

been traversed by the ball, and it passes over the line outside of the goal posts, the play is at once transferred by the defenders to the middle of the field or sometimes even beyond it (that is into their own territory) as a penalty for the failure of the aggressors to send the ball between the posts. This may be repeated again and again, the weaker side actually gaining an advantage through their inability to keep the ball away from the danger point. Naturally, this chance of the game is regularly utilized by the defenders when the ball is near their goal line, and they allow it to pass over instead of trying to force it back. In other words they make a distinct and perhaps decisive gain by not playing the game. This might be remedied if the ball were put into play by being thrown in at right angles to the point where it crossed the line,

The other weakness of the present rules is that only goals count in deciding a contest. That is to say, only one form of success is put to the credit of the players. In this department of foot-ball the Rugby game shows to great advantage. The plea is often made that the Association game is played solely for the purpose of scoring, and that the whole scheme of play is devised and worked for that consummation. There is much truth in this defence when entered in behalf of players such as the English professionals who give their lives to "shooting on goal," or perhaps for a picked all-Canadian team. But for the ordinary play the restriction works mischief to the game. Combined with the other cardinal defect, it makes the play indecisive, discourages the players, and wearies or disappoints the spectators. One improvement at least can be made. When the ball goes over the goal line from the post or the body of a defender, let this count one point for the attacking side, while a goal may count as three or four. The "corner kick" seems to be at present a very slight disadvantage to the delinquents, since a goal is very seldom made by it.

Association foot-ball needs all the advantages which it can possibly claim. It has declined in popularity, not merely for the reasons already mentioned, but also because it is not so much a University game as are Rugby, hockey and lacrosse. Less than ten years ago it almost held the place in the affections of the student which is now held by Rugby. Possibly the time may soon come round when we can have two or three general University Association teams to which all other bodies of players shall contribute. These would then perhaps be merely practice teams. It might then be a question

whether the present inter-faculty and inter-college competition should not be abolished. The first great need, however, is the ratification of the rules of the game.

The general outlook of our athletics is extremely bright. The most signal advance made within the last two years has been gained in track athletics, and all honor must be paid to such men as Merrick, Henderson, and the others who have kept the good cause before our public in its dark days which lie so close behind us. Here again the great impetus has been given through the enlisting of a University sentiment. The formation of the Inter-University League with the McGill has been perhaps the chief factor. At any rate, since this event interest has been greatly quickened; the number of competitors and competitions has increased, and the superiority of McGill, at first so manifest, is now no longer a matter of course. But, after all, what chiefly distinguishes our University athletics is the merging of individual ambition in an enthusiasm for a great common cause. Individual success tends merely to personal satisfaction—a thing more dangerous than salutary in the region of physical effort. The competitor is not helped morally, and no one else is benefited. Team play is the best kind of play, for there some of the highest qualities of a man are evoked—self-control, the spirit of co-operation, deference to command, chivalrous regard for the rights of opponents, besides the intellectual training of quick and skilful combination under the limitations of more or less complicated rules. Team play is the chief distinction between modern and ancient athletics, and is, in fact, a very fine test of the progress of civilization in the freest communities of our later centuries. But a team is essentially representative. Not to itself, even when most brilliant and victorious, but to the body which it represents, belongs the renown of its achievements.

Thus in our own happy federation and affiliation of institutions, the subordination of personal aims and endeavors, and even of college pride and spirit, to the greater glory of the University, is in the field of athletics not merely a pleasant sentiment but an active force for good of the highest and most substantial kind, a force which if well directed and controlled shall grow in range and beneficence as long as the youth of our land continue to come to Varsity for nurture and inspiration.

—JAMES FREDERICK McCURDY.

SOME OF THE YESTERDAYS OF THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY

1854-1868.

Dissecta membra annalibus eruta priscis.

Aristotle somewhere says:—"Of this alone are even the gods deprived, the power of making that which is past never to have been." Who would make it so, even if we were Olympian dwellers and we revelled in nectar and ambrosia? Let our present days look backward with a smile upon our yesterdays, and the landscape of our to-morrows will be all the brighter. This is a new century for the Literary and Scientific Society, and VARSITY is its organ, and it may be fitting to cast a retrospect, and call up in the moonlight of one's memory some of its past history. Some years ago I sought to recount some snatches of the Society's early days and I have thought that a repetition of that effort might be of some interest to the men of this academic generation.

On the 22nd February, 1854, almost a year after the separation of University College and the University and just when Europe was arming herself for the Crimean campaign, in a small chamber of the old Parliament Building on Front street, then occupied by Dr. Daniel Wilson, but long since deserted not only by the Muses, but by everybody else, were assembled a scant few of the then undergraduates. I have read the minutes of that meeting and it was then that the Professor of Mathematics, John B. Cherriman, gave the pithy advice, "Gentlemen when you have nothing to say, say nothing," thus with caustic humor mildly reproving any possible display of empty verbiage, which is worse than silence itself among men assembled together for present mutual