

the month, much after the style of the stereotyped beginning of some people's letters :— "I received your letter and was glad to hear from you, etc." To another it is simply a department of college notes. Some take it as a place to display their ability as a critic, cutting right and left without any discretion whatever: while others take the other extreme of making it a sort of "mutual admiration" affair.

Lately there has been an attempt to make this department of more universal interest than it has been heretofore, by a scheme introduced by the *Lutherville Seminarian*. The plan introduced is, that of the editors of the exchange departments shall each propose some question pertaining to college life, and its necessities, and these questions are then to be taken up and discussed by the different journals as exchange matter. The idea is a commendable one, in as much as it shows a desire to get out of the rut of commonplace comment. But just so soon as the discussion of some important question is taken up it then becomes matter for some other department, or has no room in the journal at all. For, if the discussion be elaborate, the literary department is the place for such matter, and if it is a mere expression of opinion without any substantiation, it has no room in any part of the paper.

The college papers are supported almost entirely by the alumni. And, as every good paper should seek to present the most news and best matter for the benefit of the greatest number, it does not seem right that a whole department should be kept up for the mere interchange of civilities between the editors of these departments. Of what gratification

is it to the subscriber when he strikes something like this?—"There is an excellent article in the last number of the X, Y, Z, which is well worth reading, (and yet the editor knows that not one out of six will ever have an opportunity of reading this article). The masterly way in which the writer handles his subject, shows him to be perfectly familiar with the very fundamental principles of the vital question, etc.," and possibly follow with an elaborate compliment upon the paper equally as vague.

We do not wish to convey the idea that we believe in the wholesale copying of every article we find worthy of comment, but we do believe that if an article is worth commenting upon at all, there should be sufficient matter taken to give the subscriber some idea of the subject under discussion.

It is most always possible in any well written piece, to find some terse expression which will serve as a key to the whole discussion, and thus give the reader some idea of current thought in other colleges.

If a journal deserves adverse criticism it should be given in an open and sincere manner, and because the paper deserves criticism is no reason at all that the college itself should be attacked. Scurrility should have no place in any department of college journalism. And to answer an honestly meant criticism by derisive refutation simply gives proof of how well the "shoe fits." The idea of taking advantage of the so-called "freedom of the press" in college journalism is an idea entirely foreign to college publications. It may seem all right in the great political journals of the day, to deride each other and call men liars, thieves, scoundrels and all such compli