

dency should certainly be checked before it goes to such an extreme.

\* \*

When we arrange for a public meeting of this kind, elect debaters, readers and essayists, and invite our friends to come and enjoy the entertainment, it is neither fair to the one nor courteous to the other to give such vent to our boisterous feelings. We all smiled to read in Mr. Stringer's description of Oxford life, of the funereal solemnity to be found in student gatherings there, which may reflect the staid and sober dignity of the Old World, but would certainly not reflect the youthful animation of the New. Surely, we may find some happy medium between this ultra-seriousness of demeanor and the Red Indian behavior of some Western students.

\* \*

We are not now finding fault with any legitimate expression of undergraduate spirit. A witty interruption or a pointed joke is always welcome, and good-natured banter of a speaker, within reasonable bounds, is entirely enjoyable. But when the changes are rung on some peculiarity of style or expression, or a few aged puns or jokes are made to serve for a whole evening, as has been done not infrequently, it but proves the meagre resources of the would-be funny ones, and produces "that tired feeling" in all who have any right sense of the fitness of things. Were it possible to imagine that any words of ours would put a damper on any lawful display of our feelings, we should regret that we had spoken. We are simply advocating a little more thoughtfulness and moderation, and in so doing we know that we are seconded by the better sense of every undergraduate.

\* \*

We had hoped to have received ere this some reply to the adverse criticism which the Year Book has aroused, and we are disappointed because some one who is familiar with Year Books in general, and with the making of our own Year Book in particular, has not seen fit to take up the cudgels in its defence. It is certainly not because the Year Book is without merits. Perhaps its friends believe these merits to be so great and apparent that no defence is necessary. They are certainly not without reason. The book is a beautiful production on its artistic side, as every one must admit. And on its literary side the critics who have attacked it have dwelt on only a small portion of the whole work. It is unfortunate, however, that any portions should have been introduced that could cause such suspicions as have been so freely expressed by our contributors. In similar American publications the features which rouse such objections here are however much more offensive—even professors being made the butt in many cases. It was a bold and courageous undertaking for the men and women who took hold of this enterprise and they cannot be praised too highly for breaking the ground and paving the way for a bright succession of Year Books in our University. Let us turn our attention to the better qualities of *Torontonensis*, and we shall find no dearth of them.

In the very nature of the case the *mauvais pas* of the Editorial Board were well nigh inevitable. Those of us who had nothing to do with the work cannot appreciate the difficulties to be encountered. We should like to see someone write a more favorable criticism of *Torontonensis*

than any of those which we have yet received. To any such the columns of THE VARSITY are wide open.

We do not wish THE VARSITY, by the one-sided tone of its contributions on this matter, to have the appearance of carrying on any crusade against a work which, in spite of a few blemishes, is worthy of our support.

#### EX-EDITOR AND EDITOR.

Editor VARSITY :—

DEAR SIR,—A paragraph in your editorials of last week contains an insinuation against my integrity which I can no longer pass over in silence. During the latter part of my term as editor of VARSITY A. E. McFarlane wrote to the paper a note making an insinuation so similar that I cannot but think that they both emanated from the same source. So ridiculous was it to charge me with garbling the articles of correspondents that I trusted to the good sense of VARSITY readers to know that it was utterly untrue, and accordingly I published Mr. McFarlane's note without any comment. Never yet have I troubled myself to reply to anything he has written, nor shall I till he has outgrown the childishness that he now manifests in everything that he says and does. But an editorial in the college paper, whoever be its author, cannot be ignored so readily. However, I have now no intention of entering into any public discussion of my position. As you, sir, re-echoed Mr. McFarlane's insinuation so gratuitously, and as you were present at the meeting of the Editorial Board when I explained clearly that Mr. McFarlane's article was published just as it was given to me by the Board, I must ask you to state publicly the facts of the case. Since you have gone out of your way to cast an unwarranted slur upon my conduct as editor I must require you, in justice to myself, to withdraw your insinuation and to explain as soon as possible to the readers of VARSITY what I explained to you and Mr. McFarlane and the other members of the Editorial Board. Yours truly,

BURRIS GAHAN.

[NOTE.—Verily the way of the editor, like that of the transgressor, is hard. Last week, we were told by Mr. McFarlane that we had misrepresented his opinions on Residence in our editorials. In a spirit of fair play we strove to set him right, but as we see now we worded our correction very clumsily. Mr. Gahan charges us now with making insinuations and going "out of our way to cast an unwarranted slur upon his conduct." Nothing was further from our thoughts. Mr. Gahan asks us to state publicly the facts of the case. As far as our memory serves us they are these. Mr. McFarlane wrote an article on Residence which was submitted by Mr. Gahan to the Editorial Board. The latter authorized its publication in THE VARSITY. Later, after the article had gone to the printer, Mr. McFarlane desired to make certain changes in it and these Mr. Gahan could not see his way clear to allow. He believed that he was under obligation to have the article published just as it left the Editorial Board. Mr. McFarlane's changes were very radical in some cases, as he himself states, but Mr. Gahan did not read them as he thought them unjustified. Now we can conceive it quite possible that Mr. McFarlane made the correction as he says, but that Mr. Gahan was not aware of such having been made at all; we confess to a slip of the pen in saying that Mr. McFarlane expressed this different opinion "in another portion of the same article." It was not in the article proper, but was intended by Mr. McFarlane to be inserted into the article before the latter was finally printed. We are very sorry this misunderstanding has arisen, and we hope our explanation may be satisfactory to Mr. Gahan.—Ed. VARSITY.]