

4. The library should be opened at nine and left open till six, so that a student taking all his meals in the college might be able to do so without any necessary sacrifice of his time. If this arrangement would make additions to library staff a necessity, then by all means let us have them. The library is for the benefit of the students, and it ought to be open from nine till six whether there is a common dining-hall or not.

While the scheme thus outlined may not commend itself to either the students or the college management in all its features, I am of the opinion that something of the kind is not merely feasible but absolutely necessary, if the students are to be placed in a position to know something of a real college life. Sir William Dawson in his speech at the McGill undergraduates' dinner last year advocated a somewhat similar scheme for his own college, and I have no doubt that his great influence and untiring energy will enable him to realize his ideal. Here it can do no harm, at all events, to have the proposal thoroughly discussed from every point of view in the VARSITY, and it is with a view to elicit suggestions from others that I have put forward mine.

WM. HOUSTON.

Literature.

BLUE EYES.

GLADNESS.

"Oh! those blue eyes of thine!
Sparkling and bright,
Full of sweet happiness,
Stars in the night,
Stay, yet awhile, oh, stay!
Joy to me bring,
Fade not loved light away,
Thus do I sing!"

FEARS.

"Tell me, ye gods, oh, tell!
Will they be ever so,
Free from all tears of woe,
Pure and undimmed by sorrow and care,
Beaming so fond and true,
Clear as the glistening dew,
Brighter than jewels, more precious and rare?"

SADNESS.

"Hark! 'tis no answer glad
Borne on the breeze,
Sighing and wailing sad,
Voiced by the trees;
Why do ye moan? you say,
What does your moaning mean?
Gaze dreamer, while you may,
Into her bonnie e'en,"

TEARS.

"Ah! thou assassin death!
Come from the tomb,
My light and love to slay
Leaving the gloom;
Hold! stay thy hand, I pray!"
Wildly I cried,
Alas! in my arms she lay,—
Blue eyes had died.

COMPETITION.

A correspondent of the VARSITY of December 12, takes most indefensible ground on the subject of "Competition." A mere re-statement of his position might suffice to show its utter untenableness to observing minds. As, however, the error prevails only too generally, and is responsible for much of the callous inertia that at present hampers the work of reform, you will kindly allow me a few lines in comment.

The assumption is made by your correspondent that competition is universal, necessary, and designed by the Creator. I pass by his general references to the animal, vegetable, and even mineral kingdoms, which are of doubtful accuracy, and, besides, impertinent to the matter in question. I pass by also the consideration of the condition of primitive man, the information on which subject is sufficiently meagre to expose us to inaccuracy of statement. The assumption that competition was universal in any period in the past of mankind, simply cannot be proved, and I venture to say that probabilities are against it.

But let us turn to the actual society of the nineteenth century. It is with that we are chiefly concerned. Now, is it not an obtrusively obvious fact that, in society as actually constituted, competition is far from being universal? I omit the multitude of individual instances in which family affection, neighborly kindness, and natural feeling of brotherhood, mitigate and annihilate the evils of competition. I omit also those many unwritten laws, called customs, which act in like manner to destroy competition. And I refer simply to the socialistic and co-operative spirit which, beyond doubt, is taking an increasingly large share in government and industry.

This tendency of our times is noted jubilantly by socialist leaders and proclaimed with alarm by Herbert Spencer, the apostle of individualism and competition. In his article on "The Coming Slavery," after referring to numerous socialistic features in our present society, such as public schools, post offices, the telegraph, municipal government enterprise, &c., and after pointing to prospective land laws, and government control of railroads and of the whole long catalogue of concerns for wholesale production and for wholesale and retail distribution, Mr. Spencer proceeds:

"Evidently, then, the changes made, the changes in progress, and the changes urged, will carry us not only towards State-ownership of land and dwellings and means of communication, all to be administered and worked by State-agents, but towards State usurpation of all industries . . . and so will be brought about the desired ideal of the societies."

One feature only of our social arrangements I would here particularize. Our public school system, which confers the blessing of a good education on so many for whom competition would have made it impossible, is manifestly a partial mitigation at least, of the evils of competition. And so also is that recent movement in Birmingham and Manchester, which has for aim to make government provision for such of the little school children (and there are many,) as are so disadvantageously placed in the struggle for existence that they cannot even find food enough to support their young brains through the exercises of school. Does this look as if competition were universal, "and utterly and absolutely impossible to escape"? A very casual observation of society around us would prevent many an ill-considered assertion, and destroy, before utterance, many a false and pernicious doctrine.

"To struggle with one another, we were not made so." The answer made to my plea is particularly naive. We are assured that "competition is everywhere, it has crept in somehow, and it must be admitted that men have succeeded marvellously well in doing what they were not made or fitted to do." Were we not humbly assured that the above assertion was made in all "frankness and honesty," we might be in doubt how to deal with it. What does the argument amount to? The fact, for example, that man once