

miles, the non-resident member may after all witness an adjournment for want of a quorum. While this systematic discouragement of outside membership is permitted, how idle it is to invite the smaller Universities throughout the Province to surrender their charters and throw themselves on the honour of Toronto University! Until the Senate treats its present constituencies with some degree of respect, the addition of other constituencies may reasonably be postponed. If the Senate does not consult the University Convocation, is it in the least degree probable that it would take into consideration the councils of the smaller Universities? There are said to be some new aspirants for University charters who will presently make themselves heard. Where will this confusion and mischief end? No one at all acquainted with the facts can doubt that if Mr. Crooks' University Act had been carried out by the Senate in the true spirit of its representative provisions, the present formidable difficulties would never have arisen. Though the Act has been but six years in force, the important clauses relating to convocation have already been rendered by the Senate as obsolete as are the early Canadian enactments against bears and wolves.

In this Act of 1873, it was distinctly assumed, and indeed it was explained in Parliament, that in the next University curriculum there would be a proper recognition of modern science; and, accordingly, the 7th section of the Act provided for the convocation-rights of *Bachelors and Doctors of Science*. This new curriculum has appeared; but in spite of some strenuous representations that were made in the Senate, the promised recognition of science *has been refused*. The matriculation, which profoundly affects all our High Schools and Collegiate Institutes is framed in conspicuous con-

tempt of all advanced ideas of higher education. The curriculum of 1879 is, in several particulars, more antiquated than the late curriculum of 1864; and it is vastly more antiquated than that of twenty-five years ago. A quarter of a century back, the matriculation of the Provincial University recognized the claims of modern science and of contemporary history; fifteen years ago, contemporary history had still survived, though modern science had been throttled; but in 1879, it is rendered useless for students at matriculation, or subsequently, to extend their historical studies beyond the death of George the Third. This is no oversight; it was deliberately so decided. The curriculum committee's report, as recommended by the Vice-Chancellor (Hon. Chief Justice Moss), assigned for the examination of matriculants the period of history from Queen Anne to George IV.; but an amendment was pressed and carried changing the period so as to read "William III. to George III." This is quite in the key of our early chroniclers, who spent so much time yawning over threadbare legend and mildewed gossip that they hardly ever reached the life and action of their own day. Another question out of a score that offer themselves! Can any one defend the inconsistency of admitting into the curriculum the contemporary literature of France and Germany, while carefully excluding the English literature of our own day? Sir Walter Scott appears to be the most recent English author that, at any stage of a student's career, it is "proper form" for him to acquire. If Heine and Victor Hugo have sufficiently ripened in German and French literature, are Tennyson and Browning still too crude and immature for standard English literature?

As was observed at the outset, the present unsatisfactory administration of the Senate is due not to any defect