

out. The second volume is in quarto, written upon 450 double pages of vellum, but in a single column, and in a large but very fair character. * * * * It was formerly kept at Westminster, with the king's seal, by the side of the Tally Court in the Exchequer, under three locks, in the charge of the auditor, the chamberlains, and deputy chamberlains of the Exchequer. In 1696 it was deposited among other valuable records in the Chapter House. It is now kept beneath a strong glass case in the Public Record Office, where it can be consulted without payment of any fee. * * * * In 1783 Domesday Book was published in two volumes; and in 1816 a volume of indices was printed by the Record Commission, to which a valuable general introduction was prefixed. Within the last few years, the whole of Domesday has been issued in parts, each part comprising a county; and printed by the process of photoincography under the superintendence of Mr. W. B. Sanders, one of the assistant keepers of public records.

We understand that an exact facsimile of the Domesday Book is being prepared; and it is to be presumed that Mr. Redpath intends supplementing his donation of the chest by the gift of this facsimile.

UNIVERSITY LITERARY SOCIETY.

Mr. Doherty, President, presided at the usual meeting on 2d Nov., when there were about 18 members and one or two visitors present. Mr. Boodle thanked the Society for electing him a member of the General Council. The following question was discussed, "Ought Chinese Immigration to British Columbia be restricted." The appointed speakers were: Affirmative, Messrs. W. F. Ritchie and A. G. Cross; Negative, Messrs. A. R. Oughtred and E. A. D. Morgan. In the absence of Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Kavanagh opened the debate. The following gentlemen also spoke; for the Affirmative, Messrs. Boodle, McKenzie and Smith; for the Negative, Messrs. Barnard and Murray. The decision was in favor of the Negative. The discussion throughout was lively, but many of the speakers spoke too discursively, one gentleman, notably, going out of his way to discuss the opium question. Mr. Boodle, after the discussion, called attention to the fact that most of the members of the Society were lawyers, and that many graduates made this excuse for not attending. The President very truly pointed out that this state of affairs was not due to any action of the lawyers, but that in fact those gentlemen of whom Mr. Boodle spoke, in excusing accused themselves. Mr. Cross gave notice that at the next meeting he would move that the Society proceed with the election of speakers for the next public debate.

At the meeting on the 9th Nov. there were about 15 members present. The election of speakers for the next public debate was postponed on motion of Mr. Cross, seconded by Mr. Boodle until the 16th, because the Corresponding Secretary had omitted to mention on the notices of the meeting that such election would take place. Mr. Boodle, seconded by Mr. McKenzie, proposed Mr. W. C. Davie, of Cambridge University, as a member of the Society. Mr. Boodle read a paper on "Matthew Arnold," which we publish *in extenso* in this number. As will be seen it is more descriptive of his style and writings than critical. Mr. E. W. Arthy then spoke in an able way upon the poetical aspect of the subject, criticising Mr. Arnold's rather paradoxical definition of poetry as "a criticism of life." Mr. McGoun in a depreciative and satirical tone laid bare the want of practical qualities in Mr. Arnold's character. Mr. Barnard followed. He prefaced his remarks by the statement that he had never read Mr. Arnold's writings, and the statement was fully borne out by his highly amusing speech. Mr. Boodle, in replying, devoted his remarks principally to showing the error into which Mr. McGoun fell in judging Mr. Arnold by the standard of politicians. He is not a politician, but a philosopher. An informal discussion about the choosing of the subject of debate for next night ensued. Mr. McGoun moved that the following question be selected: "Should the existence of National Societies be encouraged," and that the speakers be: Affirmative, Messrs. Greenshields and McKenzie; Negative, Messrs. Hague and Murray. It was moved in amendment by Mr. Murray, that the matter be left to the Council. The amendment was

lost by the casting vote of the Chairman. The main motion was then carried.

PROGRAMME.

- Friday, 14th Dec.—Public Debate. The subject and speakers will be arranged later on.
 Friday, 16th Nov.—"Should the existence of distinctive National Societies in Canada be encouraged?"—Affirmative: Messrs. F. Mackenzie, R. Greenshields; Negative: Messrs. F. Hague, J. B. Murray.
 Friday, 23rd—Essay, Mr. H. H. Lyman, "On the Treaties affecting Canada." Discussion to be introduced by Messrs. C. J. Doherty and W. F. Ritchie.
 Friday, 30th—"Ought the Dominion Government to take into its hands the management of the telegraph."—Affirmative: Messrs. A. W. Atwater and L. T. Leet; Negative: Messrs. J. S. Archibald and J. Cameron.
 Friday, 7th Dec.—Essay, Mr. A. E. Barnard, "Divorce Question." Discussion to be introduced by Messrs. C. J. Brooke and C. Smith.

UNDERGRADUATES LITERARY SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this Society, on November 2nd, a humorous reading was given by Mr. Lochhead, after which the question whether the present tendency of the stage is to immorality or not was discussed. The affirmative side was supported by Messrs. Rogers, Clements, and Blackwood; while the negative was defended by Messrs. H. McLennan, Davies and Turner. As in most of the debates of this Society, the speeches were marked by fluency; and we are glad to be able to say there was some evidence of preparation. The new members, who spoke, and to whose speeches most attention was paid, as is natural, are likely to prove acquisitions to the Society, if we may judge by their efforts at this meeting. The most noticeable feature of the debate was undoubtedly the exhibition of prejudice due to a narrow religious training, which the discussion evoked. To us, who supposed the education given by a university the best means of overcoming such prejudice, this was a great surprise.

At the meeting of last Friday, there was a full programme for the first time this session. Mr. Turner read an essay, and Mr. Hargraves gave a reading. The question for debate was, "Resolved, that the destruction of the Ottoman empire in Turkey would be of benefit to Europe." The affirmative speakers were Messrs. Unsworth, Lochhead and Livingstone; and their opponents, Messrs. Mackay, Calder and J. P. Gerrie. This debate was certainly one of the best in the history of the society; all the speakers had prepared themselves well, and each showed he had made an earnest attempt to grasp the whole subject, difficult and complicated though it was. It was remarkable that the time allotted to the speakers was insufficient. As this must always be the case, when the speakers are well prepared, we would suggest that the number of speakers be in future reduced to four, and the limit of time be either done away with or considerably extended. This would also lighten the difficulties of the special committee, since naturally it is easier to get four speakers than six. Another suggestion we would offer is that the special committee, in choosing subjects for debate, should not restrict themselves, as heretofore, to topics relating to Canada and the United States. With these all the students have a superficial acquaintance from their newspaper reading, and they have usually relied upon the knowledge thus acquired, when called upon to discuss the subjects selected by the special committee. Now, if the committee choose questions relating to European politics or historical events, the speakers appointed to debate them will be forced to prepare themselves by reading beforehand. We commend these suggestions to the consideration of the members.

FACULTY OF LAW.

Professor Lareau presided at the Moot Court which sat on Friday the 2nd. November, at five o'clock, when the following case was discussed:—The plaintiff, an hypothecary creditor, having obtained judgment against the defendant, caused an execution to issue against the immovables hypothecated in his favor. The opposant, who was lessee of the said premises under a notarial lease for a year, duly registered, filed an opposition *à fin de charge* founded on his lease prior to the seizure. The plaintiff now contests the opposition by a *défense en droit*.

Question.—Can the contestation be maintained?

Judgment for the plaintiff.

For the plaintiff, Mr. Buchan; for the opposant, Mr. N. T. Rielle, B.A.