

tion of pretty sentiments expressed with artistic and rhetorical correctness, but an utterance straight from the heart of the writer, rousing enthusiasm and sympathy more by the tone of sincerity, the suggestions of truth and conviction with which he gives utterance to feelings latent in his fellows, than by any laboured striving to express in metrical form sentiments which he never felt and never can feel. An ardent young French republican, with a talent for rhyming, sat up the greater part of the night to compose, at the request of an officer, a marching song for a company that was leaving Marseilles the next day. That song, a short time after, rallied on the field of Jemappes the routed army of the Republic and dashed back from the frontiers of France the wave of Austrian invasion.

Does not some one of her gifted sons entertain towards Queen's something of the generous ardour that inspired Burns to wish for the land of his birth that he—

"For poor auld Scotland's sake  
Some useful plan or book could make  
Or sing a sang at least?"

But if we have not among us a Burns or a Rouget de Lisle, if the times and conditions make the production of such a song impossible, let us, in imitation of the students of Baliol, have incorporated in our new song book a selection from some great poet that shall serve as our watchword and our rallying cry, that shall embody in some way a reminder of the aims and aspirations of the great institution of which we are proud to be enrolled as students.

\* \* \*

With this issue of the JOURNAL we present to our readers a cut of T. R. Glover, M.A., lately appointed to the chair of Latin in Queen's University. Prof. Glover, is a Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and his university career was a most brilliant one. His reputation for exact classical scholarship may be inferred from the fact that he is now at work, at the request of the Syndics of the Cambridge press, on an edition of the Olynthiacs of Demosthenes. Though unused to Canadian educational standards and conditions, Mr. Glover is meeting with marked success, and has already clearly demonstrated that he is an able and enthusiastic teacher. His wide range of knowledge joined with his ability to express his thoughts in a humorous and forcible manner make his classes specially interesting.

\* \* \*

One of our professors, in the course of a recent address to the student body, incidentally remarked that in his college days students did not besiege their professors as soon as the examination lists were published, desiring to know the number of marks they had secured or the reason for their being

unsuccessful in some particular subject. We gladly seize the opportunity to bring this matter before the readers of the JOURNAL. It cannot be denied that the existing condition of affairs in this connection is unsatisfactory, but we believe that the fault lies chiefly with the professors themselves. Apparently there exists with the Senate a written or unwritten law to the effect that the percentage of marks obtained by a student is to be disclosed only in exceptional cases. If this regulation were published and adhered to, we believe that most of the existing evils would disappear. Professors would then be relieved from the visits of dissatisfied students, while the latter would still have the privilege of an appeal to the Senate, if they really felt that an injustice had been done them. So long, however, as some students are fully informed not only of their own rank, but also of the rank of any about whom they may be curious, there is sure to be general dissatisfaction.

It seems clear that one of the following courses must be pursued in future—either let the percentage obtained by each student accompany the published results, or let it be authoritatively announced that information concerning the exact standing of any student can be obtained only by communication with the Senate and for reasons which the Senate may deem sufficient. The latter method commends itself as highly satisfactory, and we believe we are voicing the best opinion of the students in asking the Senate to give it their careful consideration.

\* \* \*

In the McGill *Fortnightly* of Feb. 18th appears an editorial purporting to give McGill's side of the question, "Whether or not Queen's have any right to the title of 'Inter-Collegiate Champions.'" We cannot help expressing the opinion that if McGill and the *Fortnightly* have chosen the writer of that article to expound their view they have been unfortunate in their choice. If the writer made the statements contained in the editorial without learning the facts of the case he is a bungler; if he wrote with knowledge of the facts, he is—well, a bungler still.

In the inter-collegiate league matches of '95-'96 Queen's and McGill were pitted against one another in the first round of the series, not, as the *Fortnightly* states, "when playing off for the championship." Queen's had yet to meet Varsity and Trinity before the question of the championship could be decided. The statement that McGill played in Kingston on the understanding that a return match would be played on Montreal ice is false. Queen's had entered the Ontario Hockey League in the same year, and our secretary, Mr. Fox, notified McGill *before any games were played* that Queen's would find