

come up year after year, and was always successfully opposed by the older heads in the union. This year the opposition to it amounted to practically nothing, and yet we cannot help thinking that the reduction in the number of points puts a premium on foul play.

In the election that followed we are pleased to say that Queen's got well served. We must congratulate Mr. W. F. Nickle on being elected to the vice-presidency; Mr. J. M. Mowat on his election to the secretary-treasurership; and Mr. A. B. Ford on his election to the executive. Mr. H. R. Grant was appointed a representative to the Canadian Union, which meets in Toronto to-day.

K. C. I. VS. FRESHMEN.

The Freshmen met their annual defeat at the hands of the K. C. I. on Saturday, Dec. 1st, to the tune of 21 to 9. The ground was very slippery and the play was decidedly loose and ragged. Considering their inadequate knowledge of the game and their lack of practice, the Freshmen did remarkably well against a strong opposing team. Orser and McConville deserve special mention and give promise of becoming capable players.

The Ontario Hockey Union held its annual meeting a short time ago. Queen's was ably represented by Mr. G. F. McDonell, M.A., who was elected to a position on the executive committee.

AMERICAN RUGBY.

As their own rugby game grows in popularity Canadians cannot but be interested in the development of the game among the great American colleges. The *Nation* of Nov. 29th contains an entertaining but rather extreme criticism of the game in general, and of the Harvard-Yale match in particular. It is interesting as shewing how the American game is regarded by one of themselves and that one a spectator. We give some selections. "The game on Saturday, at Springfield, between the two great teams of Harvard and Yale, was by the testimony—unanimous as far as our knowledge goes—of spectators and newspapers, the most brutal ever witnessed in the United States." The writer asks what the governing bodies of colleges have to say for a game where litters and surgeons are among the preliminaries and are seen to be quite appropriate by results of the game. He then goes on, "There were actually seven casualties among twenty-two men who began the game. This is nearly 33 per cent. of the combatants—a larger proportion than among the Federals at Cold Harbour (the bloodiest battle of modern times), and much larger than at Waterloo or at Gravelotte. What has American culture and civilization to say to this mode of training our youth? 'Brewer was so

badly injured that he had to be taken off the field crying with mortification.' Wrightington fell and as he lay on the ground, Hinckey, captain of the Yale men, jumped on him with both knees breaking his collar bone. . . ."

He finds a fruitful parallel for the game in the prize-ring. The pugilist is quite content if he can knock out his adversary in the first round. "He would rather not have to draw his claret and close his peepers and mash his smeller and break his breadbasket. What he wants is the belt, the championship, the stakes, and his share of the gate money." This is done by a game that wastes his adversary's strength, "but how does this differ from college football?" This last style of 'play is undoubtedly made use of in the American game and is not wanting among ourselves. How common it is to hear the captain and many of the "backers" of a team urging the man who is marking a "star" of the opposite side, to "use up" his man as quickly as possible! This pugilistic comparison loses its point for our game because of its openness and freedom from mass playing.

In view of the fact that players in the American game leave the field for most insignificant injuries, we believe that its brutality is greatly exaggerated in the above. At the same time the tendency of their game is towards rough and brutal play and the writer's suggestion that there be more skill and agility is an appropriate one. The idea that pervades their whole game at present is possession of the ball and to do this they practice mass playing, resulting in a heavy and slow game. Turning again to our own game, in the long and scattered forward line we have a good preventive of the more brutal features of the other. Our legislation, too, on rough play is very stringent, but we do not believe that rules can modify a game where an ugly disposition exists in the players.

The writer says further: "The pretence which has been put forward by some people who ought to know better, some of them college professors, that there is in the game as now played a useful preparation for modern life, is one of the saddest parts of the whole business. If it be so, all students, and not a highly trained eleven only, should be compelled to play it. The notion that it cultivates self-restraint, which some have preached, has a touch of humor in it, as Hinckey must have felt when he was jumping on the prostrate Wrightington."

The article closes with a strong appeal to parents to keep their sons out of the game. He apparently forgets that any effective reform must come from the players themselves and draws this highly interesting conclusion on one of their most popular games; but so long as our game retains its present features we do not fear any such catastrophe as this.