

students break down but the prize-winners? In the case of many bright intellects found in weakly bodies who break down, is it not known that the seeds of disease were in the constitution, and very likely would have manifested themselves, even if there had been no attempts at prizes?

There is, however, one point in which I heartily agree with your correspondent, and that is when he makes the supposition case of a disappointed medallist in one year having a higher percentage than the successful medallist of some other year. This could be partly remedied, if the faculty would mark the standing of the honor candidates, as is done in the McGill College Calendar: For example, if a student has taken 75 per cent. of the marks and obtains no medal, let him be ranked as having obtained First Rank Honors in Theology, which would indicate that he had reached a standing worthy of a medal, if there had been no candidate in that year with a higher standing than himself.

Hoping the Professors will make haste slowly, before making a change,

I remain,

Yours truly,

R. S. T.

PRIZES.

When in the second issue of the COLLEGE JOURNAL I wrote against prizes, I had no intention at this early date to write again; but the rather harsh and unfair criticism by F. H. L. makes it imperative upon me to reply.

He begins by accusing me in a rather severe manner of an "ungenerous imputation on the integrity of a fellow-student," this student being himself. Let me just say that nothing could have been farther from my mind than this, nor do I believe that it was regarded as such by any except himself. However, since he has unhappily regarded it thus, I have only to repeat that I believe I *did* give a fair representation of F. H. L.'s remarks, and ask the readers of the JOURNAL if you are satisfied with his explanation.

He says "that it requires less mental calibre to criticize than to defend," and that, "in virtue of his limited capacity, he would do himself more justice by arguing against prizes than by advocating their continuance. The latter requires brains, the former does not." For myself I accept no such an explanation and did I or any one else credit him with this little mental calibre or limited capacity, which he himself assumes, he would resent it quite as quickly as any other student in the College.

However, accepting what F. H. L. affirms he did say, "that for the purposes of argument, I would rather go against prizes, yet I preferred to see them continued," I am certain there is equally as great inconsistency in these,