

We might also mention here that the ladies of the city have determined to obtain an oil portrait of Professor Mackerras to be hung in Convocation Hall.

A FEW numbers since we had occasion to write an editorial protesting against the giving to the University of Toronto special legal privileges as the value of its degrees which were not given to like degrees granted by other Universities, whereupon the *White and Blue* makes two suggestions, which we fully believe are quite original, for we doubt if they could possibly have entered the brains of the editor of any College paper except one connected with the University of Toronto. The sublimely unconscious way in which in the first suggestion it tacitly formulates the principle that "egotism" pure and undefiled should be the ruling principle in a University, and the equally sublime way in which in the second it applies the principle to itself, is something the only parallel to which that we know of is seen in the typical "Celestial" at home. We cannot understand why, when we see legislation affecting the legal standing of sister Universities without any radical change within the Universities themselves and without any reasonable cause, we should not raise our voice on behalf of justice. And because Queen's has not for some time given the degree in question, is no reason why we should stand quietly by and see an important principle of Canadian University rights violated. But besides this we candidly admit that we had another reason for writing as we did. It is a matter that would be very likely to affect us in more ways than one as we are, and having before now advocated the reforming of our Law Faculty it would very likely affect us directly were our wishes in this matter consummated, as they are very likely to be.

Any of the above reasons would have

justified us in writing as we did. The proposed advantage is of course a very small one, but it violates the principle of the perfect legal equality of degrees and consequently we maintain that it is unjust. Besides this, any one reading the motion as it stands and knowing the previous position of affairs will see that the benefit, if any, will be derived, not by the Law Society, not by Law students, but by Toronto University; and that its promoters see this there is not the slightest doubt.

TAKING advantage of our absolute ignorance of the age of any member of the present large Freshman class, we desire to propose a matter for thought to our respected authorities. This is the fixing a minimum age for the taking of the degree of B.A., such age to be nineteen. Our reasons are numerous. In the first place few students entering under the age of fifteen and striving for any place in college preserve a clean bill of health throughout. In many cases it would be a miracle if they did. A growing boy does not want to be too greatly cumbered with head work, if he desires to have his interior working organs kept in repair. Sending him to college is all well and good if he spend more time on the football field than he does in his study, and if this be done the probability is he will take more than four years to complete his course and can fill up his time until he reach the requisite minimum age. This is only the physical side. On the mental side, in the majority of cases the reasons are still stronger. Can a student graduating for instance under the age of nineteen be expected to have derived one tithe of the advantage he should, from the University course? He can cram up facts sufficient to enable him to pass the examinations, perhaps with a certain amount of credit, but the facts garnered during a college course and the educa-