

was for the elimination of the "Fortnightly" and the addition of the "Blue Book" and "Popular," or similar magazines. That we most correctly judged the trend of popular opinion is evident from the fact that although the "Fortnightly" arrived in May, 1908, and "was good," yet when it was removed from the reading-room at the time the notice was posted in November, it was found to be still splendidly fresh and not even thumb-marked. On the other hand, two days after the arrival of the "Blue Book" it was quite worn in appearance and minus its cover. Four days after placing the "Popular" in its covers some enthusiasts seem to have swallowed it whole, for it was never seen more.

We expect that when the suggestion book comes into effect that the serious magazines will by popular vote be entirely displaced. We regret that such should seem to be the case, but believe it to be true. Seven men out of ten who are spoken to now want to know if we consider the reading room an auxiliary part of the English Composition or Literature course, while a large percentage of the others think that "we could get along with fewer reviews."

He next submits that we are not "taking advantage of the reduced rates on magazines which have been obtained between Canada and Great Britain." From the financial standpoint he is again decidedly wrong. If he speaks regarding the proportion of magazines we receive from Europe, I must again disagree with him. He believes in not getting more we fail "to satisfy a large percentage of our members and foolishly neglect an opportunity to keep in touch with European views and happenings." Mr. Editor, just 9 per cent. of our members come from Europe. This 9 per cent. should surely be satisfied with a representation of 48.4 per cent. of the periodicals. We others are, of course, desirous of keeping posted in European views and events, but does

"Union Members" intend to have us believe that the interests of the remainder, or 91 per cent., of our members, who have been born and brought up on this continent, lie in the old country to a greater extent than 48.4 per cent.

Then, Mr. Editor, referring to the removal and mutilation notice, he says, "it (the House Committee) is responsible for those very mutilations that the House Committee complains of." The members of the House Committee have first ridiculed that statement, and then given it direct denial. He is invited to come out with a charge to that effect against some member of the Union House Committee, and prove his statement. He is assured that if he does do so some one of us will have a long leave of absence from the Union; but should he fail something might be found in the house rules to cover libel.

The absurdity of the charge makes it appear barely possible that the man has not said what he means. It seems most incongruous, however, that a man who apparently spends (in what are presumably his lighter moments) such an enormous amount of time in perusing the more serious magazines, should betray such a lamentable ignorance of English forms and methods of precise expression. Should "Union Member's" mentality be of such a type that he says one thing and means another, just what does he mean? His meaning, it has been suggested, is that owing to late and unpunctuality members abuse the periodicals. This, however, is impossible, because we know that the periodicals do arrive on time; that they are put in their covers on arrival, and that they are cut and stolen in spite of it. The old numbers of the magazines have been removed from the reading room and locked up, so that stealing will be more difficult through being more immediately noticeable, but the thefts go merrily on.

It would take a permanent detective