

# QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

VOL. XXV.

KINGSTON, CANADA, DEC. 25TH, 1897.

No. 5.

## Queen's University Journal.

Published by the Alma Mater Society of Queen's University  
in Twelve Fortnightly Numbers, during  
the Academic Year.

R. HERRISON, M.A.,	- - -	Editor-in-Chief.
J. A. MCCALLUM,	- - -	Managing Editor.
T. FRASER,	- - -	Editor for Arts.
JAS. SHORTT, M.A.,	- - -	Editor for Divinity.
C. P. JOHNS, B.A.,	- - -	Editor for Medicine.
W. WELLS,	- - -	Editor for Science.
MISS MCKAY,	- - -	Editor for Levana Society.
R. B. DARGAVEL,	- - -	Business Manager.
W. H. GOULD,	- - -	Asst. Business Manager.

The Business Manager is in the sanctum on Mondays  
and Wednesdays from 11 to 12 to receive subscriptions.

Subscription \$1.00 per year; 10 cents single copy.

All literary contributions should be addressed to the  
Editor, Drawer 1109, Kingston, Ont.

All communications of a business nature should be ad-  
dressed to the Business Manager.

**B**Y the time this issue reaches our readers it will  
be too late to wish them a Merry Christmas,  
but we extend to them our best wishes for a  
happy and prosperous new year. Scattered over  
all parts of the country they are no doubt enjoying  
the festivities of the Christmas season. We alone  
are left in the deserted halls and sanctum to pre-  
pare copy and read proof. The editorial "we" in  
this case represents but one member of the staff,  
and if this issue is not up to the mark he hopes the  
indulgent reader will make some allowance.

\* \* \*

We learn from good authority that the Arts  
Society will call a meeting early in the new  
year to arrange for extending the privileges of  
the reading-room to the ladies. The idea is a  
good one, and shows that much as men may bemoan  
the lack of public spirit in our students, the days of  
chivalry and gallantry are not gone from our halls  
even yet. So far no murmur of complaint has been  
heard from that ever-increasing and consequently  
ever more important company of lady students who  
have effected such a complete change in the con-  
ditions of our college life. The fact, however, that  
the ladies reading-room has had as its supplies  
only the journals and papers that had already

fulfilled their purpose for a month or so in the  
general reading-room, shows that reason for com-  
plaint was not wanting; and the reason it was not  
forthcoming we can only attribute to that infinite  
patience which always awaits with perfect trust  
the action of the lords of the human race.

The arrangement which is suggested is that the  
reading-room be left one hour each day to the use  
of the ladies exclusively. This sacrifice on our part  
we should not find a sore trial. The reading-room  
is not so persistently occupied but that we might  
give up an hour without noticing the difference.

Anyone who has been attending the "at homes"  
given by different years in Arts will acknowledge  
that the co-operation of a hundred lady students is  
a most desirable feature in our college gatherings.  
And we are surely not so lacking in true principles  
of manhood as to take all and give nothing.

It has always been the spirit of Queen's to with-  
hold from the ladies no privilege or advantage that  
is granted to men. This has been true in the past  
as regards lectures and examinations, and we are  
happy to see that it is going to be true in regard  
to lesser privileges, such as that of the reading-room.

\* \* \*

It is not our intention to add anything one way  
or the other to the controversy that is now going on,  
*re* the subject of prohibition on the basis of the  
letters of Principal Grant to the *Globe*, but the kind  
of criticism employed by those who take exception  
to the Principal's position, as outlined in these  
letters, is worthy of note. It is assumed by almost  
all these critics that prohibition is the one and only  
means of dealing with the liquor traffic. Their  
criticisms plainly show that they believe that there  
are only two positions which any one can take,  
either he is in favor of prohibition, or else he is in  
favor of the liquor traffic and supporting the liquor  
interests. That this is not the only alternative  
would seem to be a truth almost too obvious to be  
stated. Surely the question is wider than that, for  
if not why argue further if there is but one side to  
the question? If prohibition were the *only* remedy  
and the only means of controlling the passion for