

NOTICES.**University Council.**

NOTICE is hereby given that graduates and alumni, to qualify for election as Members of the Council, must pay the fee of one dollar to the Registrar before the First day of January next. The retiring members are: M. Sullivan, M.D., Kingston; W. H. Fuller, Kingston; Rev. M. McGillivray, Scarborough; Rev. D. Ross, Lancaster; R. V. Rogers, jr., Kingston; Wm. Caldwell, Lanark; and Jas. Gordon, Crumvie.

R. VASHON ROGERS, JR.,

Dated, 15th Dec., A.D. 1879.

Registrar.

Important.

A GREAT number of our subscribers are in arrears for last year's JOURNAL. We suppose this is due to forgetfulness; as we have received many inquiries from subscribers as to whether they had paid or not. If any more are in doubt, we can assure them that inquiries will be answered with the greatest alacrity.

Remittances will be promptly acknowledged by the

SECRETARY-TREASURER.

P.O. Drawer 482.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(To the Editors of the Queen's College Journal.)

DEAR SIRs,—In the last issue of the JOURNAL there appeared a second letter from B.A., expressing regret that his first letter was published, and concluding by denying the truth of the statements contained in that letter, as "he had since satisfied himself that what was told him was an exaggerated and misrepresented account of the whole affair." Permit me, Messrs. Editors, to affirm that the account given by B.A., in his first letter of the affair in the Senate room, was correct *in toto*, and moreover, that B.A. did not receive the information which made it incumbent upon him to write his second letter from a student who was invited to the Senate Chamber on that memorable occasion,

Yours respectfully,

ONE OF THOSE WHO WAS INVITED TO THE SENATE CHAMBER ON CONCURSUS INIQUITATIS.

[We publish the above at the request of the writer, but wish it understood that we desire no more communications on the subject unless over the name of the writer. As to the affair itself, we have found, on inquiry, that B.A. was quite right in saying that his first letter was "an exaggerated and misrepresented account of the whole affair." The first part of his first letter was entirely incorrect, though at the time apparently supported by circumstantial evidence, this was the most important part of the letter. As to the encounter in the Senate Room, our present correspondent had, doubtless, full means of knowing what went on. Our reporter, we are sorry to say, was not present. The oversight must be attributed to the suddenness of the call; doubtless had the Senate had a true

idea of the importance of the subject brought up, he would have been. It seems to us, however, that the matter, as now narrowed down, should have no place in print. The grievance began, and—as recent events have shown—ended in the Senate Room, and we desire that it should now end as far as we are concerned.—EDS. OF JOURNAL.]

Anonymous Letters.

IN the last issue of the JOURNAL there appeared a contribution on "How to dispose of Anonymous Letters." I fail to see the point in the article or any sufficient reason why letters and articles on general subjects of interest should not be written and published anonymously. Should untrue statements be made it is admitted that the publication is amenable to the law, and should legal proceedings be taken against the publisher, the same publicity would be given to the denial as to the assertion. Furthermore any publisher will allow any one to contradict anonymous correspondence as publicly as stated.

* * *

[We think our correspondent has failed to see the purport of the article he mentions, which he will see, on reference refers to, privately sent and received anonymous letters, not those publicly printed.—EDS. JOURNAL.]

LADIES' COLLEGES.

NO statement is more generally accepted by every person than that under the one name or term different people may intend to convey the most diverse and contradictory ideas, and the experience of the writer leads him to say that the name which heads this article has been one of the most unfortunate in this respect. Some think Ladies' Colleges places where their "gals" go to get "manners." Others, more hopeful still, imagine their daughters can there acquire the brains which it was impossible they could inherit. Others again refrain from patronizing such institutions, being of the impression that to send a girl there is at once to deprive her of all possibility of usefulness in this world or the next, thinking that the only things to be there learned are but the most frothy accomplishments, which are not only useless in themselves, but prevent anything useful ever taking lodgment in their possessor's brains. But to enumerate all the supposed objects of Ladies' Colleges—to see life, to learn how to play the "piano," how to talk small talk, etc., would be impossible short of a folio volume of a thousand pages. Suffice it to say that only a few seem to think that the object of the institutions of which we speak is the development of the girl's intellect and moral nature, the teaching her to know herself, her powers and failings, her place and work in the great commonwealth of humanity. Now, to say this is the object, is by no means to say this is the point always reached; it is not even saying that this point is never reached, or for that matter is likely ever to be reached; in fact it sometimes seems as though the exact opposite of this were the object aimed at, and not one example only,