

make the 1890 curriculum, they should also be consulted regarding such a radical change in it. The Board of Arts Studies refused to consult the Faculty, and reported the statute favourably to the Senate. Along with the report was a minority report on behalf of Professor London and Professor Galbraith, in substance as follows: 1. That the clause in question had been unanimously adopted by the Board of Arts Studies and the Senate after increase of the work in French and German with due regard to equivalences. 2. That, in view of this fact, change before the next regular period of revision would be inadvisable. 3. The change would give rise to embarrassing complications. 4. That in educational value, French or German are each equal to Greek, and that so fundamental are they that the question of making one of them obligatory at matriculation would soon arise. On motion of Professor Hutton, seconded by Rev. Dr. Sheraton, the statute was passed; a motion for adjournment and also an amendment by Mr. Houston and seconded by Mr. Embree, to re-commit the two reports and the letter of Messrs. VanderSmassen and Squair to the Board of Arts Studies with instructions to consult the Faculty, were voted down. The letter referred to was a strong protest on behalf of French and German, and pointed out the difficulty as to equivalences in such a way that in all fairness further delay should have been granted. But in spite of a reasonable request for delay, and in spite of the proposal to consult the Faculty, the statute was at once pushed through. So strongly did the Faculty feel in the matter, that at its next meeting a request was sent to the Senate that no changes should be made in the Arts curriculum without consultation with the Faculty. Although