

that college students are not altogether fit to rule themselves. Usually they have a plentiful supply of spirit and loyalty, but usually too they are lacking in a sense of responsibility. What they undertake in all seriousness is apt to develop at times into something farcical and burlesque. This is one of the weaknesses of our courts at Queen's, as it must be at similar institutions at any university. It can only be completely remedied by removing its cause, and of this one must doubt the possibility as well as the wisdom. But some reforms can be made which could add to the dignity as well as the usefulness of the courts. The courts are not intended for amusement, and this should be relegated to a second place. Horseplay, roughness and noise occupy so much time and attention at present as to become absolutely wearisome. These things do not add to the dignity, the usefulness nor the interest of the courts. They are mere side issues and could be dispensed with with benefit. Business should come first, and amusement afterwards. But the Journal does not advocate the checking of all fun. It does not want to make the courts funereal and dull. Such a course would be suicidal. There should be ample scope for the exercise of the student's wit and humor, but there need be no opportunity for the exercise of his strength and wrestling powers. There is no necessity for converting the courtroom into a bedlam.

Another weakness of Queen's courts is their limited scope. Each faculty has its own. This is well in a way for it insures that each student shall be tried by his peers, by those who are most interested in the particular

law against which he is offending and who are most nearly affected by his misdemeanor. But it also permits an offender to hide behind his faculty. If a medical commits an offence against the rules of the Arts society for instance, his own court will take no cognizance of it and the Arts court has no jurisdiction over him. He therefore escapes. It is the same with members of the other faculties. It is one case in which faculty comes first and the good of the university second. Needless to say there should never be such a case. What is wanted is a court common to all faculties, a supreme court, if you like, which will deal only with inter-faculty difficulties, leaving all other matters to the subordinate courts. This court would necessarily be under the jurisdiction of the Alma Mater Society. Its work would be difficult, and delicate, no doubt, but its very existence might do something to lessen the frequency of inter-faculty "scraps" and raids. These little struggles may have little real effect on the spirit of the university as a whole, but they are annoying to the professors; they wantonly destroy a certain amount of property, and demoralize matters about the buildings while they last.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is gratifying to learn that the subject chosen for debate between Ottawa College and Queen's on December 5th is a live and interesting one, not one that has died naturally, or has had its very life debated out years ago. "Resolved that Free Trade within the Empire, with a high tariff wall against outside nations, is desirable." Queen's has the negative. The subject is eminently debatable, and has the ad-