

blame our divines and our religious institutions as our political leaders for the evils of our day—the evils of money-worship, class-tyranny and other modes in which human selfishness tramples upon a brother's weal as truly in democratic America to-day as in aristocratic France before the revolution. Well the divines and religious institutions are blamed, and by no voices more emphatically than from the ranks of the divines themselves. From the extreme wing of the R. C. and the High Anglican churches on one side and that of the Salvation Army on the other we hear the same ringing rebuke all along the line. Leaving out of account the eloquent appeals of "Father" Huntington, which might rouse the most sluggish sympathy, let me give three of these appeals against the apathy too long shown by the Christian Church to the great social problems of the day. The first is from the terse practical pen of the leader of the Salvation Army, who will not be suspected of undervaluing spiritual reform. The second from the Anglican Bishop of Mississippi, and the third taken from an article by a close-thinking German divine in the pages of the *Canadian Presbyterian*, a journal which not the most suspicious mind could suspect of either socialistic or Single Tax proclivities. Here they are:

1. (General Booth)—"What a satire it is upon our christianity and our civilization that the existence of those colonies of heathens and savages in the heart of our capital should attract so little attention. Why all this apparatus of churches and meeting houses to save men from perdition in a world to come, while never a helping hand is stretched out to save them from the inferno of the present life?"

2. (Bishop Thompson)—"To solve the problem of individual freedom and corporated responsibility, to teach men that no man liveth to himself or dieth to himself on earth, to fling back the atheistic lie as false to humanity as it is to God, that men are natural enemies,—not each his brother's keeper. To face the *Cainite* spirit of the time and its evil prophets in the power of divine grace and pity is the work before the church."

3. (Dr. Stuckenbergh, of Berlin, in "The Church and Socialism")—"Religion can do very much in this crisis, which is hastening towards a new epoch in human history. While religion co-operates with other factors in solving the socialistic problem, there are some demands which it only can meet. It is a *christian requirement* that the christian view of property and of all attainments and possessions should prevail in the christian church, instead of the prevalent legal and worldly views. *Literally and uncompromisingly, the church must be the embodiment of the social principles and practices of the New Testament.*"

*How far is it so to-day?* Never was the demand greater than now for enlarging the idea of the church so as to make it truly the kingdom of God. It is amazing that with Christ's example patent to all christian communities still exist in which the causes of suffering are not investigated, and no earnest efforts are made to remove those causes and to relieve the suffering. It is well known that this might be done if there were devoted to this object the time now wasted in social vanities and in

self gratification. *No one understanding the circumstances questions that the deepest and broadest reformation of the church is needed. The church must be saved before it can save socialism.* Christians wonder whether the church in many places has not so utterly lost the spirit of Christ as not to be worth saving. We are sure that the church doomed to destruction in the crisis is not the church of Jesus Christ. A generation of able and devout young men is pressing to the front determined by God's help that *the existing state of things shall change*, and many aged servants are with them. Among such young men is "Father" Huntington. Among them, too, I hope will be many of the sons of old "Queen's." FIDELIS.

### FOOTBALL.

It may not be out of place at this time of the season when the violent football fever has subsided and the College pulse has regained its normal state to venture a few words without the fear of bringing on the fever again.

Now of all the teams competing for supremacy under the Rugby Union none deserves more credit for fair, honest, steady and gentlemanly play than our own team from Queen's, but yet it does seem to me that in these fierce contests there is a deplorable tendency to lose sight of the real purpose of the game. Any sport or game that has for its object merely the acquisition of cups or medals is not worthy to be called a game or to be countenanced by College men. Our games, of whatever sort they may be, should win followers by the moral, physical and mental benefits they bestow, and not by any mean hope of prize or reward. I do not for a moment mean to say, nor do I think that any but the best motives actuate our representatives on the campus when they struggle so hard for victory, yet even actual success should be a secondary object. If to ensure success, it is necessary to retain in the team men who have played there from time immemorial almost, which I do not believe, to the exclusion of newer and quite as capable men who have not yet even a name on the field, and not only to their exclusion but to their prejudice, then I say success is not worth having. No team is worth supporting which does not bring fresh blood into its ranks each year, and train up the younger players for positions on the team as they become fit, instead of playing men on their past reputation who have grown stale and lost staying power.

For myself I do not think any man should be retained on the team, be he ever so good a player, who has been a member of the team for four or even three sessions. There are as good men coming as are going, and there is, and will be, no man whose place cannot be filled by some one who will come after him. Apart from being expedient, it is only fair that the older players should retire after at least four sessions' service, that the younger players may have a chance to show the stuff they are made of.

I think, further, that a College team should be composed of men actually in attendance at lectures, and that something more than nominal attendance should be the qualification.

I would like to hear other opinions on the changes I have suggested.—'87.