

THE MCGILL GAZETTE.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1878.

EDITORIAL.

Si Quid Novisti Rectius Istis Candidus Imperti.

THAT mankind has not yet arrived at perfection, is one of those axioms which are extremely commonplace as well as suggestive of serious considerations. One is apt, in pondering over the assertion that human affairs and mundane institutions admit of improvement and beneficial change, to regard the common surroundings of every day life with the view of their amelioration. What is true of things and persons in general, may be postulated of even university dignitaries and affairs, which have not reached; and are not likely to attain to, that approximate perfection which is the chief end of man to secure. We are not called upon to seek out the vices of human institutions, nor is it our place to suggest remedies for public disorders; but we may, fittingly enough, when we can, point out any defect which exists in the working or government of our University, or in the conduct of its operations. As a college organ we would not be doing our duty, were we to affect that *insouciance* in reference to these matters which most college men display. The mere fact of our being a journal, would seem to assimilate our functions to those of the press in general, and to give us the right to point out abuses—more or less grave; and if we can to indicate some method for their rectification. But without further moralizing of this nature, and without any further attempt to justify the propriety of that which we are about to say, let us come at once to the subject to which we desire to advert. Many of our readers may be unaware of the fact that an important difference exists between the method of con-

ducting examinations in the several faculties of the college. In Law and Medicine what may be termed the anonymous system is in vogue. That is to say, the name of the candidate is not revealed to the examiner until after the papers have been looked over, the values attached to the different answers, and the standing of the student definitely settled. A number, or motto, is given to each competitor who inscribes it on the examination paper, and also on an envelope in which is enclosed his name written on a card, which envelope is sealed and not opened till the standing is finally decided on. In the Faculty of Arts, on the other hand, the professor knows at a glance the name of the man whose papers he is examining, for it is written openly on each sheet. Now, in suggesting to the members of the Faculty of Arts the desirability of the substitution of the anonymous system, as explained above, for the mode presently followed, we do not wish to be understood as insinuating that glaring instances of impartiality or unfairness occur with any frequency. Nor can we see that such an alteration, if adopted by the Faculty, would be an admission on their part that there is even a likelihood of the display of so reprehensible a spirit of favouritism or the reverse. But placing the two systems side by side, one cannot help admitting that there is much greater fairness, in one method than in the other; and granting this superiority, no reasonable objection to the proposed change, can, we imagine, be urged. All men are human, and humanity is pretty much the same thing the world over. College professors, calm and philosophic though they be, cannot help, in the very nature of things, entertaining likes and dislikes, and to reduce the consequences of these feelings,—which must be, and are, occasionally displayed—to a *minimum* should be the aim of every lover of perfect impartiality. It would be needless to enumerate cases where an undue partiality