

curriculum as obligatory. Such, in brief, is their history. In detail it is as follows.

In 1849 the sectarian university known as King's College was secularized, and in 1853 it was divided finally into two institutions—the University of Toronto (a curriculum-making, examining and degree-conferring body) and University College (a purely teaching body), both entirely non-denominational. In other words, the University was secularized and became provincial, national. The curriculum was thenceforth made, and still continues to be made by the Senate of the University of Toronto. Before the secularization of the University the B. A. degree had been granted on a course consisting of Greek, Latin, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Natural Theology and Evidences, Logic, Metaphysics and Ethics. Shortly after the organization of the University of Toronto the curriculum was reconstructed. What took place is thus described in an editorial article of the *Globe*, 10th June, 1857:—"The Senate, as we understand, since it received its recent infusion of new blood, has considerably modified the course of study prescribed, giving a greater prominence to Modern Languages and the Natural Sciences than they have heretofore received, and thereby adapting the system of preparatory teaching to the wants of the province, where the old system of making everything subordinate to Greek and Latin was peculiarly out of place." The remainder of the article from which this is taken establishes beyond a doubt that the educators of that time realized fully what they were doing and why they did it. The changes were not made at haphazard, but were introduced with reference to a clearly defined principle. Further on in the same article the *Globe* says:—"Reform has begun in a wise direction, when it is no longer deemed indispensable to cram down our provincial throats a whole educational system for no other reason but because it has the time-hallowed sanction of Oxford and Dublin. What suits either of these localities admirably may prove very unsuitable for Canada." One may reasonably infer from the tone of the above utterance that the reforms were not carried out without opposition, as was indeed the case. The sturdy independence of thought and the vigour of