

# ➤ QUEEN'S • COLLEGE • JOURNAL. ➤

VOL. XIX.

APRIL 9TH, 1892.

NO. 21.

## ➤ Queen's College Journal ➤

Published weekly by the Alma Mater Society of Queen's University during the academic year.

N. R. CARMICHAEL, M.A., - Editor-in-Chief.  
J. W. MUIRHEAD, B.A., - Managing Editor.  
FRANK HUGO, - - - Business Manager.

The annual subscription is \$1.00, payable before the end of January.

All literary contributions should be addressed to the Editor, Drawer 1104, Kingston, Ont.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to the Business Manager.

**T**HE Alma Mater Society last Saturday evening appointed Mr. W. H. Davis editor-in-chief of the JOURNAL for '92-3. Mr. W. L. Grant was appointed associate editor and Messrs. Muirhead and Hugo will retain their present positions as managing editor and business manager respectively. We believe that these appointments are the very best that could have been made, and have much pleasure in giving our successors the benefit of our very best wishes. We have also a considerable amount of advice which we would like to give them, but they will probably show greater appreciation if it is given privately. Mr. Davis and Mr. Grant have been our most faithful contributors this session, and we have no doubt that under their management the twentieth volume will be more successful than any of its predecessors.

\* \* \*

We do not wish to appear fault finders, because we believe that generally things are pretty well done about Queen's. But we must confess that we cannot understand the present system of publishing the results of the examinations, and we completely fail to see its advantages over the system which was employed until last year. By the present method the names of successful candidates in any subject are published in three classes, being arranged

alphabetically in each class. The percentage necessary to receive a place in any class is not known; a person whose name appears in the second class knows—or supposes—that his papers were not as good as those of the persons in the first class but better than those of the persons in the third. We agree that it is desirable that a student should have some idea of what he has done. If the lists were published purely in alphabetical order, a student might feel that the lowest mark was as good as any other, and so avoid any effort to take a high position. But if this be true, what is the objection to the old order-of-merit system? A place in a class is not, it is true, a very laudable object of effort, but it is a much better one than the winning of a scholarship. Only one man in a class can win a scholarship but all may get a place. It is only right that ability and faithful work in any subject should receive recognition. But we think it much better that all should receive the recognition given by rank than that one should get a scholarship and the others no information about their relative positions. Of course an order-of-merit list does not give a candidate any idea of his marks, but the present method does not either—at least, while the meaning of the classes is unknown. Might not a combination of these methods be advisable? To publish the lists in order of merit and also divided into classes, and let the divisions represent known percentages?

\* \* \*

Speaking of examinations, we notice a regrettable tendency which they have to increase both in number and magnitude. Last year the Saturday before examinations was utilized temporarily because in some subjects students were entitled to write upon both junior and senior classes. This year it seems to have been made a regular examination day. We grant that probably this was necessary for honour examinations. Even in the case of these we think it possible to observe a limit. Philosophy and Mathematics for example are