

LIVERPOOL
INSTITUTE SCHOOLS
MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. No. 2.

DECEMBER, 1889.

PRICE 1D.

WE are glad to be able to state that the last issue of *The Magazine* was a decided success. Our thanks are therefore due to the delegates and to Messrs. Ewart and Brown, who have so ably assisted us in making it a success.

Before the next issue of *The Magazine* the school will have suffered a great and far-reaching loss. The news of the approaching retirement of Mr. Sephton from the headmastership of the Institute has been heard with great regret both by the school and the public generally. After twenty-five years spent in the advancement of the interests of the Institute, he is about to retire from the field of his labours, in which the greater part of his life has been spent. Under him the school has prospered as it has never done before, and has been raised to the position of one of the finest schools in the kingdom. The uniform success of the school in everything which has been taken up by it, the success of old pupils in after-life, the present successful condition of the school, the esteem and respect in which he is held alike by masters and by boys,—all bear testimony to the careful and painstaking superintendence which he has exercised over the school from the first. His kindly manner and interest in all things connected with the Institute will be greatly missed by all those who have come in contact with him. One might almost say he was made for the post, so admirably does he fill it. His kindness

and way of making work agreeable will long be remembered by those who have had the privilege of being taught by him. By his retirement, the masters and boys alike lose a true friend, and it seems impossible that anyone could completely fill his place. We cannot express ourselves better than in the language of Shakespeare—

“He was a man, take him for all in all,
We shall not look upon his like again.”

A. J. EWART, }
W. A. ARMOUR, } EDITORS.

—*—
L. I. L. D. S.

October 31st, 1889.—The subject for this date was a debate on “Should the Church of England be Disestablished?” Chisholm opened the debate for the affirmative, and held that established churches were always intolerable, and gave instances to show that the Church of England is no exception to the rule. Millard, for the negative, asserted the divine origin of the Church of England, and declared that the country did not pay for the support of the worship of the Established Church. A long debate then ensued, Brown, Ewart I., Armour, Roberts II., Long, Hay, Braham, Roberts III., and Dale speaking on the affirmative side, and Wolde, Williams, and Clark supporting the negative. After the leaders’ reply a division was taken, with the result that ten votes were given for the affirmative, and four for the negative, the affirmative thus winning by six votes. The meeting then adjourned.

November 7th, 1889.—On this date Long gave a paper on “The Great Reform Struggle.” He prefaced his remarks with an account of the efforts made in the cause of Reform prior to the year 1831, and described the state of parliamentary representation at that time. The various introductions of the measure were described, and extracts read from the speeches of Lord John Russell and Sir R. H. Inglis. The essayist also described the events up to the passing of the bill, and its fate in the House of Lords. The paper was then discussed by Armour, Braham, Barnett, and Dale. After the essayist’s reply the meeting terminated.

November 14th, 1889.—The subject for this date was a debate on “Was Henry V. a wise and just king?” Ewart I. opened for the affirmative, and gave an account of Henry’s reign. He excused the treatment of the Lollards on the ground of men’s ideas at that time. The speaker also held that Henry was not to blame for undertaking the French war. Dale, for the negative, admitted the soldierly qualities of Henry, but held that this did not make him a good king. The speaker also condemned Henry’s conduct with regard to the French war. The

question was then debated, Marshall, Ewart II., and Brown supporting the affirmative, and Woodward, Roberts I., Long, Mohammad, and Armour the negative. After the leaders’ replies a division was taken, and five votes were given for each, and the debate was decided in the negative by the casting vote of the chairman. The meeting then terminated.

November 19th, 1889.—On this date a debate was held in the hall of Canning Street Presbyterian church, with the Canning Street Junior Association. There was a very large attendance. Long, on behalf of the L. I. L. D. S., opened in the affirmative the question “Is a Republic desirable in England?” His arguments were directed to show that the experience of our own country, of France, and of the United States is favourable to Republicanism, and that Monarchy is a system degrading alike to ruler and to ruled. Peers replied for Canning Street. Armour entered very fully into the question of expense of Monarchy in England, and endeavoured to show from this the desirability of a Republic. Slater spoke for the negative. Hay supported the negative on the ground, that as we have already practically a Republic we might as well have a complete one. Llewellyn supported the negative. Wolde endeavoured to show that a Republic is desirable from considering the history of Charles I. and II., and Cromwell. Wylie then spoke for Canning Street. Ewart answered several arguments advanced by speakers on the negative side. Robb supported the negative. The leaders then replied, and a division was taken, with the result, for the affirmative, 10, for the negative, 21, majority, 11. The meeting then terminated.

November 28th, 1889.—The subject for this date was a debate on “Is Home Rule a wise and much-needed Reform?” Long opened for the affirmative, and endeavoured to show that the English government in Ireland has always consisted of tyranny and oppression. He also asserted the existence of a feeling of nationality among the Irish, which Home Rule alone can satisfy. Marshall, for the negative, asserted that the grant of Home Rule to Ireland would be followed by similar concessions to Scotland, Wales and India, and that two millions out of five millions of the Irish people were opposed to Home Rule, and that this class included the best portion of the country. The question was then debated at great length, Chisholm, Ewart II., Ewart I., Hay, Mohammad, and Braham supporting the affirmative, and Armour, Williams, and Roberts II. the negative. After the leaders’ reply a division was taken, with the following result—affirmative, 11, negative, 6, majority, 5. The meeting then adjourned.

HON. SECRETARY.

—*—
CHAT ON THE CORRIDOR.

THE preceding month has been a very dull one editorially speaking. The four o’clock regime, that sign of the approaching holidays, has started, and the din of preparation for the coming Christmastide already fills the air. But to say that Nov. 20th the Browns started mince-meat making; Nov. 22nd the Jones

boiled their first plum-pudding, etc., etc., is hardly school news. We are, therefore, considerably circumscribed in our remarks.

It is a well-known fact that the wisest of us are prone to make mistakes, and, doubtless, the young gentleman who said that "sub aerio monte" meant "under a brazen mountain" is of this opinion. This translation is almost as good as "practendere muros morti," "they pretend to be dead on the walls," and "corvi ovantes gutteri," "crows laying eggs in the gutter." Probably the person who when asked to prove that AC equals AB said, "AC must be equal to AB, for if it is greater it is less, and if it is equal it can't be" is also of this opinion.

WE hear that a society has been started having for its object "The Prevention of Cheek in Kids." This sounds very funny, but what it really means is that a number of boys, who ought to know better, have banded themselves together for the purpose of bullying those weaker than themselves. Now, this will not do, and we trust that those concerned in it will at once stop such senseless buffoonery.

ONE of the most exciting games the Institute F.C. have played this season took place on Nov. 20th against the College M.C. The numerous spectators watched the game from beginning to end with the liveliest interest. After a very fine bit of play by the college, one of their men was so unfortunate as to scratch his head, and it required the assistance of two college men to enable him to reach a place of safety. Unfortunately, they did not return. In spite of this the College played up with their usual vigour, and a thoroughly even and exciting game resulted in a win for the Institute by 14 goals 8 tries and 3 minors to nil.

OUR athletic readers will be glad to learn that Dempster who played in our Football teams of 1884-5 and 1885-6 was in the winning four in the Torpid Fours of his College (Lincoln College, Oxford), on the 17th of November last.

CUSTODIUS.

NOTES ON THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

THINKING it might interest the School to learn something about the Debating Society, I have taken the liberty to put down a few notes concerning the Society and its members. First, I would remark that the Society is not supported by the School as it should be. Debating societies are grand things for everybody. Everyone is called upon at some time or another to speak in public, and is it not better to have learned to speak coherently and to express one's thoughts in the best possible manner than to make a miserable failure of it? How many people when called upon to second a resolution or do something of that kind do it something after this fashion:—"Er—Mr. Chairman—hem—I rise—Mr. Chairman—er—I rise—hem—er—for the—er—purpose of resolving—er—no; I don't mean that—er—I rise—hem—to second—er—the resolution—er—etc." In a debating society by continual speaking one is trained into the habit of expressing one's thoughts clearly, and of speaking without hesitancy or diffidence. And then if anyone take the card of the Institute Debating Society and look at its subjects of debate and of paper, the amount of education which is gained by getting up these subjects is

simply invaluable. I would, therefore, urge on every member of the Sixth, and as many of the members of the other Forms as possible of the advantage of joining the Society. I am sorry that it is not taken more advantage of by the School in general. I am glad, however, to be able to say that it is now in a more flourishing condition than it has been before, but more members of the Sixth at least might attend its meetings. I consider that, taken as a whole, the speeches which are delivered at the meetings of the Society are of very good average, and will compare very favourably with that of other societies.

With regard to the members of the Society, I think that, on the whole, the best speaker in the Society is undoubtedly H. E. Long. He possesses in a marked degree an amount of enthusiasm which few of the other members possess. He speaks with a fire and energy which is very effective, and is very good at making the best of a bad case. The theme on which he is most eloquent is that of Home Rule; on this he grows quite pathetic. Still he has his faults; he is far too excitable, and often misses saying what he wishes to say by being too greatly excited. J. B. Dale, the Chairman of the Society, is the very reverse; he never gets in the least excited. What he says is generally very good, but he has a most tiresome and monotonous way of speaking, keeping his voice at one dead level the whole time and never allowing it to rise or fall. A. J. Ewart is very good at debate. He is a quiet and non-excitable speaker, and arranges his speeches in very good order. He is very earnest, and gives you the appearance of believing what he says. Still he is very bigoted, and will not admit that any one opposed to him has any chance of being right. A. M. Ker does not speak very much, and when he does speaks clearly, but gives you the impression that he does not care a brass button for the side on which he speaks. He very consistently votes on the side of his friend, Chisholm. W. H. Chisholm speaks fairly well, but he has a rather confused manner of speaking, is bad at arranging a speech properly, and does not quite seem to understand what he is saying. W. A. Armour is a clear and lucid debater, but is as fiery in debating as he is in football; too apt also to force his own opinions down everyone's throat. He is very logical and definite in his arguments, except on the one point of Home Rule. Robert Roberts is an extremely dogmatic speaker, and seems to lay down as a principle that he is right and everyone opposed to him is wrong. F. E. Marshall is a fairly good speaker, but would be much better if he did not think quite so highly of his oratorical powers. Braham speaks pretty well, and is to be congratulated on being the first commercial boy, but I hope not the last, to join the Society. J. Hay speaks well, but is rather too self-confident. Among the remaining members there is a good deal of latent talent, but they have spoken so few times and for such short spaces of time that an opinion cannot be properly formed concerning their abilities. In conclusion, I hope the members will take these remarks as good-naturedly as they are offered.

VERAX.

A STRANGE DREAM!

A HARD-WORKING MEDICAL STUDENT is, indeed, an anomaly, and when you meet such a person, it is impossible to value him too highly. Such a student, not long ago, after a hard day's work amidst unpleasant and nauseous dissections, retired to his couch in a state of semi-idiotic somnolency, and fell fast asleep without thinking of disrobing himself. When he awoke, he heard the clocks striking 18. He jumped out of bed and looked around him. Was this the room that he had gone to sleep in? The plaster was crumbling from the walls and ceiling, which were festooned with bunches of strange fungi; the floor was inches deep with dust; and the mattress on which he had lain had crumbled to powder. Putting his hand to his head, and endeavouring to collect his scattered thoughts, he sat down on the bedstead. The supports were eaten through with rust, and the whole structure collapsed beneath him, and fell without making a sound, but raising an enormous cloud of dust. Stuffed and half-choked, he rushed to the door. It appeared to have stuck, but, exerting all his strength, he wrenched it open with a violent effort. A cold blast of air struck him in the face, and, at the same time, the twilight, which had been waning for some time now became dusk. An involuntary shiver passed through his frame, partly through fear, and partly because he had no clothes on. Ridiculous though it seemed, his clothes appeared to have rotted to a dry powder. His money and his eye-glasses he alone retained, and excepting these he had nothing on. He carefully picked his way down the rotten and worm-eaten stairs, until he reached the basement, where he again began to look about him. Undoubtedly it was the same house that he had gone to sleep in; but what was the cause of its having undergone so great a change in the course of a few hours? He began to examine the place more carefully, with a view to elucidating the mystery. In a corner of the hall he found a ragged suit of clothes, which had probably been cast off and left behind by some wandering tramp. These he decided to put on, and quickly huddled himself into them, not without experiencing considerable disgust. After a moment's hesitation, he opened the door and passed out into the street.

(TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.)

SOME CURIOUS EPITAPHS.

(From Pewsey Church-yard.)

"HERE lies the body of Lady O'Looney, first cousin of Burke, commonly called the sublime. She was bland, passionate, and deeply religious; also she painted in water colours, and sent several pictures to the exhibition, and "of such is the kingdom of Heaven." She lived a life of virtue, and died of cholera morbus,

brought on by eating unripe fruit, "in the hope of a blessed immortality," at the early age of 21 years, 7 months and 16 days. "Go thou and do likewise."

(Cincinnati).

"HERE lies Henry Smith, who came to this city and died, for the benefit of his health.

(Tintagel Church, Cornwall).

"The horse bit the parson,
How came this to pass,
The horse heard the parson say,
All flesh is grass,"

(Peshawur Cemetery, India).

"SACRED to the Memory of the Rev. ———, Missionary, aged 35, murdered by his chowkidar (native servant). "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

(Ulster).

"To the memory of Thomas Kelly, who was accidentally shot by his brother, as a mark of respect."

FOOTBALL NOTES.

LIVERPOOL INSTITUTE V. TRANMERE 2ND (A.)—This match was played at Tranmere on November 9th, and resulted in a win for the Institute by 3 goals, 3 tries, to 1 try. The tries for the Institute were obtained by Ker (4), Fountain, and A. J. Ewart. Team:—Davies, back; Ker, Fountain, and Chisholm, three-quarter backs; Armour and Golding, half-backs; Wallace, A. J. Ewart, A. E. Ewart, Pulford, Marshall, W. L. Ker, Gething, Goodwin, and Millard, forwards.

LIVERPOOL INSTITUTE V. WATERLOO HIGH SCHOOL.—This match was played at Sefton Park, on November 13th, and resulted in a narrow win for the Waterloo High School by 1 goal and 1 try to 2 tries. The Institute had much the best of the game in the second half, and had very hard lines in not scoring more than twice. The tries were obtained for the Institute by Marshall and Wallace. Team:—Davies, back; Ker, Fountain, and Bennett, three-quarter backs; Armour and Golding, half-backs; Pulford, Millard, Wallace, W. L. Ker, S. G. Millard, A. E. Ewart, Chisholm, and Marshall.

LIVERPOOL INSTITUTE V. LIVERPOOL COLLEGE (MIDDLE SCHOOL).—This match was played on November 20th, at Sefton Park, and a very one-sided game resulted in a win for the Institute by 14 goals, 8 tries, to nil. The tries were obtained for the Institute by Ker, (5); Fountain, (3); Armour, (3); Bennett, (3); Pulford, (2); Chisholm, (2); Wallace, (2); and Marshall, (2). Team:—Fountain, Bennett, Ker, and Chisholm, three-quarter backs; Knott and Armour, half-backs; Pulford, S. G. Millard, E. B. H. Millard, Wallace, W. L. Ker, Vieckess, A. E. Ewart, Goodwin, and Marshall.

LIVERPOOL UNITED SCHOOLS V. BIRKENHEAD PARK 2ND.—This match was played at Fairfield on November 23rd, and resulted in a victory for Birkenhead by

6 tries to nil. The Institute were represented by Ker, three-quarter back; Armour, half-back; Chisholm, Pulford, and Goodwin, forwards. Fountain, who should have played three-quarter, was unable to do so through being injured in the match with the College.

LIVERPOOL INSTITUTE V. TRANMERE 2ND (A.)—This return match was played at Tranmere on November 30th, and resulted in a win for the Institute by 1 goal, 2 tries, to 1 try. The tries for the Institute were obtained by Ker, Ewart, and Millard.

HALF-BACK.

—*—

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

SCIENTIFIC-CES.—Of course we know how to make a Leyden jar. Editors know everything. But you cannot spell properly. L - a - d - e - n spells "laden"—not L - e - y - d - e - n. Take an ordinary pickle jar (or a partly open door, for that is a jar). Having procured your jar, fill it full of pickles, and it becomes a laden jar. To discharge it, let three or four hungry schoolboys be in contact with it for a few minutes.

R. R.—We have no doubt you think your contribution should have been accepted. Every one who writes anything for us thinks the same. We do not toss up to decide which contribution to accept and which to reject. You should not insinuate such things.

LONGFELLOW—Don't send us any more poetry. The Poetical Editor was very ill after reading your effusion. The rhyme sounds like turnips rolling over a wooden floor; and because the lines are 39·37 inches long, it does not follow that the metre is right.

—*—

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of the Liverpool Institute Schools Magazine.

GENTLEMEN,—I was somewhat amused and considerably disgusted when I read the letter in your last magazine written by "Old Boy." It is a well-known fact that if ever one attempts to discuss a question rationally and on its true merits he is liable to the furious vapourings of all its rabid supporters. Of this "Old Boy" gives us an example. It is a pity that he cannot read intelligently, for if he reads my letter again, and more carefully than before, he will find that he has made a fool of himself. What I maintain is this, that football and sports generally are secondary to school studies, but that this is no reason why the two should not be combined, and in fact it would be more profitable to do so. It might surprise "Old Boy" to know that I think the old place is steadily improving, and especially in Football. The difference is that, instead of the team being supported by a few big lazy louts, it is composed of the cleverer boys, and is a real all-round team, its members being really all as good as one another. It might also surprise him to know that the average age of the members of our football club is decidedly not more than 15. The personal attack at the end of his letter was, to say the least of it, extremely ungentlemanly. If he has room for any more surprise he will be astonished when I tell him that I consider smoking to be a detestable practice. I will not say more, for if we take too much notice of him he will think himself so very important.—I am, yours etc.

JUSTITIA.