

class, a function which reflects great credit on the College. The Y.M.C.A. also provides the freshmen and others with hand-books which are of the utmost value to them all through the year; yet there are many men in Queen's who come regularly to the receptions, who make continual use of the hand-books, but who hold aloof from or sneer at the aims and work of the Y.M.C.A. as a body. So much for that part of the question. To come to a more practical point. Is our Y.M.C.A. doing its best to secure the end it has in view? Are we doing all that can be done? I think we must answer individually "no." Granting the wisdom of holding a missionary conference in the fall, of sending five delegates to Brockville, of sending two men to Northfield; we must not depend on outside agencies or electric battery systems of infusing religious enthusiasm to give to our society the life and throb it ought to have. That work lies with us. How many men are there who, when they entered Queen's for the first time, coming mayhap, from surroundings where religion was rated low or openly sneered at, realized with a glow of honest pride that they were now in a place where not a few only, but many of their companions were ready to fight manfully the problems of life and at the same time to meet once a week for the purpose of showing their reverence to the God they profess to serve and asking His blessing on all the doings of the week? Are we to let succeeding generations of freshmen have the chance to feel as we did? If so, we must put our shoulders to the wheel. Let each man who has at heart the highest interests of Queen's attend the Y.M.C.A. regularly, work diligently on any committee to which he is appointed, come *prepared* at times to take part in the discussion, put faithful work on any subject that is assigned him, and the Y.M.C.A. will be such a spiritual force in Queen's that none will be able to ignore it.

Hoping, Mr. Editor, to get some light on the subjects from some source or other.

INQUIRER.

To the Editor :—

Having been at the A.M.S. meeting on Feb. 11th, I was more than usually interested in your editorial referring to the discussion upon football matters which occurred at it, and also in the letter from Mr. Gordon in reply.

I do not wish to directly criticize my friend Mr. G.; many things in his letter I think all—including the JOURNAL—would quite agree with; but candidly, I must say that to a grad. from "the outside," the remarks made at the meeting by both Dr. Ross and himself, in criti-

cism of the JOURNAL, seemed entirely incorrect in their point of view, and to quite misunderstand the JOURNAL.

Since both these gentlemen are well known to be honest and enthusiastic Queen's men, I think the trouble is that they are too near the difficulty to view it in its right perspective. To one living at a distance now, but who has lived in the heat of "College Politics," their point of view is easily comprehensible, but it seems erroneous as well. And too, it hurts Queen's. Last fall, many loyal Queen's men up west, here, were in several cases mortified, beyond expression, at the absence of the true sporting spirit at the Alma Mater. The great mistake there seemed to be that of unconsciously identifying the "honor of Queen's" with the putting up of a strong game. Now, a wise man may do the latter, and on account of his very earnestness and unselfishness be unconscious of the transgression of true sport, and yet—even though he may not resort to "prize-fighting tactics" or advocate "brute force"—because of his desire to take advantage of the letter of the law (regarding players, etc., for example), and to stretch to an unwise point the playing of a style of game which "puts the other team at a serious disadvantage," or because of other like actions which may seem of small account, he may sully the honor of Queen's in a way he little dreams of.

I think no one will accuse me of lack of love for Queen's, of lack of interest in her football and other athletics, or of admiration for and sympathy with men like Dr. Ross and Mr. Gordon, and others who give time and energy to fighting Queen's battles—and they have fought them well—on the football field. And conscious of this, I write the more boldly on the matter in hand.

Queen's grads want her team to win, and we get to every match within reach, and read all the news obtainable concerning them when we cannot get to see them, and yet there are few of us who would not prefer to see her defeated every time rather than see her teams run on—I do not say "disreputable" or "brutal," it is certainly not necessary to protest against these—but on narrow, selfish, unsympathetic lines (the natural faults of extreme clannishness and loyalty), or even tend strongly that way. But surely Queen's is not reduced to these alternatives.

On the whole, I agree with the JOURNAL in its remarks from the first, and I hope that next fall the A.M.S. and the football officials will take them well to heart.

ALFRED E. LAVELL,
Walsh, Ont.