

command, "Masters, render unto your servants that which is just and equal," is very loosely interpreted and acted upon. Masters generally err in making "that which is just and equal" square with their own personal interests. Servants are commanded to obey "not with eye-service, as men-pleasers." But, how many so act? The tendency now-a-days is for masters to get as much as they can out of their men at the least possible cost; and in return men perform their work in order to gratify the demand of the master, and so gain favour. We think the church is not wholly blameless for this state of matters. She panders to the wishes of the wealthy, for the sake of riches. The workingman and the poor are very much disregarded. The cents of the commonalty are despised and the dollars of the rich prayed for. What has made the British nation what she is? The artizans and men of enterprize, not the landed proprietors. What fills her exchequer? Not the pounds of the comparatively few wealthy people, but the pence of her teeming artizan population. Why should the church disregard this lesson? Would our churches not be better attended by the working-classes were they treated in a becoming way? Would the miserable system of continual begging not cease if less dependence were put upon the dollars of the rich few, and more attention given to the steady contribution of cents by the working-classes? Working men have more common-sense than that with which they are generally accredited. And ministers do not sufficiently instruct their people as to the mutual obligations of master and servant. Masters, and men in authority, in many instances, lord it over their servants and subordinates with a peevishness only becoming children; and yet they are lauded because of their social position. And do we not find even men of culture bowing before this mammon of unrighteousness, and demeaning themselves by unworthy acts?

IN most men there is an inherent disposition to rejoice over another's failings. The editor of the *Acta Victoriana* is no exception to the rule. Some busybody has been giving him information exceedingly over-colored and imperfect. He says: "We have been informed that 'Outis' has been devoting some space in the *Educational Weekly* to the criticism of college journals. 'Varsity and QUEEN'S COLLEGE JOURNAL have been examined, and not a few egregious mistakes were discovered and explained. We trust that the December number of *Acta* will not fall into the hands of 'Outis,' for by an unfortunate accident there was not sufficient time for proof-reading." After reading the foregoing, we became interested in the "egregious mistakes," and set ourselves to find out the real facts upon which *Acta's* informant based his unjust statement. *Acta* represents 'Varsity and QUEEN'S COLLEGE JOURNAL as being the only two at fault among college journals. But *Acta* should be slow to write on the information of others. We have traced the matter, and find that "Outis'" purpose is not wholly to criticise college journals. The article referred to is styled "Correctness in Writing," and begins thus: "Our esteemed contributor, 'Outis,' is intent upon remedying some common abuses of our good English speech." "Outis" does indeed criticise 'Varsity and the QUEEN'S COLLEGE JOURNAL; but instead of pitting us against the *Acta* or any college journal whatever, we find ourselves brothers in error with "Arnold's Latin Prose Composition," "The Graphic," "Blackwood's Magazine," etc. We admit that the editorial referred to as having appeared in the JOURNAL was not over-elegant, there being a superfluity of "that's" and a "don't." These "Outis" notices; but this fact scarcely justifies *Acta* in saying "there were not a few egregious mistakes." We would recommend the editor of *Acta* to read