

only legitimate object for which they may be given, namely to reward diligence ;" his last is, "that prizes are instrumental in sending some of our noblest students to premature graves, etc." Here there is a manifest contradiction. In the latter case, the writer's evident meaning is that prizes sometimes lead to the death of students by driving them to fatal excess in study. I endorse neither of the positions, but granting the second, the first is denied ; for if students win prizes at the expense of their health, it is simply adding insult to injury to tell these gentlemen that their acquired honors are not the result of diligence. Apart from hard, honest toil, I contend that prizes are unattainable. We know from the very constitution of the human mind that the certain effect of a proffered reward is to excite in the minds of a number of students a desire to secure that reward. This desire *per se* will inevitably lead to close application, and when several competitors are arrayed against each other, the additional element of honorable emulation will stimulate to still more determined effort. In view of these considerations it is a transparent absurdity, confirmed alike by reason and observation, to say that prizes are not a reward of diligence. The very fact that the securing of a medal is conditional upon the attainment of such a high standard, renders diligence an absolute necessity, to say nothing of the various other motives that act as spurs upon those aiming at college honors. O. P. Q. cites the case of a gold medalist who stated that "he hardly ever looked at his work till after the Christmas holidays." For myself I am inclined to attribute that sweet morsel of information rather to a vaunting disposition than to superior ability. We have all heard that kind of talk and know what estimate to put upon it.

So far I have referred only to the negative side of O. P. Q.'s first argument, viz., that prizes are *not* the reward of diligence. He also states the same argument in positive form, "*they are the reward of special advantages.*" Were O. P. Q. advocating the abolition of prizes in an Art's College like McGill, I would at once admit the force of his position ; but I fail to see that it has the remotest application to the students of a Theological institution, except to those who are doubling their course, and these, I submit, are beyond the legitimate range of the present discussion. We are ready, then, to admit that a superior preparatory training (I wouldn't include wealth) does often give one student the vantage ground over his less highly favored fellows, and this inequality may and sometimes does exist throughout the entire university course ; but if these students do not stand on equal footing when they come to enter upon their Theological studies, it seems to me an evasion of the true cause to attribute such continued inequality to special advantages. A man, after spending three or four sessions of judicious study in our sister college of McGill, is, or ought to be, thoroughly equipped for