

University of Toronto for 1908-1909, and finds that it includes in the curriculum the subjects required to be included by section 129 of the University Act, 1906, above set out. Your Committee finds as a fact that the University of Toronto has not given instruction in these subjects, and has left to the voluntary action of the federated Universities and Colleges the giving of such instruction. The term "Religious Knowledge" has been used in the Calendar as a convenient (though possibly inaccurate) heading for the part or division under which these subjects are included, and the subjects are referred to as being in the "Department of Religious Knowledge"—another convenient (though possibly inaccurate) term—but there is nothing in the Calendar, in this respect, which transgresses the statute. On the contrary, the Calendar complies with the statute in respect of the subjects referred to. Your Committee, therefore, begs to report that the complaint that "the setting up of this department is an illegal act" is not well founded.

10. Your Committee is of opinion that it is not within its province to enquire into the class or character of the teaching given in this department. It has been given by the federated Universities and Colleges as required by the statute. Whether such teaching is consistent with or is "opposed to the orthodox position connected with the Bible" neither your Committee nor the Board of Governors has any right to interfere.

11. With reference to the alleged teaching of "Religious Knowledge" in University College, your Committee points out that the term "Religious Knowledge" is not used in the statute; the words in section 127, sub-section (2), are, "but not in Theology."

12. The chief objection of the complainants is that the Bible is used in the course of instruction in Oriental Languages in University College, and that certain parts of the Old Testament have been commented upon in a manner opposed to the "orthodox position connected with the Bible," and, as already mentioned, Dr. Harris contended that the University Act, 1906, excludes all interpretation of the Bible through any of the Professors or Lecturers of University College, and, in his statement to your Committee, he, in effect, held that any discussion of any of the books or narratives of the Bible would be a teaching of Theology and should not be allowed.

13. Your Committee begs to report that, in its opinion, the University Act does not exclude all interpretation of the Bible in University College, and that every discussion of any of its books in the College would not be a teaching of Theology contrary to the statute. In the opinion of your Committee many of the subjects assigned to University College could not be fully and properly taught without the use of the Bible—notably, Oriental Languages, Ethics, Ancient History, and Greek require the assistance of the Bible for their full and proper appreciation. To exclude all discussion of the Bible and the literary, historical, linguistic, and ethical sides thereof, whether in the Hebrew, Greek, English, or other version, would be to exclude