

THE COLLEGE.

THE PAPER.—The *Times* has been out of joint for some time past owing to the printers' holiday; but now that our publishers have started work again we hope, though the time be short, to get out the rest of our ten issues without much difficulty.

We regret to learn that the College is about to lose the services of the Rev. Arthur Sweetman, M. A., who has been connected with this institution only since last September. He has been appointed Bishop's Chaplain in the diocese of Huron and will leave shortly to take the Incumbency of Grace Church, Brantford.

NOTICE.—It is requested by the Committee that all boys who wish to join the Cricket Club, hand in their subscriptions immediately to the collector for their respective forms. The collectors are—

For the VI. and V. Forms.....	J. L. C. Cronyn.
“ IV. “.....	W. A. Langton.
“ Upper Modern.....	J. G. McKeown.
“ Lower “.....	W. H. Biggar.
“ III. Form.....	E. B. Brown.
“ II. “.....	R. D. Richardson.
“ I. “.....	A. W. Spragge.

(Signed) J. G. McKeown,
Secretary.

Our readers must pardon any lack of interest that there may be in some of our articles, as the strike has kept them so long on our hands, that they have lost what savour they had.

Correspondence.

(Here is a communication that comes to us in a lady's hand).—ED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COLLEGE TIMES.

DEAR SIR,—I do not know much about the College or the College boys, but in reading your last issue of the *Times*, I could not help noticing a very ridiculous piece of poetry in it. I think it is a pity that the little boys of the College have not something better to occupy their time than in the composition of such nonsense. I think young ladies have generally more than one copper to spend on toffy, and they have as much right to get it at any store they please, as the little College boys have. I remain, yours truly,

B. G. D.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COLLEGE TIMES.

SIR,—I see in your last issue that a correspondent desires the omission of the reports of the Literary Society's meeting, which have hitherto appeared in the *College Times*. His reason is that they interest merely the members of that Society, and not any other readers of our sheet. On the same ground, I think, he ought to counsel the omission of all items and news relating to the College itself, as they would of course interest only College boys. But I believe he would be the last to think by analogy of such a step, though, "reasoning by analogy," one seems as natural as the other. The reason given for the insertion of the reports is, I understand, that since the paper is an institution of the Literary Society, it is but just that the meetings and interests of that body should occupy some space in the columns of its own organ. I think, however, that it would be a desirable reform to condense the reports somewhat. Hoping that your reporter will "take heed and govern himself accordingly."

Yours truly,

MICHAEL FORD, JUN '9.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COLLEGE TIMES.

DEAR SIR,—In the last issue of your valuable paper, I notice a letter from a correspondent who signs himself Michael Ford, '98, condemning the insertion of the reports of the meetings of the Literary Society.

I am much surprised to observe this, because everyone with whom I have ever had any conversation on the subject of your paper has expressed, not only his entire approval of these reports, but also the delight he took in their perusal. (It may be remarked that I have here mentioned only the approbation of the sterner sex; for this, I feel I ought to apologise to your numerous, fair and gentle readers, and may here state, as it is never too late to mend, that all the ladies that I have heard, and they have not been as angel's visits, express their opinion on the subject, have heartily concurred in commendation of the insertion of these reports.) I may also add, although I am fully aware of the fact that the opinions of "Old College Boys" are not held in much esteem among their former associates within "those ancient walls," that no part of your edition is more earnestly sought for or perused with more pleasure by me than that which contains a *resume* of the doings of the Society.

I would suggest to Michael Ford that it would be as well if he would get over that obnoxious habit of judging other people by himself. If he be too obtuse or stupid (as it would appear from his letter he is) to understand and enjoy the reports of the Society, he might at least give other people (including outsiders) credit for fair abilities and understandings mingled perhaps with a grain, here and there of common sense.

Again there may be, and I have no doubt there is, among the boys, and even the masters, a little curiosity to know what these highly intellectual personages do when they meet together in solemn convocation. This I look upon as no idle curiosity, and I therefore think it ought to be gratified; now, there is no means of accomplishing this, if that body decide upon meeting with closed doors. Moreover, when the aforementioned dignitaries and shining lights (the masters), as well as the inhabitants of the great world without, perceive that these meetings are not convened for mere amusement, but that they also have in view mutual improvement and advancement, together with the attainment of excellence in certain branches of literary culture, they may be, and no doubt will be, induced to lend your Society their material approval and hearty co-operation. This end is one which I think all will admit, is worth striving for, and in my humble judgment it can be procured or obtained in no more speedy or certain way than the continuance of the reports in question.

Many arguments could be brought to bear upon the subject, but as it appears to me that the benefit and propriety of the insertion of these reports must be plain and evident to the meanest understanding. I will not further impose upon the good nature of your readers nor trespass, to a greater extent than I have already done, upon your valuable space by the production of further argument, or the refutation of those of Michael Ford (which, by the bye, I had some difficulty in discovering).

I remain, my dear sir,

Truly yours,

P. R. E. P.

WET AND DRY.—On one occasion, when coming to Church, Dr. Macknight, a better commentator than preacher, was caught in a shower of rain and entered the vestry seeking relief. Every means were taken to relieve him of his discomfort, but as the hour of service drew near he became much distressed, and kept ejaculating "Oh, I wish I were dry; do you think I'm dry enough now?" To which his colleague, Dr. Henry, returned: "Bide a wee, doctor, and ye'll be dry enough when ye get into the pulpit!"

SHALL WE HAVE SENSE?

BEING REMARKS ON "SHALL WE HAVE ESSAYS," BY "A MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY."

"Pithy, brief, and spicy writing is, I presume, what the committee of the *College Times* wish from all their correspondents." Truly it is; and so, very naturally, the question arises, after having read that elegant exordium, and then waded through what follows—why not give us at least one of the three above mentioned ingredients to feast upon? But no. Ten lines are consumed in telling us what is going to be done, and the remainder in doing it not.

Pithy, I believe, means *containing condensed substance, vigour, and closeness of thought*. As to the last two attributes I very much resemble the man who hunted for some time in a bundle of straw for a needle. With regard to the *condensed substance*, your correspondent seems rather in the dark. If it means *spread out*, he has succeeded admirably. But this cannot be his meaning, for has he not promised to be *brief*, and does not this remarkable sentence occur, "I shall not, therefore, trouble you with saying what I have to say, in as many words as I possibly can use, as did your correspondent on this subject in your first issue?" But yet it does strike one as slightly singular that the "correspondent in your first issue," who used as many words as he possibly could use, succeeded in concluding his letter within half a column, whereas this pithy one, who condemns bombast, should be unable to stop for a whole column.

He also intended to write a *spicy* article. We will in pity pass over an examination of this feature, conspicuous only by its absence.

I don't intend to discuss whether essays are beneficial or not. "Most sensible members" understand that they are, and "it is for them that I am especially writing."

I suppose that the talent of this year's Society may not seem to your correspondent so grand as the talent of that of last year, in which he was *pro sud summa copia ac singulari facultate dicendi* (as it seemed to himself), a leading member. Since he seems to make a great point of this, let him have it, especially as I never made any comparison in the first letter concerning this subject.

But stay! here is truth. He has hit the nail on the head when he speaks of the chairman's summing up as a mere "rehash." He has summed up several times himself, and the Society cordially agrees with him.

In conclusion, allow me to say that though I consider it most "unlikely that the Society will ever entertain for a single moment the preposterous ideas" of our friend, the "enthusiastic correspondent," [observe the promised absence of high-flowing language], in your third issue, yet I can assure him that his own preposterous ideas have very highly entertained the Society.

Yours, &c.,

ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY.

Advertisements.

GEO. H. SACKMAN,
MERCHANT TAILOR, &c..
131 KING STREET, TORONTO.
East of Church Street.

R. F. TAYLOR,
MERCHANT TAILOR
No. 10 Rossin House Block, Toronto.

LARK HOUSTON & TAYLOR