

longs for some guiding mind to settle these greatest of problems for him. Happy indeed may be the one whose life is planned by another! Yet would we willingly sit quietly aside and take no part in deciding our own future? Nay, we cannot act thus indifferently; we are compelled to take some part in determining our own fate.

Now, since these questions must be settled and we, as principals in the transactions, must take some part in the solution of them, let us set to at once.

There are many questions to be asked and answered before determining upon the college which is to be our Alma Mater. We want to know the standing of the college, its opportunities for work, its surroundings, the courses of study, the class of students in attendance, its societies, its reputation, and so on through an unlimited list. Then we must base our decision largely upon what we expect to do in after years. All these things are necessary to be known before making the great choice.

But there is one other thing which we think much more important than any of the foregoing. It is, indeed, too lightly regarded, or even passed over altogether, by young men who make their own decision of their college. This is the moral influence by which the institution is surrounded. The question of moral character should be one of the greatest, if not the greatest factor in making up the decision. Many a young man would call this merely sentimentalism, and sneer at it and attempt to laugh it down; but it cannot be got rid of so easily. How many a man has been literally ruined, simply by his disregard of this most important element of a college make up.

We are led to make these remarks because we understand that one of the largest and most powerful American colleges has endorsed, by adoption, a text-book on Moral Philosophy, written by an atheist who holds a chair in that college. We are not positive of the facts in the case, but we have been informed on reasonably good authority that such is the case.

If this be true, it would be extremely dangerous for a young man to come under the instruction of such a professor. We would not for a moment grant that atheism is gaining ground, or that it will ever triumph over the truth. On the contrary, truth is spreading and fast gaining. It was only about eighteen months ago that a professor in one of our largest colleges, who had been a firm disbeliever, became an active and ardent Christian, and he has declared his reasons for his action in a printed pamphlet for the benefit of those who choose to read it. Still it would be dangerous for a young man to be placed under the instruction of a disbeliever, especially when his disbelief is directly in connection with the subject studied. A young man is not prepared to grapple with such questions with such great odds against him, not because atheism is so strong, but simply because of the unequal conditions on which the opposing sides work.

In a college course a man can be made or a man can be ruined. It depends upon his character, to be sure; but, nevertheless, it depends upon his surroundings.

Let those who have not yet decided consider carefully, they they may decide wisely. If any have decided thoughtlessly, let them reconsider before it is too late. Half of life's race consists in starting right.—*Ex.*

ALMA MATER BRANCH OF THE ENDOWMENT SCHEME.

THE enrolled members of this branch lately formed at the College are as follows:

MEDICINE.—J. C. Connell, E. Mandell, F. C. Heath, J. V. Anglin, W. Coy, H. Mitchell, M. Robertson, A. J. Errett, A. E. Bolton, W. D. Harvie.

THEOLOGY.—A. Givan, J. Steele, J. W. H. Milne, A. Gandier, L. Perrin, S. Childerhose, W. G. Mills, A. McRossie, G. R. Lang, D. J. Highland.

ARTS.—G. J. Smith, L. Irving, H. Dunning, W. A. Stuart, J. A. McDonald, H. Lavell, D. Strachan, A. G. Hay, R. Whiteman, J. Hales, J. Kirk, W. S. Morden, G. W. Morden, A. K. H. McFarlane, T. G. Allen, O. L. Kilborn, L. T. Lockhead, A. H. D. Ross, H. L. Leask, J. C. Cameron, E. Pirie, G. E. Hartwell, J. O. Claxton, W. J. Holdercroft, J. W. Muirhead, G. E. Dyde, A. G. Farrell, W. Nicol, W. A. Cameron, W. H. Cornett, C. B. Dupuis, C. A. D. Fairfield, W. R. Givens, J. McFarland, J. MacLennan, F. R. Parker, H. Wilson, H. Ross, S. Richards.

WORLD TIME.

THE Astronomer-Royal of Great Britain delivered a lecture last month at the Royal Institution, which shows that he is a complete convert to the Chancellor's proposal that there should be a common world time instead of the innumerable time reckonings now in vogue. A great step was taken in the direction of Dr. Fleming's proposal, when the managers of the American and Canadian Railways adopted in 1883 five time standards for this continent, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 hours respectively later than Greenwich, instead of the seventy-five different local times previously in use on their railroads. These five standards are now used on 97½ per cent. of all the miles of railway lines on this continent. Another step in advance was taken in 1884 when the International Conference held at Washington recommended the adoption of the meridian of Greenwich as the zero for longitude, and the Greenwich civil day (commencing at Greenwich midnight and reckoned from 0 to 24 hours) as the standard for time reckoning. The inconveniences of having five time standards on this continent are so great that in the near future a common standard, 6 hours slow by Greenwich, is sure to be adopted for railways and telegraphs, unless the more radical step of universal time is adopted. The Astronomer-Royal is decidedly in favour of taking the radical step at once. As he puts it, "The question for the future seems to be whether it will be found more troublesome to change the hours for labor, sleep and meals once for all in any particular place, or to be continually changing them in com-