

monly to have come from the pen of Chancellor Canfield himself. That article I recommend for perusal and study to everyone who is interested in University athletics, and without further parley I herald the fact that I am ready to champion that article in every respect saving one, and that is the idea expressed in the last article, numbered 16, which I do not necessarily favor at this juncture.

How Chancellor Canfield ever conceived of these ideas I do not know, for I do not think that he has had a large amount of experience in athletics, but they are there in print as his suggestions. I strongly suspect that the Chancellor, while we thought he was not paying any particular attention to these matters, has been studying them, and has been looking into the methods in vogue in other institutions. I strongly suspect that his suggestions are not entirely original with him. They are too perfect to be original with anybody, and I say that Chancellor Canfield's ideas are essentially the same as those adopted at the University of Michigan.

Before I get to discussing the merits of this proposed scheme I want to dispose of one matter, which I apprehend will be the feature meeting the most opposition at the hands of those who will not think favorably of these ideas, and that is the proposed interference of the faculty in athletics.

At Nebraska, as far as I know, the students have never been interfered with at all in their athletic arrangements by the faculty, and that seems strange, for in most institutions it is quite the reverse. At Nebraska, if the manager of a team wants to take a trip to Denver, for instance, he would not think of asking permission of the faculty, even if the trip was to be made on school days. He takes it that permission is granted as a matter of course, and that all that is required of a student is to pass his examinations.

Now, because the faculty has been lenient in the past is no reason why they may not take the reins in their own hands in the

future, as they have an unquestioned right to do. I do not sanction a course of action in which we go ahead blindly in a matter and then have to look askance to see if there is a nod of approval from the faculty, and in which, on the other hand, we are compelled to renounce our contract and plead that it was *ultra vires*, if it chances to meet with their disapproval. Such dealings bring upon us the well-deserved contempt of other colleges. What we want is to have our faculty helpful and enthusiastic in athletics. We want them in our counsels; we need their advice and co-operation, and it is my experience that if faculty and students work together, half of the troubles that ordinarily beset an athletic management are dispensed with.

Some of the pleasantest recollections of my college course at Ann Arbor are those that arise at the thought of our athletic meetings, when we talked and discussed matters of the greatest interest to the University with certain members of the faculty. It was then we learned that the interests of faculty and student are almost always identical, and in no instance, even after the hottest debates, was the voting done upon what in politics are called party lines.

Our past experience at Nebraska in athletic management can be of little service to us. It can only show what must be shunned and avoided. I pronounce it a sad commentary upon our intelligence that we should have a board of five members select the players on a team. That is democracy, forsooth. Whoever originated that scheme, in the language of Mr. Nye, must have had a prognathous jaw and the low, retreating forehead of the pickerel. I do not believe that there is another college in the United States where the captain does not have the sole power of selecting the team. As for myself, I believe in delegating power to a man and looking to him for the responsibility, and when that is done the captain is more likely to be the best man for his position than under the present system. If the captain has this great power he has its