

But enough of this. The first choice has proved unavailing. Whither will the second tend? We would again earnestly urge the appointment of one whose long residence in Canada has given him a desirable insight into the state of thought and feeling of those with whom he will have to deal—a requisite which an immediate immigrant would deplorably lack. Surely to find such a one cannot be a difficult task. What we advocate is, the election of a Canadian, one of administrative ability from whom a separate Professor of Theology may remove the hampering strings of exclusive devotion to lecturing, and so give him time and scope for application to the real duties of the Provostship. That there are many such we have no doubt; among others Rev. R. W. NORMAN, of Montreal, or Rev. C. J. S. BETHUNE, Head Master of Trinity College School, would be very suitable to our needs. When the next election is to take place, we do not know; but we earnestly trust that the result will be permanent and generally satisfactory. By considering the misrepresentations thus far made relative to this matter, we are led to an inquiry somewhat foreign to the question under treatment but still of undeniable pertinency: Why does the Council continually permit statements of this character concerning the College, that are notoriously false to those acquainted with the facts, to appear in the public press without an authoritative denial? Is the theory of silence giving consent, in the eyes of the people, to be regarded as a dead letter? The vast majority under whose notice damaging statements fall, give a ready credence to them unless flatly contradicted. Whose province is it to attend to these matters?

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of "Rouge et Noir."

DEAR SIRs,—To a visitor coming into the College vestibule, the first thing that looms up is that mysterious conglomeration of articles, arranged about the walls, commonly called the *museum*; and, if he be at all observant, he must be struck with the very peculiar way in which broken shells, bottled curiosities and dusty swans are intermingled. An ordinarily unscientific individual will pass on to the other "sights" with two general impressions, viz., that our geological collection is so large that we can spare a piece of rare coral to prop open the front door, and that our Pro-

fessor of Science differs from all others as to the arrangement of his specimens. What a scientist would think of our cases let us refrain from conjecturing.

Why should this state of things be?

Our collection is by no means a poor one, though no additions have been made to it for many years, with the notable exception of the chest of botanical specimens left to us by Professor Maddock. Is this state of chaos and careless destruction to go on? Can no one be found, with the power and energy to classify and re-label the specimens? Cannot the place left vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Bovell be filled by one who is not a mere honorary member of the committee? Of the three joint curators, our Chancellor already has his hands too full, and the Revs. Canon Bleasdel and C. J. S. Bethune are too far away to be of any practical use.

If *somebody* will attend to it they will not only confer a great benefit upon many students, but will be doing what is only common justice to the College.

Yours very truly,
MEGATHERIUM.

VEXATIOUS LEGISLATION.

To the Editors of "Rouge et Noir."

DEAR SIRs,—In my communication I propose to consider, in a very hurried manner, the most distasteful regulation which has yet emanated from the Council-chamber of our Corporation.

In the year 1878 an order was first mooted and passed without either consideration or delay, that for the future students when sending down *agrolats* should be charged the sum of twenty-five cents, but that, in case a doctor's certificate were produced such amount should be remitted. Immediately upon the proclamation of this moral regulation, steps were taken to bring about its abolition, and a petition signed by the whole College was at once drawn up, wherein were set forth the grounds upon which they requested its removal. In this petition the chief objection urged was, that such legislation coming so suddenly and unexpectedly after a different *regime* for the long period of twenty-five years, was utterly unexplicable, save upon the ground that the Corporation considered Truth and Honor were virtues less highly esteemed and cultivated by the students of "seventy-eight" than by those of a quarter of a century before. No wonder then that those feelings of just indignation that

such an imputation should be cast upon their honour as Christian gentlemen were excited which culminated in the protest which was at once forwarded to the Corporation. But what was the answer? "The Council do not, in ordering that a fine be paid for illness, thereby intend any imputation upon the students' honour. The payment of such amount is intended simply as remuneration due the servants for the extra labour which illness entails." In fact it amounts to a duty, ten cents import tax on dishes and provender, and fifteen cents export tax on dishes alone (of course we here take it for granted that the patient is not so ill as to be deprived of an appetite—the last friend which deserts the afflicted one); the total amount thus realized to be given to the servants of the College, who thus correspond to the customs officers of a country. The idea of Protection was then inflaming the minds of many, and appears to have extended even to the minds of our University Fathers.

Now if this amount be intended as partial payment of the servants' wages would some one kindly inform me how it was that for twenty-five years the servants' interests were so grossly overlooked? Strange that such a grave omission should not have been detected by the ever-watchful, eagle eye of the Bursar and Secretary.

But even supposing the above to be the real cause of the grievance in question we maintain that it is not *our* duty to see that the servants get their lawful dues. That is a matter for which the authorities, not the students, contract. But observe how inadequate is the *alleged* cause of the fine or whatever you choose to call it. "If a doctor's certificate is produced the fine is *dispensed with*." Here we see that the servant, who is generally more poorly off than the doctor, is defrauded of that which is rightly (according to the sentence of an infallible corporation) his little due, in order that the physician may be enriched; consequently his labour goes unrewarded. Now, who in the world are the persons intended to be benefited? Is it the servants or the doctors? We must obtain some more lucid explanation of these inconsistencies than has yet been given us. To be consistent the regulation must be amended and improved by the Council and some provision made to secure for the servants at *all* times what is rightly theirs, and not simply when the patient fails to get a certificate.

Again, if this fine be intended to remunerate the servants why are stu-