

A REMEMBRANCER.

The Executive Committee of the class of '99 has decided to invite the Senior year to leave some memorial behind it when next May it bids good-bye to the University. It has not been settled what form this will take; a number of good suggestions have been offered, but the committee does not make any definite recommendation. Some have thought that a bust of either some great Canadian or perhaps of someone connected with the University would be suitable; another proposal is that the year subscribe enough money to found a scholarship; and again there is a large number who would like to see the Ridgeway memorial window, which was destroyed at the fire, restored in its old place. But whatever the class decides upon, and any one of the suggestions mentioned above is an excellent one, besides many others not named, we are sure that the underlying idea will meet with the hearty support of all the members of the Senior year. They will do themselves credit and confer something of lasting value to their Alma Mater if they carry the proposed memorial through.

MR. ROSS REPLIES.

Editor of THE VARSITY.

Dear Sir.—Your issue of Nov. 2nd contained a thoughtful article by Mr. Good, '00, on the subject of "College Sentiment," which was chiefly directed towards disagreeing with some remarks I had made on that subject at the first meeting of the Literary Society. Continued discussion on many subjects is both unadvisable and tiresome, but this question is of such great and far reaching importance and interest to all undergraduates that I think it merits further consideration. This I propose to give it as briefly as possible, by examining Mr. Good's somewhat severe arraignment of my remarks and arguments.

In his opening paragraph Mr. Good makes some very rhetorical references to "jingo patriots (college of course), with blood and thunder in their eyes, etc.," which can hardly be called virile; and as these remarks doubtless result from thoughtlessness on his part they will not be considered.

Mr. Good next gives the skeleton of my definition of patriotism, in its analogy to college sentiment. I will clothe his skeleton and present it as it was: "College sentiment is that love and veneration for one's University which urges one to zealously support and uphold its institutions and interests." He next asserts that I made no distinction between "institutions" and "interests," but that is a mistake on his part. I maintained that there was a difference, but that the University had been in existence a sufficient length of time to allow the functions which "our love and veneration for our College urge us to support," I say to allow these functions, or interests, to become institutions of the University.

Mr. Good then asserts that my list of college institutions worthy of support was very incomplete, but I find by an examination of my notes that I mentioned all of Mr. Good's additions, with the exception of the De-

partmental Societies, and to them I will refer later. I might remark that I urged the support of VARSITY, *College Topics*, *Acta Victoriana* and *Sesame* collectively under "College Papers."

Mr. Good next presents what must, I think, be granted an extremely ill-chosen analogy, viz., he compares the justice of the abolition of slavery with what he considers the just abolition of hazing and the "scrap." Now the doing away of slavery resulted from a remarkable change in the moral and religious attitude of the people towards this question, while undoubtedly no moral considerations of any acknowledged weight, could be impressed into explaining the abolition of hazing and the "scrap." Surely this is comparing a mole-heap to a mountain. It would be superfluous for me to discuss the "scrap" and hazing, for the right or wrong of these questions is, and always will be, a matter of personal conviction.

About the "Hustle," however, I would like to say a few words. Perhaps I did lay too much stress on this as being an essential institution of our College life, but I still maintain that the "Hustle" is an innocent, efficient, harmless and enjoyable way of initiating our friends, the Freshmen, into the life of the great University they are to attend; and, moreover, I think it assists greatly in planting in them the seeds of a strong college sentiment. Sufficient argument for its retention, however, is that the Freshmen themselves enjoy it as much as their initiators, but no more I imagine than did a number of Toronto's most prominent citizens and many members of our Faculty on last Convocation, who doubtless appreciated it as an interesting and harmless affair—a "relic of the past," if you wish—but a good one!

Mr. Good next draws a microscopic psychological distinction between motive and action. When I urged the support of such college institutions as the games, Hallowe'en, the Lit, etc., it seemed to me *ipso facto*, that they merited the zealous support of all undergraduates—which no one will deny; and consequently the question of the "value" of those institutions being pitted against their "age" is reduced *ad absurdum*.

Although the question of Departmental Societies has been thrashed out in almost every detail, I cannot remember anyone ever asserting that these societies fostered college sentiment. It seems almost inconceivable that the meeting together of from a dozen to two or three dozen students in the discussion of some of the important subjects in their particular branch of study could possibly be productive of any degree of college spirit. Those societies are chiefly useful, I take it, in affording splendid opportunities to their members for preparing carefully, and delivering acceptably, an essay before a cold and critical undergraduate audience.

Mr. Good, it seems to me by his consideration of this question, and several others, is taking a very narrow view of a very large question, and looking at true University life from too serious an aspect. He takes little consideration of that commendable overflowing of animal spirit, if you wish, that produces the keen struggle of the "Hustle," the free jollity of Hallowe'en, and above all of that enthusiasm which everyone feels, in the participation or watching of athletic contests, and makes University life the pursuit of cold knowledge and the mere aesthetical. Prof. Clark of Trinity has said: "We have long agreed that education does not mean the mere imparting of information or human knowledge;" and again President Patton, of Princeton, has said: "I