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EDITORIAL

THE POOR BOY AT THE BAR.

Perhaps the most amazing argument that is sometimes made against high standards for legal education is that such standards will exclude the poor boy who wants to be a lawyer. Happily this argument is not made as frequently today as a few years ago, because everyone who is at all familiar with the tremendous strides that public school education has made in the last two decades knows that poor boys and poor girls have been crowding the doors of our state and our private institutions. The question is not whether a poor boy can go to college, but whether he wants to go; and that is a matter of individual temperament, not controlled by wealth or poverty. If a young man is not willing to undergo certain privations in order to fit himself adequately for a high calling, he is not worthy of that calling. Surely his example is not a sufficient reason for lowering the standards of the calling. Put up the bars high, in medicine, in engineering, in law, in the ministry; and only thoroughbreds will make the jump. None others should be sought.

A study recently made by Professor H. B. Eversole of the College of Commerce, at the University of Kentucky, indicates
that the cost of a college education at the State University is within the reach of any young man of character, high purpose and determination. The average cost for students not living at home was $724.60; the modal class centered at $625. One-half of the students spent less than $690, and several reported a total cost of about $400. Of students not living at home, 52.6 per cent were earning all or part of their expenses.

In view of these facts, it is hardly conceivable that the argument that standards must be kept low in order to accommodate poor boys who cannot afford to go to school, will prevail much longer. Loan funds, scholarships and other financial aids are available. Business houses are commendably active in making part-time jobs open to deserving young men. Few students have to withdraw on account of funds, and most of these return at the next semester ready to go on again. Getting an education is for a poor boy with the right spirit a great adventure; he asks no favors; he wants to compete on an equal basis with those who happen to come from wealthier families; and time and again it is the poor boy who stands first in scholarship and in character. High standards for those who seek to practice law or any other learned profession will not handicap or disqualify the young man with a poor pocketbook, but only the young man with a poor heart. It takes courage and nerve and vision to give up five or six or seven years after high school to prepare for the law, but whether a man has that kind of courage and nerve and vision is not a matter of dollars, but of character.