

SPORTS.

HOCKEY.

QUEEN'S WINS THE CHAMPIONSHIP FOR '95.

THURSDAY evening, Feb. 21st, in the Mutual street rink, Toronto, Trinity university and Queen's played the final match for the O. H. A. championship. There never was the slightest doubt even in the minds of our opponents as to what the result would be, even before the game; but as it proceeded assurance became doubly sure, and at the close we had won the championship of the Province with a score that has never been equalled in a final game, viz., 17 to 3. Thus did Trinity meet a Waterloo, paralleled only by Varsity's of the previous week.

At the end of half time the score stood 14 to 0 in our favor, and it was during this half that the boys did their work. Their combination astonished even Toronto citizens, and rendered the efforts of Trinity's defence useless. The game grew so one-sided that many left the rink at half-time, knowing that Trinity could not hope to do much against such odds. In the second half, however, honours were more evenly divided. Trinity played much better hockey and our fellows grew careless. The result was that in this half each side scored three, making the final score 17 to 3.

The teams were as follows:—

Trinity—Goal, McMurrich (Capt.); point, Douglas; cover point, Wilkie; forwards, Senkler, Osler, Temple, Corby.

Queen's—Goal, Hiscock; point, Curtis (Capt.); cover point, Taylor; forwards, Rayside, McLennan, Cunningham, Weatherhead.

W. A. Gilmour of Osgoode Hall make a good referee.

POINTS.

Queen's has had an unbroken record of victories this season, winning six matches and scoring 75 goals to their opponents 19.

Trinity's defence was superior to that of Varsity, but their forward line was weaker.

"Queen's team is the best combination that has visited Toronto this year, with the possible exception of the Winnipeggers."—*Mail and Empire*.

"Queen's should travel in the States and teach the Americans how to play hockey."—*Mail and Empire*.

And now we would like to have a chance for the Dominion championship and the Stanley cup, at present held by the Montrealers. It is hoped that a match will be arranged.

This victory gives us the Intercollegiate championship also, and the boys are to be congratulated on their well-earned honours.

should not be one at all. This course was very much enjoyed by the ministers present.

Papers were read on the influence of Egypt, Babylon and Greece, on "The Thought, Form and Development of the Jewish Religion," Rev. J. J. Wright, Lynn, dealing with Egypt; Rev. Dr. Milligan, Toronto, with Babylon; and Rev. M. Macgillivray, Kingston, with Greece. After the reading of each of these papers, an hour was devoted to discussion. The writers of these papers all approached their subject in a fine sympathetic spirit, but this can hardly be said of all of those who took part in the discussions which followed. In my opinion scant justice was done to the writers, when we bear in mind the labor involved in the preparation.

The mind of the Conference seemed to be that the Jews learned almost nothing on the subject of religion from these nations—that Isaiah "sized up" his countrymen pretty accurately when he intimated that, though they had eyes and ears and intelligence, they could not, or would not see, or hear or understand.

Two papers were also read on "Wendt's view of The Kingdom of God" as that view is expressed in the "Teaching of Jesus," one by Rev. A. Laird, of Port Hope, and one by Rev. J. Sharp, Admaston. An interesting discussion followed, the conclusion being that, while there is much in Dr. Wendt's work which is valuable, his general position can hardly be maintained.

A special feature of the Conference this year was a course of three lectures on Church History and related topics by Rev. J. De Soyres, M.A., of St. John, New Brunswick. These lectures were exceedingly interesting and were very much appreciated.

Those attending the Conference had also the opportunity of hearing a special lecture by Professor Watson on "Browning's Treatment of the Story of Alcestis." It need hardly be added that the lecture was marked by rare insight and was very suggestive and stimulating.

From this meagre account of the Conference, it will be seen that there was great abundance of material to be considered and, if possible, assimilated. If some of us carried away a comparatively small number of new ideas, we have only ourselves to blame—we should have been better able to receive them. With regard to the Conference as a means of instruction, I am inclined to think more would be achieved if less were attempted. However that may be, it is certain that we all carried away a fresh sense of our limitations—a keen conviction of how little we know. We all carried away, also, a strong inspiration to be more diligent and faithful in every department of our work, and a broader charity for those who do not think as we do.

J. S.