

The JOURNAL is not expected to meddle with politics, yet at this time it cannot forbear to challenge the statements of certain persons and papers that deny the right of students to vote in their university city. How the students vote is neither here nor there. It is their right, their moral right, that is being questioned; their legal right is, for the present at least, established. The law provides that sailors, fishermen, students, and others who find it necessary to ply their calling abroad, shall be allowed to exercise the franchise at home. In the case of sailors and fishermen this is just. These men do not remain for any length of time in any one place, and it would be impossible for them to vote anywhere except in the constituency in which their home is situated. Besides their principal interests are centred there. With the student it is different. If he belonged to a wealthy class and had property interests in his home riding it might be well to have him vote there. Students, however, are not as a rule burdened in this way. Their interest is, or ought to be, centred in the city where they spend the greater part of their time. They are not transients like sailors and fishermen. When they register they do so with the intention of spending at least four years in the college. For four years then they are virtually citizens of the university city, and as such have a right to vote there. Moreover, many a student before coming to college has been for years absent from his father's home. He has never voted there and has no moral right to do so. His real home is at the college centre. To give students the right to vote, and then to ask them to travel several hundred miles to exercise that right is

virtually to disfranchise them, and the disfranchisement of the students means the wilful casting out from the political field of a portion of the best element in the country. It is doubtful if the country can afford to do this.

Ladies.

TO many of us probably, Kingston means little more than Queen's and yet, as we learned at a lecture given recently, few cities in our dominion have a more interesting history. Of the story of its early growth as related by Principal Ellis, we give the following sketch.

On July the twelfth, 1673, when the famous French Governor, Count Frontenac, came up the St. Lawrence with his brightly painted barges and attendant canoes, he looked on a very different scene from that which meets the eye of the tourist approaching the present Limestone City; far as the eye could reach extended a forest and only the regular dip of the paddles broke the stillness of the summer day. Yet there were living creatures on the shore; for concealed among the trees, Iroquois warriors were eagerly watching the approach of the flotilla. Nor was Frontenac ignorant of their presence in the neighborhood. At his command, La Salle had invited the Iroquois to meet the representative of the French king in council, and the regular, well-ordered advance of the boats in battle array was planned to impress the Indians with the might and power of France. Weary with their fourteen days' journey from Lachine, the Frenchmen gladly pulled up their boats and prepared to camp.

Various reasons may be assigned for this visit. In the first place, La