

fortunate fellows. And we in no way intend to imply that it is not praiseworthy for a student to take extra time to master as perfectly as he can his special line of study. It is one of the valuable points in connection with the option we have in Queen's of taking as few classes as we like in a session, that it gives liberty in all stages of our course for this thorough work. But what we do contend is that competition with these more fortunate students, who can afford to take a longer time than usual, should prevent a less fortunate one from winning the distinction of a medal, even though in scholarship he may be quite up to level of medallists in other departments, or of graduates of other years in his own department.

But since it is the privilege of intelligence to minimize chance, we may expect a university, which ought to be an expression of the highest intelligence, to come as near as possible to bestowing her distinctions in all cases according to real merit. The step we suggest is a very simple and inexpensive one, and we believe will receive favorable consideration, especially as we understand it has already been recommended by the University Council.

\* \* \*

In No. 13 of *'Varsity* there appears a most remarkable editorial on the proposed Inter-Collegiate Debate.

"The debate with Queen's University has fallen through. The Queen's men did not ask the earth and the fulness thereof, but if we except Hawaii and the pine-apple crop we should have a fair relative idea of the extent of the conditions they wished to impose."

Queen's can well allow the facts to speak for themselves. They are as follows:—In November *Varsity* challenged Queen's to a debate to be held in Toronto in Feb'y, '93. As our last debate was held in Toronto we were entitled to have this one in Kingston, but willing, as ever, to oblige our friends we agreed—our letter Dec. 16th—to debate in Toronto. As we were challenged to an Inter-Collegiate Debate we of course concluded we might select our debaters from among regular registered students in the Arts department. On January 28th, however, their Secretary writes: "We would respectfully *urge* upon your Society

the necessity of electing as your representatives two under-graduates, as there is no post-graduate course in connection with University College, Toronto." On Feb. 2nd, we assured them that both of our debaters would be under-graduates. With regard to how the debate was to be decided we mutually agreed on "a committee of three, a chairman and two colleagues, one to be nominated by each University." The points of difference were over the time limit and the subject of debate. One of the conditions of our acceptance of their challenge was—our letter Dec. 16th—"Each debater to be allowed 25 minutes." This has been the customary time limit. On the 23rd of January they wrote that on the 20th inst. they arranged for the debate a musical program of one hour's length, and therefore they would like the time limit to be 15 minutes. On Feb. 2nd we replied that on account of the extent of the subjects of debate such a limit would be unsatisfactory.

With regard to the subjects of debate, as has been customary, we allowed them, the "home" University, the affirmative, and we submitted for their choice the three following subjects: (1) Resolved, that the future prosperity of Canada can be better attained by Independence than by Annexation. (2) Resolved, that the future prosperity of Canada can be better attained by Imperial Federation than by Annexation. (3) Resolved, that the future prosperity of Canada can be best attained by Annexation with the United States.

If one will but notice he will see *Varsity* could take either the affirmative or the negative of any aspect of this question. We were willing to accept any side that they refused. On Jan. 28th they write, "This committee cannot accept any of the subjects submitted, but will be *pleased* to take the *affirmative* in the following: (1) Resolved, that the future prosperity of Canada can be secured by working towards the attainment of Independence rather than by Annexation. (2) Resolved, that it is inexpedient for Canada to take any steps towards severing the political ties which bind her to the mother country (or Great Britain). (3) Resolved, that it is inexpedient for Canada at the present time to sever the political bonds which unite her to Great Britain (or the mother country).