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$260; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 14
	<i>Attendance: 33 16 24 — — 3 Total 76</i>	s, 1924
		c, 1925
	Washington University School of Law	II M(3)
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$264; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$3</i>	Hrs. 13½
	<i>Attendance: 56 43 55 — — 1 Total 155</i>	s, 1900
		c, 1923

¹ Provisionally approved.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

49

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis	The Minneapolis College of Law	II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$125; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i> <i>Attendance: 32 28 16 19 — — Total 95</i>	Hrs. 10
	Minnesota College of Law	II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$125; Degree, \$5</i> <i>Attendance: 73 40 35 30 5 — Total 183</i>	Hrs. 7
St. Paul	St. Paul College of Law	II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$150; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i> <i>Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i> <i>Attendance: 57 49 57 28 1 4 Total 196</i>	Hrs. 10

MISSISSIPPI

Jackson	Jackson School of Law	E2 ¹
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$117.50; Diploma, \$5</i> <i>Attendance: 33 27 — — — — Total 60</i>	Hrs. 10

MISSOURI

St. Louis	City College of Law and Finance, School of Professional Law	II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$125 for first three years, \$150 for fourth year</i> <i>Attendance: 60 33 44 85 17 6 Total 245</i>	Hrs. 7½
	Missouri Institute of Accountancy and Law, Law Department	II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$125 for first three years, \$150 for last year,</i> <i>Degree, \$15</i> <i>Attendance: 51 36 27 11 4 — Total 129</i>	Hrs. 6

¹To complete the course, one summer session is required in addition to two academic years

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

MONTANA

Missoula	Montana State University, School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$104 for residents, \$179 for non-residents; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$5</i> <i>Attendance: 34 19 34 — — 1 Total 88</i>	II M3 Hrs. 14 s, 1914 c, 1923
----------	---	--

NEBRASKA

Lincoln	University of Nebraska College of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$110 for first year, approximately \$102 for each upper year, and for non-residents, \$50 additional, or more, according to the amount charged Nebraska students by their own State University; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$5</i> <i>Attendance: 92 62 53 — — 1 Total 208</i>	¹ II M(3) Hrs. 12 s, 1905 c, 1923
Omaha	The Creighton University, School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$200; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15</i> <i>Attendance: 40 60 54 — — — Total 154</i>	III M3 Hrs. 13 s, 1907 c, 1924

¹ Three years of college will be required beginning September, 1938.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

51

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

NEBRASKA

Omaha	University of Omaha Law School	II E4
	Fees: Annual, \$110; Degree, \$10	Hrs. 7½
	Attendance: 22 37 49 29 — 15 Total 152	

NEW JERSEY

Camden	South Jersey Law School	II E4
	Fees: Annual, \$210; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15	Hrs. 10
	Attendance: 21 20 22 15 — 9 Total 87	
Jersey City	John Marshall College of Law	II M3 ¹ , II A3, II E3
	Fees: Annual, \$260; Degree, \$25	Hrs. 12
	Attendance: Total 335	
Newark	University of Newark, School of Law	II M3, II A3, II E3
	Fees: Annual, \$225; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15	Hrs. 12
	Attendance: Morning 36 54 43 — — — Total 133	
	Aft. & Eve. 78 80 109 — 5 — Total 272	
	Total 114 134 152 — 5 — Total 405	

¹ No morning division during 1937-1938.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

NEW YORK	
Albany	Union University, Albany Law School II M3 <i>Fees: Annual, \$310; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$10</i> Hrs. 13½ <i>Attendance: 75 62 56 — — — Total 193</i> c, 1930
Buffalo	The University of Buffalo, The School of Law II M3 <i>Fees: Annual, \$325; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$10</i> Hrs. 13½ <i>Attendance: 59 59 53 — — — Total 171</i> c, 1936 ¹ s, 1937
Ithaca	Cornell University, The Cornell Law School ² III M3 <i>Fees: Annual, \$430; Matriculation, \$11; Degree, \$10</i> Hrs. 13½ <i>Attendance: 71 53 54 — 1 — Total 179</i> s, 1900 c, 1923
New York City	Columbia University, School of Law III M(3) <i>Fees: Annual, \$400; Entrance examinations, \$10; Degree, \$20</i> Hrs. 13 <i>Attendance: 211 134 152 — 15 10 Total 522</i> s, 1900 c, 1923
	Fordham University, School of Law II M3 ³ , II E4 <i>Fees: Annual, \$252 for Full-time students, \$172 each for first two years for Evening students, \$212 for upper two years; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$20</i> Hrs. M 12 <i>Attendance: Morn. & E 9</i> <i>Early Aft. 148 104 97 — — — Total 349</i> s, 1936 <i>Evening 174 119 128 95 — 3 Total 519</i> c, 1936 <i>Total 322 223 225 95 — 3 Total 868</i>
	New York University School of Law II M3 ³ , II E4 <i>Fees: Annual for Full-time students, \$247 for first year, \$287 for second and third years, \$207 for Part-time students; Degree, \$20</i> Hrs. M 13½ <i>Attendance: Morn. & E 10</i> <i>Early Aft. 229 177 173 — — — Total 579</i> c, 1930 <i>Evening 125 66 75 67 89 54 Total 476</i> s, 1932 <i>Total 354 243 248 67 89 54 Total 1055</i>
	St. John's University, School of Law II M(3), II A(4), II E(4) <i>Fees: Annual, \$10 per semester hour; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15</i> Hrs. M 12 <i>Attendance: Morning 158 161 110 — — — Total 429</i> A 9 <i>Aft. & Eve. 181 361 290 — 130 — Total 962</i> E 9 <i>Total 339 522 400 — 130 — Total 1391</i> c, 1937 ¹
	St. Lawrence University, Brooklyn Law School of II M3, II E4 <i>Fees: Annual, \$240 for full-time students; \$160 each for first two years and \$200 each for last two years for Evening students; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$15</i> Hrs. M 12 <i>Attendance: Morning 79 88 83 — — 1 Total 251</i> E 9 <i>Evening 106 349 376 — 119 9 Total 959</i> c, 1937 ¹ <i>Total 185 437 459 — 119 10 Total 1210</i>
Syracuse	Syracuse University College of Law III M3 <i>Fees: Annual, \$335; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$13</i> Hrs. 12½ <i>Attendance: 40 34 23 — — — Total 97</i> s, 1900 c, 1923

¹ Provisionally approved.

² College degree required except for students taking the six-year combined course in this University.

³ In addition to an evening division, separate divisions meet respectively in the morning and in the early afternoon.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

53

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

NEW YORK

New York City	New York Law School	II M3, II A4, II E4
	<i>Fees: Morning, \$220 first year, \$240 second year, \$260 third year; Afternoon & Evening, \$150 first year, \$170 second year, \$200 last two years</i>	Hrs. M 14 A 9 E 9
	<i>Attendance: Morning</i>	51 — — — — Total 51
	<i>Aft. & Eve.</i>	80 116 114 — — — Total 310
	<i>Total</i>	131 116 114 — — — Total 361

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

NORTH CAROLINA		
Chapel Hill	The University of North Carolina, The School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$188 for residents, \$288 for non-residents</i> <i>Attendance: 50 26 27 — — — Total 103</i>	III M(3) Hrs. 13 s, 1920 c, 1925
Durham	Duke University School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$281; Degree, \$10</i> <i>Attendance: 52 34 19 — 1 3 Total 109</i>	III M3 Hrs. 12½ s, 1930 c, 1931
Wake Forest	Wake Forest College, School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$240; Degree, \$7</i> <i>Attendance: 29 21 18 — — — Total 68</i>	II M(3) Hrs. 13½ s, 1935 c, 1935
NORTH DAKOTA		
Grand Forks	University of North Dakota School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$80 for residents, \$120 for non-residents; Degree, \$5</i> <i>Attendance: 23 17 18 — — — Total 58</i>	II M3 Hrs. 13 s, 1910 c, 1923
OHIO		
Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati, College of Law (Cincinnati Law School) <i>Fees: Annual, \$200 for college graduates, \$215 for others, plus a health fee of \$10 for non-residents of Cincinnati or \$1 for local students; Degree, \$5</i> <i>Attendance: 31 32 43 — — — Total 106</i>	III M3 Hrs. 13½ s, 1900 c, 1923
Cleveland	Western Reserve University, The Franklin Thomas Backus Law School <i>Fees: Annual, \$315; Degree, \$10</i> <i>Attendance: 75 60 48 — — 16 Total 199</i>	¹ III M3 Hrs. 12½ s, 1900 c, 1923
Columbus	The Ohio State University College of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$117 for residents, \$267 for non-residents; Matriculation, \$15</i> <i>Attendance: 78 73 78 — — — Total 229</i>	III M(3) Hrs. 14 s, 1901 c, 1923

¹ College degree required except for students taking the combined course in this University.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

55

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

NORTH CAROLINA		
Asheville	Asheville University Law School Fees: \$10 per month for first thirty months, \$20 per month for last six months Attendance: 4 7 15 — — — Total 26	[II E3 ¹] Hrs. 9
OHIO		
Ada	Ohio Northern University, Warren G. Harding College of Law Fees: Annual, \$195; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 34 17 15 — — 2 Total 68	II M(3) Hrs. 14
Akron	Akron Law School (affiliated with the Cleveland Law School) Fees: Annual, \$144; Matriculation, \$10 Degree, \$10; Graduation, \$25 Attendance: 21 16 18 15 6 — Total 76	II E4 Hrs. 7½
Canton	William McKinley School of Law Fees: Annual, \$150; Matriculation, \$5 Attendance: 12 10 15 9 — — Total 46	[II E4] ² Hrs. 9
Cincinnati	Cincinnati Y. M. C. A. Night Law School Fees: Annual, \$132; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 51 57 31 33 — 2 Total 174	II E4 Hrs. 9
Cleveland	The Cleveland Law School Fees: Annual, \$125 for first two years; \$135 for last two years; library fee \$2.50; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 60 70 55 52 — — Total 237 The John Marshall School of Law Fees: Annual, \$190 for Morning students; \$108 for freshmen and sophomore Evening students; \$125 for junior and senior Evening students; Degree, \$10 Attendance: Morning 6 — 4 — — — Total 10 Evening 48 24 20 22 8 — Total 122 Total 54 24 24 22 8 — Total 132	II E4 Hrs. 7 II M3, II E4 Hrs. M. 13 E 7½
Columbus	Franklin University, The Columbus College of Law (Y. M. C. A.) Fees: Annual, \$151; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 34 17 24 11 — 4 Total 90	II E4 ³ Hrs. 9
Toledo	The University of Toledo, The College of Law Fees: Annual, \$109; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 39 26 12 13 3 2 Total 95	II E4 Hrs. 9
Youngstown	Youngstown College, Youngstown College of Law Fees: Annual, \$160; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 25 9 6 7 7½ 1 Total 55	II E5 ⁴ Hrs. 6

¹ Length of course is forty-eight weeks.

² Degrees are conferred by the Cleveland Law School on graduates of this school who are qualified to take the Ohio bar examinations.

³ For graduation attendance at three summer terms of six weeks each required.

⁴ Five-year course covering five calendar years.

⁵ Fifth year students.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

OKLAHOMA		
Norman	The University of Oklahoma School of Law Fees: Annual, \$22 for residents, \$122 for non-residents; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 129 95 94 — — — Total 318	III M3 Hrs. 13% s, 1911 c, 1923
OREGON		
Eugene	The University of Oregon, School of Law Fees: \$90 for residents, \$210 for non-residents; Degree, \$6.50 Attendance: 47 23 25 — — — Total 95	II M(3) Hrs. 12% s, 1919 c, 1923
PENNSYLVANIA		
Carlisle	Dickinson College, The Dickinson School of Law Fees: Annual, \$250; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 62 36 30 — — — Total 128	¹ III ² M3 Hrs. 14% c, 1931 s, 1934
Philadelphia	Temple University, School of Law Fees: Annual, \$250 for Morning students, \$215 for Evening students; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$15 Attendance: Morning 53 32 21 — — — Total 106 Evening 53 47 34 39 — — Total 173 Total 106 79 55 39 — 12 Total 291	¹ II M3, II E4 Hrs. M 14 E9% c, 1933 s, 1935
	University of Pennsylvania Law School Fees: Annual, first year \$420, second and third years \$405; Matriculation, \$5; Deposit, \$5 Attendance: 162 103 100 — 7 16 Total 388	*IV M3 Hrs. 13 s, 1900 c, 1923
Pittsburgh	University of Pittsburgh, The School of Law Fees: Annual, \$300; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 66 39 47 — — 10 Total 162	*IV M3 Hrs. 13 s, 1900 c, 1923
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Columbia	University of South Carolina, School of Law Fees: Annual, \$175 for residents, \$275 for non-residents; Degree, \$2.50 Attendance: 48 24 36 — — — Total 108	II M3 Hrs. 14 s, 1924 c, 1925

¹ All candidates for admission to the bar of Pennsylvania who are not college graduates must have passed the general educational examinations conducted by the College Entrance Examination Board for the Pennsylvania State Board of Law Examiners.

² In the case of students taking the local combined course, college work beyond the second year may be taken concurrently with law work.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

57

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma City	The Oklahoma City Law School	[E4]
	<i>Fees: \$10 per month for 10 months;</i>	Hrs. 6
	<i>Matriculation, \$5; Graduation, \$5</i>	
	<i>Attendance: 69 28 25 18 — — Total 140</i>	
Tulsa	Tulsa Law School	II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$160; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 8
	<i>Attendance: 34 28 22 19 — 5 Total 108</i>	

OREGON

Portland	Northwestern College of Law	II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$110; Degree, \$10</i>	Hrs. 9
	<i>Attendance: 109 62 55 28 — 15 Total 269</i>	
Salem	Willamette University, College of Law	II M3
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$160; Degree, \$5</i>	Hrs. 13
	<i>Attendance: 19 19 16 — — — Total 54</i>	

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia	Philadelphia College of Law	¹ II M3, II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$243 for Day students, \$183 for</i>	Hrs. M 16
	<i>Evening students; Matriculation, \$3; Degree, \$15</i>	E 12
	<i>Attendance: Morning 2 2 4 — — 1 Total 9</i>	
	<i>Evening 7 5 6 8 — 2 Total 28</i>	
	<i>Total 9 7 10 8 — 3 Total 37</i>	
Pittsburgh	Duquesne University, The School of Law	² II E4
	<i>Fees: Annual, \$225; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$15</i>	Hrs. 10
	<i>Attendance: 48 32 37 22 — — Total 139</i>	

¹ All candidates for admission to the bar of Pennsylvania who are not college graduates must have passed the general educational examination conducted by the College Entrance Examination Board for the Pennsylvania State Board of Law Examiners.

² College degree will be required for admission beginning in 1938.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total

SOUTH DAKOTA

Vermillion	University of South Dakota, School of Law Fees: Annual, \$120 for residents, \$170 for non-residents; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 31 25 29 — — — Total 85	¹ II M(3) Hrs. 14 s, 1907 c, 1923
------------	---	---

TENNESSEE

Knoxville	The University of Tennessee, College of Law Fees: Annual, \$160 for residents; \$250 for non-residents; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 28 33 14 — — 9 Total 84	II M(3) Hrs. 14½ s, 1900-06; 1912 c, 1925
-----------	---	--

Nashville	Vanderbilt University School of Law Fees: Annual, \$236; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 25 23 22 — — — Total 70	II M(3) Hrs. 14 s, 1910-26; 1929 c, 1925
-----------	--	---

¹ Beginning in 1940 three years of college will be required.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

59

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

TENNESSEE		
Chattanooga	Chattanooga College of Law Fees: Annual, \$100; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 39 22 12 — — — Total 73	E3 Hrs. 8
Knoxville	The John Randolph Neal College of Law Fees: Annual, \$75; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 37 22 15 — — — Total 74	E3 ¹ Hrs. 6
Lebanon	Cumberland University Law School Fees: Annual, \$260 Attendance: 175 42 — — — — Total 217	M1 ² Hrs. 10
Memphis	University of Memphis, Law School Fees: Annual, \$130; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 66 40 30 — — — Total 136	E3 Hrs. 6
	Southern Law University, Inc. Fees: Monthly, \$10 Attendance: 40 21 17 — — 5 Total 83	E3 Hrs. 7
Nashville	Andrew Jackson Business University, School of Law Fees: Annual, \$80; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 6 25 — — — — Total 31	E2 ³ Hrs. 6
	Kent College of Law (Colored) Fees: Annual, \$75; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 4 — — — — 7 Total 11	E3 Hrs. 6
	Nashville Y. M. C. A. Night Law School Fees: Annual, \$75; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 63 20 24 — — 4 Total 111	E3 Hrs. 6
	National College of Law and Commerce Fees: Annual, \$75 Attendance: Total 12	E2 Hrs. 3 ⁴

¹ Degree requirements indefinite; dean states three years required for graduation.

² A two-year course is also offered. Beginning Sept. 1938 completion of two-year course will be required for a degree. The average number of hours per week does not include moot court.

³ Course covers 24 calendar months without summer vacation.

⁴ Dean states extra work will be given toward end of year.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

TEXAS

Austin	University of Texas, School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$50 and \$7 deposit for residents, non-residents pay same amount their own state university charges non-residents</i> <i>Attendance: 307 223 178 — — 4 Total 712</i>	¹ II M(3) Hrs. 13¼ s, 1906 c, 1923
Dallas	Southern Methodist University, School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$243; Degree, \$10</i> <i>Attendance: 23 22 18 — — — Total 63</i>	II M(3) Hrs. 12½ c, 1927 s, 1929
Waco	The Baylor University Law School <i>Fees: Annual, \$237; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$25</i> <i>Attendance: 49 21 36 — — 2 Total 108</i>	II M(3) Hrs. 15 c, 1931

UTAH

Salt Lake City	University of Utah, School of Law <i>Fees: Annual, \$163.50 for residents, \$198.50 for non-residents; Degree, \$10</i> <i>Attendance: 49 33 25 — — 1 Total 108</i>	II M(3) Hrs. 12 c, 1927 s, 1929
----------------	---	--

¹ For other than college graduates, the content of the college work is partly prescribed.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

61

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: First year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduates, unclassified, and total.

TEXAS		
Beaumont	East Texas College of Law	¹ I E3
	Fees: Monthly, \$10; Degree, \$5	Hrs. 3
	Attendance: — 10 12 — — — Total 22	
Dallas	Y. M. C. A. Schools, Dallas School of Law	¹ I E4
	Fees: Annual, \$108; Degree, \$5	Hrs. 9
	Attendance: 67 48 19 7 — 7 Total 148	
Fort Worth	North Texas School of Law	E3
	Fees: Annual, \$90	Hrs. 6
	Attendance: 25 17 14 — — — Total 56	
Houston	Houston Law School	E3 ²
	Fees: Monthly, \$7.50; Degree, \$5	Hrs. 3
	Attendance: 45 75 46 — — — Total 166	
	South Texas School of Law	¹ I E4
	Fees: Annual, \$90; Degree, \$10	Hrs. 9
	Attendance: 63 45 26 45 — 48 Total 227	
San Antonio	St. Mary's University of San Antonio, The School of Law	II M3, II E(4)
	Fees: Annual, \$180; Graduation, \$20	Hrs. M. 13
	Attendance: Morning 5 — — — — — Total 5	E 9
	Evening 12 13 4 — — — Total 29	
	Total 17 13 4 — — — Total 34	

¹ Two years of college work will be required for entrance beginning July, 1938. Academic year extends through the summer at East Texas College of Law.

² The course of study covers a period of two years and nine months and is continuous without summer vacation or recess.

APPROVED SCHOOLS

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: Five year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduate, unclassified, and total.

VIRGINIA

Charlottesville	The University of Virginia, Department of Law Fees: Annual, \$270 for residents, \$290 for non-residents Attendance: 165 100 98 — — — Total 363	¹ II M3 Hrs. 14½ s, 1916 c, 1923
Lexington	Washington and Lee University, School of Law Fees: Annual, \$275; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 34 38 34 — — — Total 106	II M3 Hrs. 14 s, 1920 c, 1923
Richmond	University of Richmond, The T. C. Williams School of Law Fees: Annual, \$230; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 19 20 16 — — — Total 55	II M(3) Hrs. 13½ c, 1928 s, 1930
Williamsburg	The College of William and Mary in Virginia, The School of Jurisprudence Fees: Annual, \$210 for residents, \$360 for non-residents; Degree, \$7.50 Attendance: 19 9 2 — — 21 Total 51	² III M3 Hrs. 16 c, 1932 s, 1936

WASHINGTON

Seattle	University of Washington School of Law Fees: Annual, \$122.50 for residents, \$227.50 for non-residents; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 128 77 56 — — 4 Total 265	III M(3) ³ Hrs. 14 s, 1909-10; 1919 c, 1924
---------	--	---

WEST VIRGINIA

Morgantown	West Virginia University, The College of Law Fees: Annual, \$129 for residents, \$379 for non-residents; Degree, \$10 Attendance: 62 44 35 — — 1 Total 142	III M(3) Hrs. 13½ s, 1914 c, 1924
------------	--	--

WISCONSIN

Madison	University of Wisconsin Law School Fees: Annual, \$80 for residents, \$280 for non-residents; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 135 127 125 3 — 8 Total 398	III M(3½) ⁴ Hrs. 12½ s, 1900 c, 1923
Milwaukee	Marquette University Law School Fees: Annual, \$230; Matriculation, \$10; Degree, \$12.50 Attendance: 84 58 44 — — — Total 186	III M(3) Hrs. 14 s, 1912 c, 1925

WYOMING

Laramie	University of Wyoming, The Law School Fees: Annual, \$60 for residents, \$82.50 for non-residents; Matriculation, \$2; Degree, \$5 Attendance: 29 7 9 — — — Total 45	II M3 Hrs. 14½ s, 1923 c, 1923
---------	--	---

¹ Three years of college required beginning with session of 1939-40.

² College degree required except for students taking the combined course in this College. College work beyond the second year may be taken concurrently with law work.

³ Beginning September, 1938, a four-year course will be inaugurated.

⁴ An additional one-third of a year of law school study (three months) may be substituted for six months of office apprenticeship which is required of students who complete the regular three year law course.

UNAPPROVED SCHOOLS

63

Autumn attendance figures are given in the following order: Five year (entering class), second year, third year, fourth year, post graduate, unclassified, and total.

VIRGINIA

Norfolk

Norfolk College, School of Law

Fees: Annual, \$100

Attendance: 16 12 8 — — — Total 36

E3
Hrs. 6

WASHINGTON

Spokane

Gonzaga University, School of Law

Fees: Annual, \$175; Matriculation, \$5; Degree, \$15

Attendance: 52 33 25 23 — 1 Total 134

II E4
Hrs. 10

COMPARATIVE FIGURES, 1889-90 TO 1937-38

UNITED STATES LAW SCHOOL ATTENDANCE SINCE 1890, GROUPED ACCORDING TO THE AMOUNT OF TIME REQUIRED AFTER HIGH SCHOOL TO COMPLETE THE COURSE

	1889- 1890	1899- 1900	1909- 1910	1919- 1920	1929- 1930	1932- 1933	1928- (aut.)	1930- (aut.)	1931- (aut.)	1932- (aut.)	1936- (aut.)	1937- (aut.)
Full-time schools requiring More than five academic years (I)	0	761	1,741	3,407	7,770	8,521	6,072	6,923	7,453	7,752	9,013	9,374
Five academic years (II)	0	0	751	2,326	8,284	7,304	8,454	7,384	6,917	6,716	6,185	5,416
Three or four academic years (III)	1,192	3,992 ²	5,946 ¹	4,799	233	176	339	296	156	163	45	11
Part-time schools having a law course of three or more academic years (IV)	108	2,275 ¹	4,787 ²	9,338	16,235 ¹	18,584 ²	16,086 ¹	13,842 ¹	13,495 ¹	12,653 ²	10,264 ⁽²⁾	9,386 ⁽¹⁾
Mixed full-time and part- time schools (V)	0	704	1,963 ¹	3,087	13,418 ¹	10,708	14,804 ²	11,822 ²	10,771 ²	10,242	14,075 ¹	14,606
Schools having a law course of less than three aca- demic years (VI)	3,186 ³	4,676 ⁵	4,310 ⁵	1,546	761 ⁴	860 ³	642 ³	657 ³	625 ³	726 ³	636 ⁽¹⁾	462
Total	4,486 ³	12,408 ⁴	19,498 ²³	24,503	46,751 ⁴	41,153 ⁴	46,397 ⁵	40,924 ⁶	39,417 ⁵	33,260 ⁴	40,218 ¹⁽³⁾	39,255 ⁽¹⁾

Total Number of
Degree-Confering
Law Schools..... 61 102 124 146 180 185 173 180 182 185 185 179

¹, ², ³, etc., denote the number of schools at which the attendance for that year is not known.

(1), (2), (3), etc., denote the number of schools for which the attendance is estimated.

**APPROVED AND UNAPPROVED LAW SCHOOLS AND LAW SCHOOL ATTENDANCE
1935, 1936, 1937**

	1935			1936			1937		
	Part-time or Mixed	Full time	Total	Part-time or Mixed	Full time	Total	Part-time or Mixed	Full time	Total
Approved Schools	(14) 5,648 13.5%	(74) 14,782 35.3%	(88) 20,430 48.8%	(19) 7,387 18.4%	(75) 14,707 36.5%	(94) 22,094 54.9%	(20) 9,678 24.6%	(77) 14,351 36.6%	(97) 24,029 61.2%
Unapproved Schools	(97) 20,479 48.8%	(10) 1,011 2.4%	(107) 21,490 51.2%	(88) 17,456 43.4%	(8) 668 1.7%	(96) 18,124 45.1%	(81) 14,559 37.1%	(7) 667 1.7%	(88) 15,226 38.8%
Total	(111) 26,127 62.3%	(84) 15,793 37.7%	(195) 41,920 100%	(107) 24,843 61.8%	(83) 15,375 38.2%	(190) 40,218 100%	(101) 24,237 61.7%	(84) 15,018 38.3%	(185) 39,255 100%

AUTUMN LAW SCHOOL ATTENDANCE FOR 1937 BY CLASSES

		First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year	Gradu- ates	Unclassi- fied	Total
Approved Schools								
Full-Time schools	(77)	5,696	4,252	3,979	50	155	219	14,351
Mixed schools	(20)	2,936	2,629	2,493	582	452	586	9,678
Part-Time schools	None	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	(97)	8,632	6,881	6,472	632	607	805	24,029
Unapproved Schools								
Full-Time schools	(7)	371	167	116	—	1	12	667
Mixed schools	(16)	1,684	1,283	1,064	388	90	419	4,928
Part-Time schools	(65)	3,625	2,527	1,977	829	233	440	9,631
Total	(88)	5,680	3,977	3,157	1,217	324	871	15,226
GRAND TOTAL	(185)	14,312	10,858	9,629	1,849	931	1,676	39,255
Total Number of Morning Students								
Approved Schools		6,884	5,196	4,907	50	156	290	17,483
Unapproved Schools		807	435	308	87	1	38	1,676
		7,691	5,631	5,215	137	157	328	19,159
Total Number of Afternoon and Evening Students								
Approved Schools		1,748	1,685	1,565	582	434	105	6,119
Unapproved Schools		4,873	3,542	2,849	1,130	323	498	13,215
		6,621	5,227	4,414	1,712	757	603	19,334
Graduates and Unclassified		—	—	—	—	17	745	762
Grand Total		14,312	10,858	9,629	1,849	931	1,676	39,255
Total Number of Students in Schools having a law course of less than 3 academic years								
	(5)	286	144	—	—	15	17	462

LAW SCHOOLS

65

AUTUMN LAW SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, 1936 AND 1937 — BY STATES AND
NUMBER OF LAWYERS ACCORDING TO 1930 CENSUS

State	1937		1936		Increase or Decrease	Approx. Percent	Number of Pop. per Lawyers Lawyer	
	Number Schools	Attend- ance	Number Schools	Attend- ance			1930 Census	1930 Census
Alabama	3	361	3	383	-22	-6	1,598	1,656
Arizona	1	104	1	90	14	2	542	804
Arkansas	2	169	2	170	-1	0	1,512	1,227
California	20 (1)	2,156	20	2,345	-189	-8	10,109	562
Colorado	3	265	3	265	0	0	1,563	663
Connecticut	2	546	2	545	1	0	1,886	852
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	—	207	1,152
District of Columbia	9	4,830	9	4,739	91	2	3,477	140
Florida	5	315	4	264	51	19	2,615	561
Georgia	5	471	5	460	11	2	2,813	1,034
Idaho	1	46	1	48	-2	-4	580	767
Illinois	8	2,819	9	3,012	-193	-6	11,770	648
Indiana	5	547	6 (1)	736	-189	-26	3,818	848
Iowa	3	392	3	376	16	4	2,634	938
Kansas	2	278	2	309	-31	-10	1,832	1,027
Kentucky	4	377	4	353	24	7	2,639	991
Louisiana	3	361	3	374	-13	-3	1,632	1,288
Maine	1	29	1	34	-5	-15	763	1,045
Maryland	3	683	3	647	36	56	2,782	586
Massachusetts	8	5,198	8	4,729	469	10	6,940	612
Michigan	5	1,354	5	1,418	-64	-5	4,507	1,074
Minnesota	4	808	4	781	27	3	3,145	815
Mississippi	2	187	2	188	-1	0	1,249	1,609
Missouri	6	963	8	1,007	-44	-4	5,560	653
Montana	1	88	1	84	4	5	714	753
Nebraska	3	514	3	612	-98	-16	1,751	787
Nevada	—	—	—	—	—	—	231	394
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	363	1,282
New Jersey	3	827	3 ¹	571 ¹	256	45	6,633	609
New Mexico	—	—	—	—	—	—	350	1,209
New York	10	6,047	10	6,777	-730	-11	27,593	456
North Carolina	4	306	4	312	-6	-2	2,389	1,327
North Dakota	1	58	1	61	-3	-5	600	1,135
Ohio	12	1,507	12	1,677	-170	-10	8,886	748
Oklahoma	3	566	3	575	-9	-2	3,514	682
Oregon	3	418	3	382	36	9	1,595	598
Pennsylvania	6	1,145	6	1,152	-7	-1	8,093	1,190
Rhode Island	—	—	—	—	—	—	675	1,019
South Carolina	1	108	1	99	9	9	1,135	1,532
South Dakota	1	85	1	101	-16	-16	743	933
Tennessee	11	902	10 (1)	877	25	3	2,484	1,053
Texas	9	1,536	12 (1)	1,836	-300	-16	6,591	884
Utah	1	108	1	85	23	27	603	842
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	—	331	1,086
Virginia	5	611	5	600	11	2	2,419	1,001
Washington	2	399	2	352	47	13	2,285	684
West Virginia	1	142	1	132	10	8	1,554	1,113
Wisconsin	2	584	2	627	-43	-7	2,600	1,130
Wyoming	1	45	1	33	12	36	300	752
Total	185	39,255	190	40,218	-963	-2	160,605	764

1, 2, 3, etc. denote the number of schools at which the attendance for that year is not known.

(1), (2), (3), etc. denote the number of schools for which the attendance is estimated.

STANDARDS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

*Resolutions of the American Bar Association are printed in
CAPITALS; Rulings of the Council in small type.*

(1) THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION IS OF THE OPINION THAT EVERY CANDIDATE FOR ADMISSION TO THE BAR SHOULD GIVE EVIDENCE OF GRADUATION FROM A LAW SCHOOL COMPLYING WITH THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS:

(a) IT SHALL REQUIRE AS A CONDITION OF ADMISSION AT LEAST TWO YEARS OF STUDY IN A COLLEGE.

An approved school shall require of all candidates for any degree at the time of the commencement of their law study the completion of one-half of the work acceptable for a Bachelor's degree granted on the basis of a four-year period of study either by the state university or a principal college or university in the state where the law school is located.

Each school shall have in its records, within twenty days after the registration of a student, credentials showing that such student has completed the required pre-legal work.

Students who do not have the required preliminary education shall be classed as special students, and shall be admitted to approved schools only in exceptional cases.

The number of special students admitted in any year shall not exceed ten per cent of the average number of beginning law students admitted during each of the two preceding years.

No student shall be admitted as a special student except where special circumstances such as the maturity and the apparent ability of the student seem to justify a deviation from the rule requiring at least two years of college work. Each school shall report to the Council the number of special students admitted each year, with a statement showing that the faculty of the school has given special consideration to each case and has determined that the special circumstances were sufficient to justify a departure from the regular entrance requirements.

The following classes of students are to be considered as special students unless the law school in which they are registered has on file credentials showing that they have completed the required pre-legal work:

- (a) Those transferring from another law school either with or without advancing standing in law;
- (b) Those doing graduate work in law after graduation from an unapproved school;

- (c) Those taking a limited number of subjects either when registered in another department of the University or when on a purely limited time basis.

- (b) IT SHALL REQUIRE ITS STUDENTS TO PURSUE A COURSE OF THREE YEARS DURATION IF THEY DEVOTE SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF THEIR WORKING TIME TO THEIR STUDIES, AND A LONGER COURSE, EQUIVALENT IN THE NUMBER OF WORKING HOURS, IF THEY DEVOTE ONLY A PART OF THEIR WORKING TIME TO THEIR STUDIES.

A law school which maintains a course for full-time students and a course for part-time students must comply with all of the requirements as to both courses.

The curriculum and schedule of work of a full-time course shall be so arranged that substantially the full working time of students is required for a period of three years of at least thirty weeks each.

A part-time course shall cover a period of at least four years of at least thirty-six weeks each and shall be the equivalent of a full-time course.

Adequate records shall be kept of all matters dealing with the relation of each student to the school.

The conferring of its degree shall be conditioned upon the attainment of a grade of scholarship ascertained by written examinations in all courses reasonably conformable thereto.

A school shall not, as a part of its regular course, conduct instruction in law designed to coach students for bar examinations.

- (c) IT SHALL PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE LIBRARY AVAILABLE FOR THE USE OF THE STUDENTS.

An adequate library shall consist of not less than seventy-five hundred well selected, usable volumes, not counting obsolete material or broken sets of reports, kept up to date and owned or controlled by the law school or the university with which it is connected.

A school shall be adequately supported and housed so as to make possible efficient work on the part of both students and faculty.

- (d) IT SHALL HAVE AMONG ITS TEACHERS A SUFFICIENT NUMBER GIVING THEIR ENTIRE TIME TO THE SCHOOL TO ENSURE ACTUAL PERSONAL ACQUAINTANCE AND INFLUENCE WITH THE WHOLE STUDENT BODY.

The number of full-time instructors shall not be less than one for each one hundred students or major fraction thereof, and in no case shall the number of such full-time instructors be less than three.

(e) IT SHALL NOT BE OPERATED AS A COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE AND THE COMPENSATION OF ANY OFFICER OR MEMBER OF ITS TEACHING STAFF SHALL NOT DEPEND ON THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS OR ON THE FEES RECEIVED.

(2) THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION IS OF THE OPINION THAT GRADUATION FROM A LAW SCHOOL SHOULD NOT CONFER THE RIGHT OF ADMISSION TO THE BAR, AND THAT EVERY CANDIDATE SHOULD BE SUBJECTED TO AN EXAMINATION BY PUBLIC AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE HIS FITNESS.

(3) THE COUNCIL ON LEGAL EDUCATION AND ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR IS DIRECTED TO PUBLISH FROM TIME TO TIME THE NAMES OF THOSE LAW SCHOOLS WHICH COMPLY WITH THE ABOVE STANDARDS AND OF THOSE WHICH DO NOT AND TO MAKE SUCH PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE SO FAR AS POSSIBLE TO INTENDING LAW STUDENTS.

Schools shall be designated "Approved" or "Unapproved."

A list of approved schools shall be issued from time to time showing the schools that have fully complied with the American Bar Association standards.

No school shall be placed upon the approved list without an inspection prior to such approval made under the direction of the Council.

All schools, in order to be upon the approved list, are required to permit full inspection as to all matters when so requested by any representative acting for the Council, and also to make such reports or answers to questionnaires as may be required.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE POLICY ANNOUNCED BY THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION IN 1921, WE RECOMMEND THE ESTABLISHMENT IN EACH STATE, WHERE NONE NOW EXIST, OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR A COLLEGIATE TRAINING, FREE OR AT MODERATE COST, SO THAT ALL DESERVING YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN SEEKING ADMISSION TO THE BAR, MAY OBTAIN AN ADEQUATE PRELIMINARY EDUCATION; AND, THAT THE SEVERAL STATES BE URGED THROUGH THE COUNCIL ON LEGAL EDUCATION AND ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR, TO PROVIDE AT STATED TIMES AND PLACES, FOR PRE-LEGAL EXAMINATIONS TO BE HELD BY THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OR BY THE BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS THEREOF, FOR THOSE APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION TO THE BAR OBLIGED TO MAKE UP THEIR PRELIMINARY QUALIFICATIONS OUTSIDE OF ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING.