

nations in these subjects, they will devote their time and energies specially to them to the neglect of the final subjects. The practical result is that these primary subjects receive three years time and study, while the finals, the practical and the more important, receive but one. Of course every student is required to attend two courses of lectures upon these final subjects; and he *does* attend, and he gets certified and that is all. His study of these subjects is practically limited to one year. We hope that the authorities of the Royal will consider this matter, and if possible make their examinations coincide with those of the Council, for we are persuaded that if they do, the primary work will be as thoroughly studied as now, and that the final work will receive more time and more study than it now receives, and that graduates will leave the halls of their Alma Mater with a more practical knowledge of their life-work than has hitherto been the case.

THE *'Varsity*, a veritable modern Ishmael, with its hand against every man, and every, etc., etc., seeks in a recent issue and in the same article to wage war with our esteemed contemporary, the *Acta Victoriana*, and ourselves.

We presume, in order to direct attention, the article in question is christened "Principal Grant, et al, vs. the Toronto Foot-ball clubs." But the funny part of it is, that having announced his text, the editor drops the first half and substitutes Queen's College Foot-ball Club vs. Toronto Foot-ball Clubs.

The avowed object is to dress down the *Acta Victoriana* and ourselves for saying that it was guilty of "bombast" and "gall" for claiming that there were three foot-ball clubs in Toronto equally as good as the present champions, and another, (the University club,) better. The wail of the poor *'Varsity* now is, "Alas! our good intentions were

wronged, ruthlessly misinterpreted," etc. We regret that lack of space hinders our quoting in full its lamentation, and the many excellent things it tells us about the respective merits of our foot-ball club and the Toronto club.

The line of argument followed is to vindicate the statement above referred to, viz: That there are three foot-ball clubs in Toronto *the equals*, and that *their own* club is *the superior* of the champions. We are disposed to stop here, and quote our Principal's frequent advice, "deeds, not words." But it is worth while, for the amusement of our readers, to state a few of the "facts" in order to show how the *'Varsity* man with his pen can down all the other foot-ball clubs in Canada and never place his men in the foot-ball field. The three Toronto clubs which are the equals of the champions are, the "Knox College," "Victorias," and the "Torontos," while the *'Varsity* club is their and our superiors, and this is the way he proves, to his own satisfaction, we presume, this assertion: First, as to the Knox College Club, he says "Even Queen's will admit that here we have found one of their three equals." Why? we ask, what are the facts? The only match in which these two clubs measured their strength was played on neutral ground and resulted in an honest victory for our team, one by virtue of which they held the championship for '83 and '84. The Knox College men acknowledged their defeat manfully, but the *'Varsity* editor seems to regard this as sufficient guarantee for his statement. Of course the "fact" that he asserts it ought perhaps to verify it. But just a word here; the Knox men tell us they had *no* foot-ball club during the last foot-ball season and that they have not played any since their match with our club. The *'Varsity*, however, in view of the admission of the Knox College men that they were fairly defeated, and their assertion that