

for the answer to these questions will decide the matter :

1st. When leading members of the Senate of Toronto were urged, as the address of the Principal assures us they were, to unite with Queen's in drawing up a rational examination, were they to blame in declining the overtures made ?

2nd. When subsequently, viz., in December, 1886, the Senate was officially approached by Queen's, why was no answer given? Who is to blame? Will the *Varsity* answer distinctly ?

\* \* \*

We see in the current number of *The Wide Awake* another story by our fellow-student, Mr. T. G. Marquis. Simply and sweetly told, with a lesson upon the folly of judging by appearances, it will no doubt be read with delight by the little readers of the magazine in question. We extend to Mr. Marquis our congratulations on his literary progress. It is no little credit to him to have his name enrolled among *Wide Awake's* contributors.

\* \* \*

There is an article in the March number of the *Educational Monthly* on "Queen's University and what it has done for Canada in the Past," by our clever friend, *Fidelis*. It is a condensed history of the University *ab ovo*, and it will teach our readers the character of the men who stood around the cradle of our Alma Mater at her birth. It will give those of them who have only known her in her days of prosperity some faint idea of what it cost to make her what she is. Never, we venture to say, did a University pass through such a series of crises and survive them ; and never did a University have a more noble-hearted, whole-souled, self-sacrificing body of friends, alumni and professors than Queen's. All honor to them ; and may the day never dawn when we, who have inherited the fruits of their labors, shall forget how much we owe to those who bore so gallantly the burden and heat of the day. Such an article is an inspiration, and we know little of the temper and *calibre* of the men of Queen's to-day if they do not show the country, when occasion calls, that the same spirit animates them which animated those who have gone before.

\* \* \*

But Miss Machar, in bringing before us the admirable spirit of those who established Queen's upon a sound financial and educational basis, does not forget to remind us of a danger which arises from the very fact that we have such an efficient staff of professors. Having no desire, however, to impair in any way the strength of wisdom of her remarks by a condensed statement of them, we refer our readers to the Literary Department for her own words. There is only too much truth in what she says, and we hope that our Senate, as well as students, will take the trouble of considering it.

\* \* \*

There is also an able and thoughtful article by Sir Daniel Wilson in the same number of this magazine.

The author complains that the matriculation papers in English set by the Department are *simply puzzles*. After making a careful study of them for years he sums up his opinion of the whole matter by saying that he is thankful that he matriculated long ago. When the President of Toronto University, a gentleman who has been an English author for half a century, states as his deliberate conviction that the papers set in English are ridiculous, and adds that he himself could only "dimly guess" at the meaning of the questions put, we ask in the name of common sense what the Education Department means by this sort of thing? If this is a sample of the system which Mr. Ross boasts to be the "best" on this continent, will some of our North-West missionaries kindly furnish us with a sample of what is considered the "worst." We heartily agree with President Wilson that for matriculation English an essay on some general topic, to be judged on its (1) orthography, (2) grammar, (3) rhetoric, (4) style, (5) punctuation, is a test sufficiently severe and sufficiently comprehensive for all practical purposes. We may add that such an examination paper would have the advantage of displaying in about equal parts the efficiency of the pupil and the common sense of the examiner.

\* \* \*

No. 146 of the pocket edition of Funk's Standard Library is a work on the "Drink Problem" by Axel Gustafson. We have not space in this place to deal with the work as we should wish, but we direct the attention of all temperance workers to it as a little book which deals thoroughly and systematically with that greatest of all curses—strong drink. Mr. Gustafson deals trenchantly with the usual objections made to Total Prohibition, summing them up under the headings of (1) moral suasion, (2) opposition of the Bible, (3) a violation of personal liberty, (4) impracticable, (5) law cannot precede public sentiment, (6) public sentiment is not ripe for it, (7) we must reach it step by step.

After showing that moral suasion has been tried for ages, and with a result known to all of us, he adds that if it is a right and duty to abstain and to induce others so to do, it is equally a right and duty to vote against the traffic and to induce others to do so also. But for a synopsis of his arguments we must refer our readers to the work itself. We can only say that the reasoning in general is clear and sound, and the arguments in favor of total prohibition are certainly of more weight and power than any which can be urged against them. A better hand-book for the mission field, general temperance work or private information it would be hard to find.

\* \* \*

The King's College *Record* has been treating its readers during the session to a series of essays upon Canadian poets. The articles are well, some of them ably, written, and would astonish some of the gentry who still go about with bees in their bonnets telling people that