The present accommodations for the Law School are wholly inadequate. Its situation in the top of the Court House is isolated, inconvenient and cramped. Contiguity to the courts is of service, but enlargement to keep step with the growth of classes is impossible. While pent up and huddled together on one floor, recitations must soon suffer and library research be often cut off. Distance and inaccessibility sever it from its natural connection with the university at large. This condition of things is an obstacle to progress, and unsuited to the dignity of the school. Unless soon changed, it must fail to meet the requirements of the students.

The prosperity of Yale under its present administration has been very great. The long line of great buildings rising on the campus testify in an imposing fashion to the era of New Yale. The old brick row, solitary remnant of the past, recalls the narrow college. The lofty edifices of the quadrangle speak of their logical conclusion — university reconstruction in harmony with modern life and thought. But these generous gifts have been given almost exclusively to the undergraduate departments. To donors, Yale has long meant and still means Yale College. The immense value and importance of the professional schools as the culmination and crown of the university system has been quite overlooked, and they have been left, in the main, starved and beggared, while the college has absorbed the funds. The result of this process is that the professional schools of Yale resemble, in too many instances, sporadic growths which have
been left to struggle along as best they might without any organic
relation or vital connection with the undergraduate departments;
and the natural transition of Yale graduates to Yale professional
schools interrupted in a manner greatly to be regretted.
No one can begrudge the material strength of the college
proper. Its needs are very great. But the abandonment of the
professional schools has resulted in an inharmonious development
and disorganization. They are not in their relative position, and
the work they ought to do to make Yale a broad and many-sided
university is largely left incomplete.

Just now the Law School suffers most because its opportuni-
ties are the greatest and its funds the least. It has pushed its way
up without endowment. It has none now with the exception of
one professorship. The university treasury has been unable to
assist it to any appreciable extent. Practically it is self-support-
ing. Of necessity this limits the usefulness of the school. With-
out room to grow and soil to grow in growth will cease, and it
cannot be doubted that the students of the future will make greater
demands than the students of the past. Will the friends of the
Yale Law School come to its assistance, and help it to evacuate
its present quarters? A beginning has already been made.
A building fund has been started and amounts to nearly thirty
thousand dollars. It has been subscribed for by Connecticut
alumni alone. In addition, the corporation has purchased a very
convenient and accessible lot on Elm street, between Temple and
College streets. This site will be given as soon as the necessary
funds for the building can be obtained. Prof. Francis Wayland
is the treasurer of the fund, and any amounts, small or large—
but particularly large, will be welcomed. The cost of the pro-
posed building will be about a hundred thousand dollars. Its
immediate construction is a matter of vital importance to the Yale
Law School.

* * *

It is a proverb among lawyers that evidence can be learned
only in a court room. Yet this branch of the law occupies a
prominent place in every law school curriculum. A large part of
the course is devoted to its study. Evidence should not be a diffi-
cult subject to master, but it seems to be the bugbear of every stu-
dent. Why is this so? Simply because no foundation is laid for
the study. Whether the student learns evidence from cases or
from Greenleaf, he is plunged into the midst of a lot of rules for
which he can see no reason. In no other branch is he required to
accept and learn what, at the time, are to him dogmas supported
by no principle. And yet the law of evidence is neither dogmatic
nor illogical. It is founded in reason and exact justice. Is there
not some way to reveal this underlying reason and unfold to the
student the methods by which the exact justice is reached? True,
the law of procedure is more difficult to learn than is substantive
law. Yet in pleading, the other branch of the law of procedure,
the student is given a theoretical foundation upon which to build
his practical structure. Such a method should be followed in evi-
dence. Let a few lectures upon the theory of evidence precede
the work in Greenleaf. Give the student a chance to comprehend
the theory pure and simple, in all its logical derivation. Let him
have a bird’s-eye view of the entire subject. He will find his way
much plainer when he comes to practical details.