

EXAMINATIONS.

To the Editor of the Queen's College Journal.

DEAR SIR,—It seems to me, Mr. Editor, that the writer of the editorials on the relations of examinations and crams, in No. 4 of the Journal, does not do his subject justice by going deep enough to find truth. For example he says: "It is the student who can cram and mechanically reproduce at an examination, direct answers to direct and cranky questions who gains the honours and is reckoned the scholar." This is far from the truth, and experience teaches us better. Any one who understands the amount of work that is required of an honour man of the present day at Queen's, will see the utter impossibility of becoming such by a process of cram, while those who stand at the head of our pass classes do not get there by cram, but by sure means of steady work. Before a class has been together two months, the poorest student intellectually in the class can point to the one or two who will head the list at the finals. How can he thus fortell? Evidently by what he and the rest of the class as well as the professor see plainly going on every day, faithful persevering study. Does not this show that he who is reckoned the scholar, and he who crams can never be considered in the same category? Go to the seat of war and interview the crammer, ask him how he expects to stand, and the answer comes readily, "if I get through I will be satisfied." A good many crammers get through, a good many do not. Those who do stand where? Not at the top, they form a cluster around the foot of the list, stars of a lesser magnitude.

The crammer and the cribber belong to the same species. The former depends on the kind of a paper the professor sets him, the latter on the professors good nature in not being too strict in the examination hall.

There is a black sheep in every flock, so in every class there is a cribber or two. This fact the senate should bear in mind when examination time comes, and as an act of charity to the cribber and others, let them have a more vigilant system of watching. A cribber who finds that he cannot crib will be taught a lesson, which will cure him of his pernicious habit, and he will cease to be a cribber; while those whom he bothers by trying to elicit information from, will also enjoy the blessing. Let the professor look to his paper as well, and the reign of the crammer will also end.

POLLUX.

ALMA MATER ELECTIONS.

To the Editor of the Queen's College Journal.

DEAR SIR,—Though far away from the halls of old Queen's, I am still there in spirit. I have read "Arts" communication on Alma Mater elections with great interest. I am quite sure, however, that "Arts" has not thoroughly considered his subject. He rushes blindly into print and accordingly is inconsistent. I refer to the latter part of his letter, in which he deplores the "meds," lack of independence, and rejoices over the backbone of

the art student. Let him answer the following question: Where is the backbone of those medical students who are graduates in arts? Surely when a man goes within the halls of Esculapius he does not become demoralized so as to lose his independence; but to what other conclusion does "Arts" reasoning lead us? Moreover, what sort of weakness is it when the "meds" rally around their own candidate? It is a weakness that brings them out at the top every time. The "meds" have a perfect right to be represented in the A. M. S., and so can nominate what candidates they like, and as many of them as they please. It pleases them usually to nominate one good man for each contest, and in this they show their wisdom. On the other hand, arts students have backbone and opinions of their own. They see that the "meds" have as good men as they themselves have, and so they split and put the "med" in. Sometimes the "meds" majority is so great that if the medical vote were taken away still he would be elected by a majority of arts' votes. Thus, because the "meds" vote the same way as the majority of the arts, who have backbone, they the "meds" have no backbone. Truly "Arts" is endowed with an undue quantity of that opinion which, according to himself, is inherent in every art student, when he reaches such conclusions as these. Because pine will split when oak will not, therefore pine is better than oak.

As a general thing the "meds" see their candidates for the minor offices at the head of the poll, and in these their men are just as good as any the arts can bring out. But with regard to the president, the "meds" when they see the arts man will make the best one allow him to go in by acclamation or help to put him in. Facts show that we have elected more presidents on the art ticket. The "meds" never bother with the critic, by custom he has always been an arts man.

Again the arts students have so much backbone, that at one time when the only good man available was a "med," they must needs bring out an arts prof. to oppose him. They showed such good sense that they must oppose the only available good man, because he was a "med." But the better man went in.

It is the best thing possible that the "meds" are so dependent. It gives greater interest to the election; it seems to develop the *backbone* and *opinion* in the arts student; it fills the depleted treasury to overflowing and serves to bind the college closer together.

Such is the way in which this appears to one who was once an arts student.

R. M.

The earliest known lens is one made of rock crystal, unearthed by Layard at Nineveh. This lens, whose age is to be measured by thousands of years, lies in the British museum, with surfaces as bright as when it left its maker's hands, while, exhibited in the same place, may be seen other lenses of comparatively recent date, whose surfaces are entirely destroyed by London smoke.