

subjects to be placed in a "curriculum," and so far from empowering these two institutions to teach or examine, expressly relegates that branch of the work to the federated Universities and Colleges.

Referring to Trinity College, with which institution you say you are working in this matter, you state that the position you contend for "was made a *sine qua non* of federation by Trinity." You say further, that it asked "that the option should be offered in all four years, and, as there was a prejudice against the term 'Theological Options,' that the Oxford designation, 'Religious Knowledge' should be substituted; but, although by Sub-section 2 of Section 29 the options referred to are extended over all the years of the course to be taken, yet you do not find a substitution of the words 'Religious Knowledge' introduced into the Act, but you have there the words, 'in Theology' and 'certain Theological subjects.'" In the closing portion of your letter you have succinctly stated your "position as to what has now been done in respect of this matter."

"I quite agree with you that it is *ultra vires* in University College. I am sorry that it should be transferred to the Department of Orientals, as, if this work is done at all, it should not come in by any back door."

"The legal and political objections are:—

"First: Public funds must not be employed for this purpose;

"Secondly: University College is ruled out of the work by the Acts;

"Thirdly: A secular body like the Board of Governors cannot guarantee the character of the teaching."

May not the result of this branch of your letter be shortly and correctly summed up as follows:—