

quite willing to admit the truth of this statement. In fact it explains why college students so frequently exchange *college gowns* for *funeral shrouds*." But F. H. L. would say, No, no, "I do not endorse either." It is an old adage that there are none harder to convince than those who won't be convinced.

Again F. H. L. admits that superior preparatory training does often give one student the vantage ground over another, and this inequality may and does sometimes exist throughout the entire University course. But he argues that there is a *levelling* process in McGill, etc., which does or should place them on equal footing when they come to enter upon Theological studies. There is a grain of truth in F. H. L.'s criticism of this argument. I confess that the great advantages which I pointed out in my first letter, that some have over others, do apply primarily and more directly to the University than to the Theological College; yet I deny F. H. L.'s conclusions, that they have no reference to a Theological College. He says that "this argument, as applied to Theological Colleges, is a bold assertion without even the pretence of a proof." This is another of his loud erratic statements so characteristic of his whole criticism. For many of the subjects studied in McGill or any University are carried right through our whole Theological course, as Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Philosophy, etc., indeed, everything studied in the University is, directly or indirectly, an assistance in our Theological course. Now the person who has had the superior preparatory training, will have a more perfect knowledge of these subjects on entering the University, and also when he graduates; and consequently also when he enters upon his theological course, and the student with a superior knowledge of these subjects has a decided advantage over other students in Theology who possess an inferior knowledge, yet again F. H. L.'s rash statement ignores the most important factor in education, the *development* of the mind, and the learning *how* to study, the intellect of those who had a thorough preparatory training of many years must be better developed than the intellect of those whose early training was neglected. Therefore, while there is a grain of truth in F. H. L.'s criticism of this argument, the conclusion is wholly false and illogical as the preparatory advantages do very materially affect the whole theological course in this twofold respect, nor is F. H. L. ignorant of this fact.

Then he attacks the statement I made, "that some argued in favor of prizes by saying that they assisted indigent students." Now, he paraphrases these words, and in doing so makes them convey a false meaning. Or in other words he says that "prize-giving is a dispensing of charity." This is what he makes my statement to mean, and then he adds that charity is not a reward of merit. Neither it is, nor did I say that any argued that prize-giving was a dispensing of charity. This is certainly a misinterpretation of a plain statement. For, whatever ambiguity (of which I claim