

what of his method? That is a hard question to answer. It is indeed so inconsistent that one is inclined to doubt whether there be any method at all. Or, in his own words, "should (his) mentality be of such a type that he says one thing and means another, just what does he mean?" for the last quarter of his letter is occupied with ridicule of a crude kind, and Union Member's "whole letter" is finally dismissed as a clumsy joke! What then, may we ask, of the "extreme interest, gratification, and very good suggestion?"

May one be pardoned for indulging in a simile? It is as if two men enter the ring for a bout (the "Martlet" should represent Queensberry rules). At the first blow of the glove the opponent takes his off and strikes back with naked knuckles and even descends to a—to be colloquial for once—"rough house."

Now, Mr. Editor, is it necessary or with good reason that such correspondence is published? Not that I think that the grievance and its natural reply should have no place in your paper. The "Union" is the Students' Club and the "Martlet" is the Students' publication.

Personally, I think sincere grievances have much greater demands upon you than sly pokes at professors, or illustrations. The House Committee has enough to do without calling meetings which may bring on local storms without clearing the air. Redress from that quarter should always be the last resort; it is the High Court of Appeal in Club matters. But my point now is that some plan of action should be adopted if possible which should protect a correspondent from such a galling attack as that I have mentioned, all arising, I am convinced, from a hasty reading of Union Member's letter. "It" has no reference to "House Committee"

but to the greater "evil," subject of the main sentence.

Is it not your right to demand modifications in, or to expurgate, material sent you without rejecting it altogether? I ask in good faith; I have no wish to add to the burdens of a staff busily occupied in the interests of "Old McGill." It may be you often do so. I but voice the sentiments of others in wishing that a like discretion had been used in this case. Mr. Cleuston may have supposed he had the choice of weapons,—as a matter of fact he had within certain limits. What these limits are, I have attempted to suggest. Of the choice made it is enough to quote "*de gustibus non est disputandum.*"

I am, dear sir,

Yours faithfully,

R. D. HARRISON, '07.

Consolation for Freshette.

Dear Freshette:

We read with pleasure and loud applause your very timely letter in a late number of the Martlet. We strongly approve of the sentiment therein expressed and sincerely hope that the state of affairs which you have so graphically depicted may be swiftly remedied. Most certainly the position of the seniors seems entirely uncalled for and we think that their ideas on the subjects you mention show a deplorable lack of experience and decided spinsterial tendencies. We ardently trust that the present Freshettes will show more foresight in these directions than their predecessors and improve their golden opportunities.

The cutting criticism of "Not a Senior," in the Martlet for Dec 11, was undoubtedly called forth by the strong and undeniable terms of your letter which certainly went to the heart of existing conditions with most disconcerting directness. It is a wise saying "If the cap fits you, wear it"