

notice on the blackboard. The petitioners were not school boys petitioning for a holiday for play—they were not those who were in the habit of shirking their work; and they were justly incensed at being answered so curtly. If the Faculty had good reasons for shortening the vacation (and no one doubts that they had) they should have appealed to the good sense of the students, by calling a meeting of the petitioners, and explaining how matters stood. If the students had been treated with the deference due to men who came to college to work and not to play, they would in all probability not have “cut.” Then again it was a mistake on the part of the students to make the proceeding's of the mass meeting partake of the nature of a threat. The Faculty are not to be threatened, and of course were compelled to enforce their authority; but we firmly believe that had the students agreed quietly and without demonstration to take a longer vacation, nothing would have been said; the classes might have gone on, but little would have been missed if the different professors had been appealed to properly. The Senate must be obeyed, and we would always protest against any direct disrespect of their orders, but we hope they will not again overestimate the power (moral or otherwise) they have over the undergraduates of the University.

SOME recent trouble in a sister college has afforded the press of this country a subject for discussion. Editors who never have been within the walls of a college have discussed college life, and given much gratuitous advice to college men as to their behavior. What chiefly underlies these articles is the broad principle “the freedom and equality of man. This is all very good; and there is reason in the protest of the secular journals against “hazing;” but there, their arguments should stop.

The editors of this journal believe strongly in “caste,” so to speak, in a college; and when the policy of a governing body of a university is to discourage the formation of classes, (or “years” as they are commonly called) they believe unity among the students will be broken up, and *esprit de corps* will suffer; and is not their belief borne out by the state of society in this University at present? “Years” were disturbed when the curriculum of 1875-76 was created—and they received a further blow by the curriculum of 1880-81, until now the first year man may enter on the study of philosophy and physics, and the senior can decline Anglo-Saxon nouns along with the freshman in the class of English. “Years” are all mixed up and no year is distinct. The junior students consider themselves quite the equal of any others because they cannot recognize any superior classes. We believe in allowing a man some selection in the classes he will take, but still think that the senior years might be made distinct and identical in interest. But lately the policy of the Senate has been to teach the senior that he has no privileges or responsibilities apart from the other students. This policy has been manifested in different ways, which have been so obvious as not to be worth mentioning. If the authorities expect help from the students in maintaining a good spirit they must look for it from the seniors, and it is not sufficient to tell a senior that he has responsibilities, and is an example, he must be made to *feel* responsible by having some power. This power the seniors used to have—they abused it in one or two instances—but that is no reason why it should have been taken away from them altogether. Then again, if a Freshman is made to feel that he has all the privileges when he enters, that he will ever have, and that his four sessions will count him nothing socially does any one suppose that he will have the same interest