

boycotting unsuitable and "short grub" boarding houses, be doing work as beneficial in its results as that of any committee of the Y.M.C.A.

Yours, &c.,  
FRESHMAN.

*To the Editor of the Journal:*

DEAR SIR,—The letter written by Quasi-Modo as a reply to an editorial which appeared in your issue of the 20th Jan. is somewhat startling; not because of its merit, but rather on account of the tone of superior wisdom assumed by the writer in attempting to despatch so summarily an article which his letter shows that he has entirely misinterpreted. "Levanaite" metes to him like measure, but makes no attempt to point out the fundamental error in his communication, and thus to disclose its utter uselessness.

The attention of the writer of the editorial had evidently been called to the influence exerted by the lady students through their votes at the recent A. M. S. elections, and as a result he\* was led to inquire into the real as well as nominal relations existing between the lady students and the A. M. S. In his editorial he states clearly the result of his investigations. It was this. The ladies on payment of the fee are regular members and entitled to the privileges of all other members. Those of the lady students who take sufficient interest in such matters are well aware of this. So far they have for several reasons not chosen to identify themselves closely with the society by attending the meetings; the most powerful one, underlying all superficial reasons, being that they have not yet become convinced that co-education extends beyond the lecture room. After stating these facts, the writer closes by raising a question as to the advisability of a closer connection between the lady students and the A. M. S.

Now Quasi-Modo has missed the point altogether. He supposes the question propounded to be, "In what relation do the lady students stand to the A. M. S.?" This question was fully answered by the editorial. With his characteristic confidence in his own omniscience pertaining to College matters, he says, "The answer to the question propounded is simple; the lady students stand in the same relation to the A. M. S. as do those of the opposite sex." We would call his attention to the fact that there are *only* three weak points in this piece of would-be information. It certainly lacks the element of novelty, for as the school-boy says, "We knew it all before." Although it may possess the virtue of brevity, this is more than counterbalanced by its incompleteness, for he deals with only one side of the question. He states the *nominal* relation but

\* Quasi-Modo will please remember that good usage sanctions the use, in an indefinite sense, of the masculine pronoun when referring to either sex; hence of whatever sex the writer may have been, there was not necessarily any intention to mislead.

ignores what is of far more importance, viz., the *real* relation. For further light on this side of the question it would be well for him to re-read the editorial. Last and most egregious blunder—he answers the wrong question.

So far, the fundamental error has been dealt with but having once started to dissect, it may not be amiss to go into a few of the details. Not only with the writer's presumption is one impressed, but with the pugnacious spirit which pervades the whole communication. Quasi-Modo is evidently on the defensive; a very good position to be in when there is any danger for an attack, but it seems foolish to waste one's energy by striking at random into the air. He quotes from the editorial, "The objection has been raised that the meetings are not of such a nature as the ladies would care to attend." Ready to take offence, Quasi-Modo at once supposes this to be a complaint coming from the ladies. Had he reflected a little he might have known that the lady students are hardly in a position to make such a criticism of the general meetings because they do not attend them. For Quasi-Modo's information we state that prominent members of the opposite sex, have raised this objection; so that the forcedly witty remarks on "sewing circles" and "flounces" were as uncalled for as they were inapt. On the whole, Quasi-Modo appears to think that the lady students are dissatisfied with their treatment. No such sentiments are expressed in the editorial; and after consulting the leading voices from that side of the house we find that they feel in no wise down-trodden; on the contrary they express themselves as having received their dues in the past, and being of an optimistic tendency, they look hopefully into the future.

There is, too, a strange inconsistency in Quasi-Modo's assertions. He designates it a "fiction" that the lady students receive invitations to attend the meetings on special occasions and at the same time acknowledges that they do, by stating that the reason they are notified only in particular instances is because they have no bulletin board! Apart from his contradiction, what sort of reasoning does he display here? Could not a regular notice be put up where the occasional notice is posted?

But surely enough has been said to show Quasi-Modo that he has not only failed to throw any new light on the subject but that he has in all probability been the means of spreading throughout the country a wrong impression as to the spirit and standing of the lady students at Queen's. The fact that *The University Monthly*, of Fredericton, N.B., has quoted for the purpose of contrasting the amicable relations existing at Queen's with the open conflicts at its own College, from the very editorial attacked by Quasi-Modo, this fact shows that the reputation of our College is affected by the tone of the articles which