N bidding the class of '84 farewell, memories keep thronging before us of the many pleasant relations between '84 and '85, as classes, and between the individuals of each.

There is always a strong wish among the Juniors that they too were Seniors and were going out to make their fortunes; a wish which invariably comes back as a mockery when the good times—comparatively speaking—of school days are past.

Many of the friendships formed here will, we have no doubt, last through life. Many now good friends will be parted and meet one another years from now almost strangers, so different their lives, interests, thoughts, and associations.

Our Alma Mater does not pamper us; there is little sentimentality or romance about the life here, but she throws her sons forth to the world fitted for rugged work. We wish the members of '84 success, one and all.

"Farewell! a word that must be, and hath been,—A sound which makes us linger;—yet—farewell."

THE editor wishes to express his appreciation of the very efficient co-operation of the assistant editors during the past term. Also of Mr. Litchfield's services, and those of the many contributors who have helped to make The Tech a success. The task, although involving extra work to a considerable extent, has been a pleasant one, and if, as we hope, the paper has accomplished some good, filled some want, the knowledge of this will amply repay the exertion it has cost.

A N editorial in No. 11 of The Tech upon the age requirement for admission has provoked several replies and more or less discussion. We take this occasion, at the risk of making the subject wearisome, to explain some of our views as then stated, and to answer some of the objections, or to remove some of the misconceptions which have since appeared.

With regard to the communications of A. B., while cheerfully conceding the need of more or less advance of standard in other directions, we unhesitatingly affirm that no examinations are a complete test of an applicant's fitness, that an age requirement, however arbitrary, is an approximately fair, supplementary test, that it is eminently just to say that because a man is more mature at eighteen than at sixteen, men of eighteen are as a rule more mature than those of sixteen.

A. B.'s other argument, the loss of a year's time, seems plausible, but we cannot afford thus to overlook certain other possible, almost probable, contingencies. The assumption is that a man reaching his prime at fifty loses by begin-