

# » QUEEN'S » UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

VOL. XXV.

KINGSTON, CANADA, FEB. 12TH, 1898.

No. 8.

## Queen's University Journal.

Published by the Alma Mater Society of Queen's University  
in Twelve Fortnightly Numbers, during  
the Academic Year.

|                    |       |                            |
|--------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| R. HERBISON, M.A., | - - - | Editor-in-Chief.           |
| J. A. MCCALLUM,    | - - - | Managing Editor.           |
| T. FRASER,         | - - - | Editor for Arts.           |
| JAS. SHORTT, M.A., | - - - | Editor for Divinity.       |
| C. P. JOHNS, B.A., | - - - | Editor for Medicine.       |
| W. C. ROGERS,      | - - - | Editor for Science.        |
| MISS JAMIESON,     | - - - | Editor for Levana Society. |
| R. B. DARGAVEL,    | - - - | Business Manager.          |
| W. H. GOULD,       | - - - | Asst. Business Manager.    |

The Business Manager is in the sanctum on Mondays  
and Wednesdays from 11 to 12 to receive subscriptions.

Subscription \$1.00 per year; 10 cents single copy.

All literary contributions should be addressed to the  
Editor, Drawer 1109, Kingston, Ont.

All communications of a business nature should be ad-  
dressed to the Business Manager.

THE Grant-Lucas debate, occurring, as it did,  
too late for any notice in our late issue, calls  
for some reference, though it be rather out of  
date in the present. An event which called for  
such attention from the whole country can surely  
not be overlooked by the JOURNAL of the Uni-  
versity whose principal was one of the participants.

The result, generally, was a feeling of disappoint-  
ment. It was expected that a man who ventured  
to challenge Dr. Grant would have facts and figures  
at command, and some small degree of logic to  
meet and refute the arguments of his opponent.  
Very few who knew anything of the Principal's  
power in debate ever doubted his success, but all  
hoped that he might find at least a foeman worthy  
of his steel. Mr. Lucas may be a good-hearted,  
earnest worker in the cause of prohibition, but his  
utter lack of logical scientific method in presenting  
his views made the whole affair unsatisfactory and  
disappointing, to Dr. Grant, as well as to others.

Any one who is an advocate of prohibition—and  
there are many such within our college halls, despite  
the uncalled-for view of the *Witness*, that we follow  
Dr. Grant as a flock of sheep—would gladly have  
seen the opponents more fairly matched. And  
any one who held Dr. Grant's view as sincerely as

he does would gladly have seen as his opponent  
one who could have brought forward at least the  
strongest arguments for prohibition, that they might  
be refuted or stand unshaken.

We do not believe that prohibition was defended  
in any sense, as it might have been. And on the  
other hand the influence upon the country at large  
will not be anything like so great had both sides of  
the question been presented with equal cogency.  
One effect it certainly will have, that Dr. Grant will  
not be so willing to turn aside from his busy life as  
a university professor to meet in combat every calf  
that bawls.

The conduct of the audience merited the praise  
Mr. Lucas bestowed. A few foul-mouthed indi-  
viduals will always be found in a large gathering of  
this kind. Good order, however, was kept through-  
out the debate. The only disturbance was due to  
the lack of courtesy and good sense on the part of  
Mr. Lucas, when he used the expression, "Dr.  
Grant is unfit to be President of Queen's Univer-  
sity." It is surely little wonder that an uproar fol-  
lowed for a few minutes. British fair play is al-  
ways desirable, and it will always be given by  
Queen's men to one who has a sense of British  
honor and common politeness.

\* \* \*

James Ross has won us afresh. The broad sym-  
pathy of the man, the throbbing heart of the Chris-  
tian pastor, the persuasive power of the preacher,  
remain with the professor whom Queen's is proud  
to have contributed to Montreal. We are sure his  
words have stirred up the missionary spirit within  
us. While we are impressed with the nobility of  
true missionary effort and feel the great national  
importance of our home mission work, let us not  
shut our eyes to the need of everyday missionary  
spirit among ourselves. We need something more  
than organized work for next summer's operations.  
We need this winter a bigger sympathy with our  
fellow-students, a sympathy that will aim at tran-  
scending petty cliques, and will seek to establish  
friendship among all sorts and conditions of men.

Some of us may think we are morally strong,  
while feeling that we are weak socially. "Let him