

✻ EXCHANGES. ✻

THE *Montpelierian* is a new and pretty face. A principal characteristic, is its fearlessness. It wrestles with the question as to the authorship of Shakespeare's plays under the head of "Was it Bacon or Shakespeare?" Undoubtedly many moral lessons are drawn from that bloody tale of the "Spider and the Fly," and well drawn. The *Montpelierian* seems to be recovering from the effects of a libel suit; it has no respect for lawyers: "As soon as a young man becomes convinced that he is endowed with talents a little superior to those of most other people, he makes up his mind at once to be a lawyer. To be a good lawyer, and make the profession pay, one must not only consent to mingle freely with the lowest and most degraded of mankind, but he must be able to take the poor man's living without a flinch; he must be able to prove the truth of that which is false; he must be able to prove the falsity of that which is true; and, in short, to make a complete and consummate liar of himself." The Local department needs weeding.

THE *Dalhousie Gazette* for March 12th, is an interesting number. The *Gazette* borrows several of our "squibs" without giving credit, an omission which in this case we don't object to. We sometimes get articles from students which we don't like to refuse though we doubt their originality and their wit, and it is provoking when these are copied and credited to our paper.

THE *Sunbeam* is much offended at a simple remark that we made setting forth the opinion that boarding-school girls were not remarkable for their staidness. Come to think of it, Miss *Sunbeam* has cut us dead this session; was it for this? But, come now, Miss Ex. Ed., put away that pout; it does not become your amiable face at all. When we used the word "flighty" we certainly did not have your dignified paper in our mind. The Local Editor says you are a Florence Nightingale, but Florence was never sarcastic. The February number of the *Sunbeam* is a good one. The tone of the articles is eminently sensible. In a contributed article, the author's fellow boarders are advised to give more attention to the cultivation of something more lasting than to pretty hands, Saratoga frizzes, &c. An editorial congratulates the students on the earnestness with which they pursue their studies; which it considers very fitting in an age when women can take such a high place in science, literature and art. The death of Miss Rhodentia Mus is graphically related.

THE *Trinity Tablet* has just put in an appearance for the first time this session. It says that "an exclusively local paper meets our idea of what a College periodical should be," and endeavours to come up to its ideal as far as possible. It is nevertheless an interesting paper and the doings in and around Trinity College, are set forth in an entertaining manner. It is conducted by the Junior Class, who say they notice a change for the better in that "contributions are pouring into the *Tablet*." No longer do we hear the cry "the students do not support their paper." The students do support their paper, and we thank them for their aid. May they continue as they have begun. Although we cannot accept everything that is offered, it is well that a surplus supply of material should exist. The editors are beginning to look forward to the time when their duties will consist solely in selecting the best from a large number of excellent contributions; when they, themselves, need never write "paper-fillers," and when the office of editor will be as honorable as ever, but a sinecure." In our simplicity this is what we thought would be the duties of an editor—our eyes have been opened. But if such a happy state of affairs exists in Trinity College, how is it

that that with the exception of a piece of poetry and two short letters, all the articles in the last number of the *Tablet* show distinctly the editorial hand in their creation. The *Tablet* conveys the impression that Trinity College is plunged in the depths of gloom during Lent. It is a very courteous paper and overflowing with amiability to all men. It is also neat and gentlemanly, and we will be glad to receive it regularly.

WE have made the acquaintance of several new papers this month. Foremost among them is the *College Rambler*, from Illinois College, Jacksonville. The sincere gentleman who controls the exchange department says he "loathes and abhors the exchange review," so we will humor him by merely saying that the *Rambler* is a good representative of the average College paper; that ought to be general enough for any body. The exchange editor gives his opinion on the College exchange column in a very neat and pithy article. But we don't agree with him that the exchange column as it now exists should be abolished; and the *modus operandi* of exchange editors he generalizes so glibly, is not ours by any means. He says that the cheap notoriety attained by the *Niagara Index* and some of its style, gained by loud-mouthed and indiscriminate abuse of its neighbors, and the faults of other papers, are arguments against the exchange departments as they now exist; but if the *Index*, &c., wish to display their coarseness and bad taste, in their exchange columns, there is no reason why other papers should give up a most interesting column. We say interesting and we may add useful department; for if an exchange column is properly conducted it is both of these and one of the best parts of a paper. As for ourselves we give our candid opinion of a paper and we want a candid opinion in return. When annoyed by any display of bad taste and foolishness in a paper we perhaps express our opinion too candidly, but it is only the hope that the paper criticised may see what we think are its defects. Such a conversation as this has often taken place between our editors: "The A— for this month says we are too B— in our C— department, and I don't know but that it is right to a certain extent." "Pshaw! a paper that is so D— as the A— has no right to talk." "Perhaps not, but you remember the E— said the same thing." But so an effort is made to improve the feature commented upon. If we thought that the majority of exchange editors are as the *Rambler* says we should be disappointed; but we don't think so. We are willing to admit the same sentiments in other papers, as those which govern ourselves. No, no, *Rambler*, try to "convert" the *Index*, &c., if you like; but don't assume the role of iconoclast until you have sufficient data. But we must compliment you on the way you express your opinion.

THE *Lutherville Semianarian* introduced itself this week. It is a "Miss," and a good type of the Ladies College paper. Its exchange column lacks in dignity. As the *Sem.* is only in its first volume it of course shows the usual characteristics of a new paper, but if all such started as well, they might be congratulated.

THE following is the answer given to a complaining subscriber by the *University Reporter*: "We are sorry you don't like the paper. We publish it simply to please you. We should ask you to come down and edit it, only that if you did, some idiot would say how much better he could do it himself, and that would annoy a nervous person like you."

THE *Notre Dame Scholastic* doesn't care what outsiders think of Notre Dame, or itself, but nevertheless devotes a great deal of space in replying to criticisms and strictures, merely by way of courtesy.