

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Messrs. Editors:—

In glancing over the list of correspondence in the last issue of the *ATHENÆUM*, an article on the gymnasium came to my notice, not on account of its excellence in thought or expression, but on account of its tendency to convey wrong impressions.

As one who has been involved in some of the statements of this article, I would like an explanation. What does the writer mean by a *successful failure*? What was promised to the Students when they paid the entrance fee to the gymnasium last year? Did the proprietors guarantee to hand the apparatus over to them when they were done with it? The writer seems to insinuate that the proprietors of last year established the gymnasium for the purpose of cheating the students and lining their own pockets. That such is not the case it is hardly necessary to affirm. From the statements made at the general meeting of the students, it was clearly shown that the amount received from admission fees, barely covered the necessary outlay for apparatus, without taking into consideration the amount of time and labor expended by the managers.

Further. The writer on some unexplainable hypothesis draws the conclusion, or seems to think that each one who pays his admittance fee necessarily owns part of the apparatus. He remarks that when the term is over the gymnasium is no more and all the students have received from it is their exercise.

On the same theory the writer might say of those who attend the rink, that as their money kept it in operation, therefore the rink should belong to them, but instead of that when the winter season is over the rink is no more, and all the benefit they have received from it is their skating, while they are no nearer possessing a rink than they were the year before.

Again the writer says that we purchase the appliances and bear the expenses of equipping a gymnasium and in the end find ourselves at the point from which we started. What is meant by this? Does it mean that the students are annually defrauded out of a gymnasium by the misappropriation of the funds they supplied to construct it? I do not wish to infer this, but will attribute the mistake to the awkward arrangement of his sentences. The students do not *pay* for the appliances. They give their money with a fair understanding that they are to have the *use* of them, which is a slightly different thing.

As for personal animosities I have met none and do not apprehend any, but should the students be dissatisfied with the present arrangement, and desire to form a club, I shall be glad to dispose of my interest in the concern and unite with them in sustaining it.

My object in writing this letter was not to oppose

the organization of an athletic club, but to object to the manner in which the writer of the last issue cast such unwarrantable insinuations on the proprietors of the Gymnasium.

Thanking you for the space given,  
I remain, yours etc.

ONE OF THE PROPS.

## EXCHANGES.

SOME of the recent editors of our paper having, in the accustomed order of things, been succeeded by others, the management of the Exchange column has fallen into new and inexperienced hands. During the past term, this department of the paper, did not, for reasons unnecessary to specify, receive the attention in former years devoted to it. This discontinuance of a custom has not commended itself to those having the paper in charge, and accordingly it has been determined that an effort shall be made to re-establish this department in its former position. Though most College Journals are agreed as to the importance of an Exchange column, a glance at a few of our Exchanges easily shows that opinions quite widely differ as to the proper manner of conducting one. Perhaps it would not be unwise for the present Editor to give an outline of his own views on this question, so that his subsequent course, while possibly calling forth disapproval, may not occasion surprise. It seems to us that the true object of the Exchange column is the general improvement of the College paper. When, however, as is sometimes the case, this possible instrument for good is debased from its true function so far as it becomes the battle-ground over which tear noisily volleys of street-Arab slang and undignified nothings, we think both it and the Editor should be consigned to a nameless grave with all possible dispatch. The office of an Exchange Editor is then this:—To freely grant praise when worth is perceived; and to impartially, but fearlessly, present unfavorable criticism where such appears to his careful judgment to be required. None of our papers approach to perfection, and we need not Burns to tell us that we cannot see ourselves as others see us. The *Acadia Athenæum*, therefore, invites such criticism as has been designated. Finally, asking some portion of clemency from those fierce spirits who scan the stranger columns, we have written our preface.

THE January number of the *University Monthly* does not seem to have suffered much from the loss of its editors. Though not containing quite the usual amount of matter on strictly literary subjects, it is in other respects a creditable issue. The editorial on singing is a strong appeal to the students to renew in