

The editorial also seems to suggest, though it does not state, that the spirit which Mr. Mott represents and engenders is the spirit of those who think that Queen's is too "intellectual." The following words of Mr. Mott should effectually dispel that idea: "The highest order of constructive statesmanship is demanded to-day both in the foreign outreach of the missionary enterprise and in the supporting movements on the home field. The students, therefore, who are ambitious to make their lives count most largely in extending the limits of the Kingdom should apply themselves with peculiar intensity and thoroughness to their regular college and university work. They, of all men, should not tolerate superficiality. So far as it does not contravene this distinctive and paramount purpose of college life, they should also avail themselves wisely of the advantages of extra-curriculum activities. They should catch the passion for helpfulness—seeking to serve men in the midst of the highly potential opportunities of college days Above all, they should go in training and stay in training for Christlikeness." Mr. Mott himself is a scholar of no mean order, and some of the strongest men of Queen's, intellectually, men who have headed their classes, were among those who were apparently most influenced by him.

The criticism which the editorial contains is a negative one. It is likely the writer did not attend all Mr. Mott's meetings. No one, however, who did not attend every address should attempt to say what was lacking in Mr. Mott's message to us. For his work was carefully planned, so that there was no repetition, and each address contained part of his complete message. It is to be regretted that the JOURNAL did not arrange to have his addresses reported so that all might judge for themselves. There are many at Queen's who are indebted to Mr. Mott for a wonderfully clear and comprehensive view of the situation on all the great battle-fields of the church, for a firmer grip on the vital truths of Christianity, and for a clearer realization of their own duty towards all men, and who feel that their whole lives will be greatly influenced by the thoughts and interests his addresses here have aroused in them.—R. M. M.

Queen's University, February 4th, 1910.

To the Editor of the Journal:—

Dear Sir:—In the last number of the JOURNAL there appeared an article deliberately libelling the Science Hall Vigilance Committee. It is our candid opinion that this article is simply a personal attack directed against the court by one who was convicted. It is a matter of regret that the JOURNAL should be allowed to degenerate into a mere medium whereby an individual may air his personal grievance. Coming from the editorial column it is more to be deplored.

We believe that the manner in which the court was conducted has met with the general approval of the Science student body. The Vigilance Committee exists for a purpose and the members have directed their best energies towards fulfilling that purpose, so we feel justified in saying that the JOURNAL has gone too far to spread abroad an article that is deliberately calculated to injure the reputation, as well as the work of the Science Court.

(Signed) By order of Vigilance Committee,

R BARTLETT, Clerk of Court.