

FOR want of space we are compelled to leave out a lengthy article on "A Longer Session." But the subject being of importance the substance of the communication may be briefly discussed. It asks that the session be made two months longer than it is at present, and one reason for more time is that inordinate cramming could be avoided, if the amount of work gone over remained unchanged. We can't help noticing, however, that the inveterate crammer would only defer the evil day two months longer, and would as usual enjoy ignoble ease until within a few weeks of the exams. But apart from the interests or benefit of this class, which, we are sorry to say, can be found in Queen's, a longer session by a few weeks at least would be of decided advantage to many, if not all.

It is a plain fact that the time is too limited for the most diligent of students to get up the work as he desires. And, if there was general satisfaction given by commencing the session earlier this year than ever before, simply because there was more time, and hence more thoroughness in getting up the work throughout, any one can see how an extension of even one month would tell on the final exams. As Queen's extends her influence and raises her standard second to none in this country, we as students rejoicing in her standing before the world, feel the need of more time. The process of education is slow but sure, and a true education cannot be forced; if then, our session were longer—the curriculum of work remaining as it is—the mental training would tend towards the end so much to be desired. And we would have young men whose minds are in full activity to grapple with life's work, and not the receptacles of so many facts, for which the recipient finds no value, simply because they passed so rapidly before his mind that they could not be assimilated. But the student, from a physical standpoint,

would be benefitted also. A longer session means the development of muscle on the campus, the re-organization of the rifle corps, the formation of stronger ties of association and friendly rivalry in many games with students of sister institutions. Thus more bodily exercise with less mental strain would obviate broken-down constitutions. For no matter what may be said against it, it is too true that many sacrifice health to gain knowledge. Some may think a few weeks would make little difference to such, but this is a mistake, for a few hours less study, and a few hours per week more exercise, stand between robust health and an active mind on the one hand and a dyspeptic frame and an enfeebled mind on the other.

We hope this question will receive the agitation and consideration it demands, and that the time may be so extended that every student will be able to appreciate fully the benefits of his college training.

EMERSON, THE PHILOSOPHER.

(A REPLY.)

IN the last number of the JOURNAL there appeared an article under the title, "Emerson, the Philosopher," which, however, without particularly dealing with Emerson, brought in quite a variety of subjects in its course. Still one particular idea, to which the others were apparently intended to be subordinate, struggled for expression throughout the greater part of the article. It manifested itself in a very well-intentioned effort on the part of the writer to show that whereas all philosophy and religion seek to solve the great problem of man's relation to God, yet the Christian religion, with that pure and lofty figure of the God-man as its centre, alone reveals that relationship in all its clearness. But though the intention may have been of the most laudable character, unfortunately the results are of such a nature that on a reduction of the statements to coherence with each other, the conclusions are anything but warranted by the premises—are, in fact, the exact opposites of what they reasonably should be. As I believe that if allowed to pass unquestioned the statements there made, when freed from unwarranted assumptions, would be injurious to the cause of Christianity, and as I am confident this was not the intention of the writer, I take this opportunity of showing where I conceive him to be astray. I assume at the outset that if any attempt is made to philosophically justify any position, it is thereby open to philosophical