

possible, to a Canadian and a Queen's graduate.

The question is a delicate one and we would hesitate to touch it, did we not feel that there is a wrong impression abroad which needs correcting. The matter has already been somewhat aired in the press, but the part taken by one or two papers at least has rather served to strengthen the feeling that a serious wrong has been done the great body of Queen's graduates. An article in the *British Whig* on the day on which the appointment was made states boldly that the Queen's man who had made application "was unfortunate in being a Canadian. A stranger had more chance." In the same issue an editorial headed "Canadians at a Discount" says, that the influences which told in favor of the teacher-elect can only be surmised. "A college degree," the writer goes on to say, "may mean much. A good deal depends upon the individual who hears this. He may be a good student and a poor teacher." There is then a hint that the appointment may prove ruinous to the present endowment scheme by incensing the university's graduates. Statements such as these are unfortunate, in that they cast a slur upon the fair-mindedness and good intentions of Queen's Board of Trustees. They also have an additional disadvantage in being not strictly according to the facts. To hint that any ulterior motive rather than the good of the university influenced the choice of the new assistant professor is equivalent to saying that Queen's trustees are unworthy of trust, or that they have an unreasoning antipathy to Canadians and Queen's graduates. The thing is surely absurd. The appoint-

ment was made as usual by the local trustees. Their names are well known and far above reproach. It has long been recognized that they have the good of the university at heart. Furthermore, they are nearly all Canadians themselves and not at all likely to be prejudiced in favor of a stranger. Queen's has trusted her trustees much ere now, and they have always proved worthy. It is unkind, to say the least, to hint, at this late day, that they are ill intentioned or biased. It is more reasonable to suppose that knowing all the circumstances they acted in the best interests of the university.

Naturally Queen's graduates would rather see one of their own number honored, and there is little doubt that the trustees would rather have appointed a Queen's man. Their actions in the past have shown this. A glance at the university calendar cannot fail to prove it. In Divinity, out of four professors, one is a Queen's graduate. In Arts there are in all nineteen professors, assistant professors and lecturers. Nine of these are Queen's men. In Science there are seventeen, seven of whom are Queen's men. In Medicine all but two of the professors are graduates of the university. There is surely no reason to complain if occasionally the trustees go outside the college for new blood, especially when there is almost absolute certainty that the new blood will add strength to the old stem.

As for "Visitor's" letter in a later number of the *Whig*, stating that the "ear-splitting accent" of Oxford and Cambridge men makes it impossible for them to speak German and French correctly, it is too absurd to require comment.