

All quite contradictory if treated as F. H. L. treated my arguments ; but I deny that although F. H. L. has either wilfully or ignorantly violated the chief canon of interpretation, that there is the slightest contradiction.

My first position was, "that prizes were not *always* a reward of diligence, but often of superior mental capacity and certain advantages," my last position was, "that prizes were instrumental in sending some of our noblest students to premature graves." These statements, says F. H. L., contradict each other. They do not. Read my article and you will see that I was representing a person of superior mental capacity, but of feeble physical nature, getting a medal and going down to the tomb shortly afterwards. This was a true case. Now F. H. L. says diligence, then, was rewarded. True, *his* diligence, of which he had some no one denies, was rewarded, as is the diligence of every medallist, etc., but it does not follow that the *highest* diligence was rewarded. As there may have been many others, and doubtless there were, who had greater physical strength, yet not such retentive memories and who studied much longer hours than he did, yet got nothing. Therefore these two arguments are not contradictory, as it does not follow that the highest diligence was rewarded, and they would be contradictory only if the highest diligence had been rewarded, and not necessarily even then, as I did not argue that the highest diligence was *never* rewarded, but that it was not generally the most diligent that received the prizes, therefore all F. H. L.'s talk about these arguments being contradictory is empty twaddle, originating in the violation of the chief canon of interpretation and in the mutilation of my arguments.

But F. H. L. says, "I endorse neither of these positions," neither of the two arguments referred to. Then he must believe that the most diligent always gets the prize, and that prizes are never instrumental in sending students down to premature graves. When we hear a person of F. H. L.'s experience and knowledge of college life express himself thus we are amazed, as the truth of the first position is demonstrated almost every session in every college that awards prizes.

And to deny the second position is equally absurd and wrong in the face of so many facts. A few days ago a citizen of Montreal told one of our students, whose name F. H. L. may have, that prizes were the death of one of his friends. A professor in Toronto University also states that out of a class of 12, 3 were physical wrecks, solely because of the offered rewards ; the name of the professor F. H. L. may also have, and I can multiply instances if necessary. Then are the arguments against prizes only *probable* or are they *demonstrative*? I suppose F. H. L. regards nothing as demonstrative unless you may write Q. E. D. after it. But let me enhance my argument by a quotation from an article in the *Acta Victoriana*, against prizes: "It is also urged that they, prizes, etc., are a great incentive to work. We are