

see the wickedness of the city. He engaged the services of a policeman to show him the haunts of vice and wickedness, and he saw so much of evil that his heart sank within him at the enormity of the sin in that great city. But had he remained in the city and had engaged another guide he would have seen so much good in the city, in its churches, asylums, hospitals and schools as to make him believe that New York was a city in which Christian love and life abounded. Now your correspondent seems to have been so intent on seeing evils in prize-giving that I fear he has seen evil, where no evil really exists. Let us then look fairly at this question, and bring to bear upon it not opinions merely but hard solid facts.

The giving of prizes is a very old custom, and, therefore, there must be good reason for its long existence, or long ere this it would have been abolished. It is a mistake to make war on everything that is old. We are to preserve the good and reform only what is bad, or abolish it altogether. It is not well to discard old customs without good and solid reasons.

Your contributor has concluded wrongly, because his facts are not beyond question. In the present age there is a spirit of communism abroad. It has made its appearance in the sphere of labor, and in the writer's article we have a taint of it in the intellectual sphere. Because God has gifted one man more than another, he wishes to break down this distinction or to ignore it by refusing to give rewards.

But it is written : "To him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundant ; and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that he hath." Not only in College but in the world rewards are given. It is the diligent, the intellectual and the pains-taking who gain success in the world. Even if we abolish prizes in College we cannot abolish them in the world.

However, let us examine some of the conclusions stated in the paper under review. He says it is "special advantages" that is rewarded and not "diligence." Your correspondent is certainly at fault here. We venture to say that in our experience and in the experience of others who have looked into this question, that without regard to "special advantages" the medallists and winners of Scholarships generally have been noted for their diligence, and were not only, if you will, ahead of others in having enjoyed "special advantages," but certainly ahead of them in diligence also, so that the prizes were gained in almost every case by the most diligent student. Besides in a system where prizes are awarded is it right to conclude that diligence alone is to be rewarded? The enjoyment of "special advantages" by some of the students was due to the foresight and diligence of themselves or of their parents, and even if it were true that "special advantages" alone were rewarded, there would be no injustice in such award. Has it not rather been a stimulus to parents and guardians to give special advantages to their sons, so that they be successful in the competition for prizes. The prizes at per-