

" In collar and two strips—the meagre relict
Of all his bygone lustre—not of name,
But garb."

Now, alas! the scene is changed, and changed far more than would appear to the superficial observer. The gowns still are seen; but no longer do they mean what they once did. With regard to them the matriculation is ignored, and now if any ten-year-old desires to wear a gown, let him pay four dollars of a registration fee and go through the innocent formality of signing his name in a book which apparently contains nothing more than a lot of other signatures—and which he therefore supposes is an autograph album on a large scale—and he is immediately informed that he has to get a gown, and, in utter disregard of the effect such a strain on his imagination may have, is thereby told to consider himself an undergraduate. *O tempora, O mores!* We fear the days of the gown of hallowed memories are numbered as far as Queen's is concerned, for as soon as such a badge as that comes to be meaningless, it is time it was abolished. Yet we do not advocate this move, rather the opposite. The gown is very attractive to us, and hence anything that tends to lower it will be strongly opposed. Why should the gown be deprived of its old meaning? Why given to anyone who comes to Queen's to gain knowledge he should have acquired in our Grammar schools? If the gown is to mean anything, it should not be given to those students who enter college without in any way, publicly at least, having shown themselves able to enter upon a B. A. course. It makes too much of a farce of the whole costume, and as we said before will be the most effective mode possible to entirely stop the wearing of it. We hope that the rule as to all students wearing it will be reconsidered, and the privilege limited as formerly to matriculants.

FOR some time it has been generally known that the authorities of Queen's had decided to admit any ladies who might apply to all the benefits of the College and University, and such being the case, we view with all the more interest the present wordy war on the subject of co-education that is raging among the College papers in the States. We here have not yet had the opportunity to experience either the blessings or curses of the system, but it is rather interesting to hear the remarks of others who purport to speak from experience. Those opposed to it carry their statements not merely to the verge of the ridiculous, but are over head and shoulders into it. If they "state but the facts," we fear they say little for the good breeding of the students, but we are not willing to believe that the results they give are merely the offspring of co-education; for example: One exchange seems to fear that if co-education becomes common, the evil effects of slang will become woefully prominent, and the pure English tongue become a dead language in our Colleges. To prove this they quote from a couple of co-educational College papers. In one is a communication from a female correspondent, "We girls miss the hoof fall of some members of '79." And in another is the following, "Girls, if the boys are to take grammar from our lips, we must stop using so much slang—Jerusalem! Get your chair off my foot you blasted crinoid." It seems to us we have seen just as bad slang in papers that are not co-ed. Another exchange (*Acta Columbiana*) has promised most fearful disclosures of the evil effects of co-education at a college where it has been in operation for a number of years, and the second paper on the subject is now out, and it has disclosed—Oh, horrors! it has disclosed the fearful effects of a cane and banger rush in a class where half were females, and after a most minute and graphic description