

THE eight graduates in Theology—John Moore, B.A., Peter M. Pollock, B.A., Adam R. Linton, B.A., James F. Somerville, B.A., James Murray, B.A., James Bennett, B.A., Daniel McTavish, M.A., and W. H. W. Boyle passed a most successful preliminary examination before the Presbytery of Kingston, on the 18th of March. Their examination for license to preach, is to take place before the same Presbytery on the 29th of April. They will therefore be licensed to preach in all probability before the College session closes. Lose no time is the spirit of the age.

POPULAR APOLOGETICS.

WHILE the Science of Apologetics in its learned aspect is taught with more or less efficiency in all our Theological Colleges, yet young men upon leaving College often find themselves unable to answer popular objections to religion, that meet them on all sides. To answer such cavils and difficulties with the arguments and syllogisms of Scientific Apologetics, would be somewhat like shooting mosquitos with a Krupp cannon. Yet mosquito sceptics are very conceited and persistent and generally give the christian worker more trouble than the Goliath infidels. The veriest children, with a wise sort of look, call themselves Agnostics, and though it is not difficult to show an intelligent man the fallacies underlying Agnosticism, yet it is difficult to make it so simple that these children may understand they are but fools. A mere numskull will tell you now-a-days with the utmost assurance that Buddha and Mahomet are as well entitled to be called Saviours as Christ. To the thorough student of comparative religions this objection has no weight, but how can we show this in a popular way to a man who knows little about Buddhism and has never seen a copy of the Koran in his life! In short, much of our defence of religion like much of our preaching, has been above the heads of the common people. A man without logic or reason can stand upon a platform and set forth his objections in such a ridiculous light as to draw forth shouts of applause. Thus the *profanum vulgus* are laughed into scepticism by men who in their ignorance contradict themselves in almost every sentence they utter. Let students be trained to answer these objections and they will always be ready to give a Roland for every Oliver.

ROYAL COLLEGE.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.

THE Examinations in Medicine are over and the Medical Students are happy or the reverse, according as the decision of the examiners was "passed" or "plucked."

Now seems the appropriate time to make a few observations upon the method of conducting these examinations.

We will first notice a few respects in which improvements have been made and then suggest some alterations which we think would be for the better.

The examinations are of two kinds—written and oral—

every student must take both. This is well. In the first place it is a severer test and in the second place it avoids the possibility of any student cribbing his way through.

The questions for the written are dictated by the examiner. This precludes the possibility of students obtaining the questions before the examinations and is therefore to be commended.

The order of merit is not published—all the satisfaction a student can now obtain (*i.e.* officially) is that he has been successful or has failed. Formerly every student had the satisfaction of knowing exactly what percentage he made in each subject. "Why was the change made?" might be reasonably asked. The Faculty say, because occasionally a student was dissatisfied with his marks in some subjects. So that it happens that because of the old system causing dissatisfaction to one student, they abandoned the old system for the new which gives satisfaction to none but dissatisfaction to all. Moreover we believe that a student has the right to know what percentage he makes. It seems to us rather a cavalier method of treating the students to say to them, "you have passed" or "you have been plucked." Besides were the order of merit made known there would be better work done by the students in general. At present the only way in which a student can have his name specially mentioned is to win a prize and as the number of prizes is limited all cannot get one. A student who wins a prize is no better, as far as the published lists show, than one who has got through by the "skin of his teeth." We would greatly like to see a return to the old system in this particular.

To the mode of conducting the honor examinations all the students most emphatically object and we most certainly agree with them. At present the rule is that every student who makes 60 per cent. in every subject has the right of being examined for honors. So far so good—we hold that every student who comes up to the standard should be enrolled in the calendar as an honor man and should also be furnished with a certificate to that effect. As a matter of fact however every student who makes the required percentage does not go up for honors. Before the examinations begin he must signify his intention to the examiners, of going up for honors. Now many students not feeling confident of taking this high stand do not send in their names as honor candidates and are thus shut out from any chance of winning honors. Moreover as the standing of the students is not published it is never known (*i.e.* from an official source) who are entitled to compete and who are not. All who have had sufficient confidence in their own ability to meet the requirements and have signified their intention of so doing are allowed to go up. Now as a matter of fact, though the results are not published, it is well known in the college that, in the past, students who have not made their 60 per cent. in all subjects, because they had the cheek to send in their names, have been allowed to compete for honors and have been awarded the positions notwithstanding the fact that others had made the required per cent. but had not sent in their names. This is, to say the least, manifestly unjust and we sincerely hope that before next spring this crying evil and glaring injustice will be rectified.

The *Gazette* says that Lord Dalhousie in answer to Prof. Schurman wrote that all educated Scotchmen would pronounce the "ou" in Dalhousie like the "ow" in "now."

"What are you laughing at, my dear?" asked Mrs. Jones of her husband, who was chuckling over his morning paper. "Something I saw here," he replied; "but it's hardly funny enough for two."—*Adelphian*.