

Is it the University or the Department? Whichever it be, those who make out the curriculum for Toronto University, and hence for the High Schools, seem always to be at a loss in regard to the one subject—English. Or at least they always make a muddle of it.

Some years ago Sir Walter Scott's "Marmion" was chosen as a portion of the English subjects for matriculation in Toronto University, and as a matter of course it formed one of the works to be read in the High Schools, and thence it was adopted into the matriculation subjects of the other universities. But, after the various calendars had been published, and the work had been partially read in the schools, somebody discovered that "Marmion" was not a fit and proper work to be read by all creeds and both sexes. Hence a new instruction was sent to the schools, and "Marmion" was withdrawn, and something else put in its stead. It is no matter of ours at present as to whether "Marmion" is an objectionable work or not. Suppose it is, could not this have been discovered in time to prevent its being authorized, and thus to save a great waste of time and an immense amount of confusion? Last year Coleridge's "Christabel" was given. But after a little somebody found out that it also was objectionable, and "Christabel," like "Marmion," had to make room for something else. In the Queen's College calendar, however, "Christabel" was retained, and hence one source of confusion in the English paper of the last examination. In the present year, that is the year to which our last calendar applies, Shakespeare's "Timon of Athens" was placed in the senior matriculation on the authority of the curriculum of Toronto, but it also has been changed for something else since that calendar was published.

That mistakes should occur occasionally is to be expected, but the occurrence of such blunders year after year is the height of absurdity, and shows that whoever makes out the English part of the curriculum either does not know the character of the work he prescribes, or is culpably careless, or that outside influence and pressure is brought to bear on the Department or the Government.

2. A second source of annoyance was the difficulty of getting candidates to observe the conditions of application as communicated to them through the calendars or otherwise. Thus, after the papers had been transmitted to the Department for distribution, applications were received from a few candidates; and in some cases we were asked to send the papers direct to the teacher or inspector of the locality at which the applicant desired to appear. Now, as the Department alone was held responsible for the safe-keeping and secrecy of the papers, to send these papers to any one teacher or inspector would be quite equivalent to sending them to whoever might ask for them, and thus all assurance as to the secrecy of the papers would be destroyed. Hence the only way was to pointedly refuse to transmit any papers except through the proper channel, and accordingly at the proper time, although knowing that such refusal would in some cases create bad feelings towards the universities. Such a lesson to candidates, however, may prove beneficial. A regulation may be looked upon as a law made for a special purpose. If the regulation is not necessary it should not be made, and if necessary, it should be obeyed. Now irregularities in the conducting of examinations are particularly objectionable; hence any regulations having the good of examinations in view are worthy of consideration and should be attended to; and the best