

The players lose nothing financially in giving their time and effort to training and play, the coaches and managers are paid good salaries, and the whole thing is as legitimate and as lucrative a business as the presentation of a drama; but there is the same difference between the American business game and the Canadian game as there is between the drama in the opera house and private theatricals in the back parlor. In a 'business' game the object is to *win*; in a game, the object is to *play*. Which do we want?

It is not the American game that we intend to discuss here, but the Queen's game, and that as regards the hiring of a professional coach. The question has been thoroughly considered at different times in the history of Queen's football. This year the question again came up; it was decided to secure a coach, but a satisfactory agreement with those approached could not be made and the matter was dropped. We believe that prior to the season of 1904, no coach has been hired by the athletic committee. In that year one was secured, and paid \$50. The team won the championship, but claimed they could have done it without any advisory assistance. On the whole, we can hardly consider it a fair trial of the plan. In the season of 1905, no one wanted a coach; this fall, as we said, we tried, and failed to get one.

We would deeply regret the introduction into the Queen's game of that spirit of professionalism and trade which has destroyed the American game as a game. We, of course, and the other members of the I.C.R.F.U., in our sports, stand for something higher and manlier than the score card and cash box. We like to win,

but like better to 'play the game.' In the game of life, we admire the man who wins high place and fame; we revere the man who attains to but little, or loses all, but who still 'plays the game.' We regard the hiring of a professional coach as an introduction of professionalism that is unwarranted and unwarrantable. We believe that such an action means no less than the entrance of the thin edge of the wedge that has dislodged American football from the realm of true sport. In the game as played in the United States, we have professionalism grown to its perfection, and we can judge by its fruit of the worth of the tree.

The professional coach is not working for the best interests of football and of sport in general. His object is to win. If his team wins, he gets the credit for it, and a substantial bonus, in addition to a salary out of all proportion to the services he renders; if the team is defeated he blames the material he had to work with. If he is to produce a winning team, he must have the men; once these are chosen, all others who wish to play football are discouraged as nuisances. If the necessary men are not available in the student ranks, what remains but to import men, and dishonor the eligibility rules? The coach only holds his position by virtue of the fact that the team wins; if the team loses, his position is gone. He is a product of the commercialism that would win at all cost. There is a very pathetic fallacy evident in the opinion of the ordinary spectator at a game, in that he believes that the coach wins or loses the game. It is the players who win; it is the players who lose. What then is the value of the professional coach?