The evil is confessedly greater in some branches than in others. In classics a student who is keen for a medal must settle down to close fagging. The students of history are tempted to fall into this vice and to master the index. In some parts of science the eager aspirant prays sincerely for a tenacious memory, as the handiest faculty for his purposes. Theology does not escape this tendency, and the gentleman who possesses to the greatest degree the knack of qu ck hand-writing, and the facility of recalling the divisions, is not rarely the likeliest to earn a bursary. What of the earnest student who has been narrowly scrutinizing the systems? What of him who has been eager not so much to shine in the class lists, as to search for real truth on which to rest his mind and heart? Oh, he has the fortune of figuring in an obscurer place! This style of things is a scandal to that science which boasts that it is the highest; it involves intellectual slavery; it sets a premium on secondary powers; it is a wrong valuation of worth; it converts a college for intellectual energy into an arena for the hot contest of prizes.

If the results of an examination are to decide the merit of those who compete, it is only fair that the character of the questions should be such as to bring out the students' mastery of the topic: he should be asked to cruticize a theory, to show the relation of topics, or to discuss a view. The questions also should be few in number in order that the swiftest hand-writing may not

win the day.

It would be a step in advance if essays of a critical nature should be handed into a professor who could judge by the treatment whether the writer had sternly grappled with the matter. These essays might be the competitions for prizes, while the annual examination might be sufficient for passing from one year to a higher. Since the competition would likely be limited in number, the professor would not be overloaded with short essays. Whatever the reform, the style of examination should be to test the power of sound theological thinking in the rivals for honors; every other sort is a piece of folly.

It is a question, too, whether the money at present alloted to scholarships might not be better spent in securing another professor, or in enlarging our library, or improving our out-grounds. Would the abolition of scholarships keep off students who are needy, and who welcome the aid of bursaries? We answer that the neediest students do not always win a prize, and yet they loyally cling to the college. There is not so much room for fear on that score, for as a class students will flock to that college which they judge to be the

ablest, even without the tempting lure of money.

This is an editorial, and is already too lengthy, but there is a crying need of change in the mode of giving scholarships. And it will be a downright shame if the question is allowed to stand still and unagitated in order that the mud may sink and settle at the bottom. There are serious defects; can they not be rectified?

Legislators have found it necessary to control the liquor traffic. In the process of legislation different systems of control have been adopted: low licenses and high licenses, Sunday prohibition, local prohibition, and general prohibition. At the present day temperance sentiment is tending towards the total prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquors. Our own country is at present greatly shaken with a temperance agi-