Communications.

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for opinions expressed by Correspondents.

Underclass Baseball v. Track Work.

At the Freshman Class Meeting, March 21, was read a communication from Major Briggs of the Advisory Council to President Pritchett deploring the fact that a Freshman baseball team is to be put in the field. Major Briggs makes the following points: Men will be drawn from the regular track work; the team cannot properly represent the Institute against 'Varsity teams; and, third, the series of games is unimportant, culminating in a single Sophomore game.

Apart from the fact that abandonment of the game of baseball would be a great disappointment to the Freshmen, and that they are now practically committed to it by Class action, the question is so serious that it deserves fair consideration.

That, in a class of five hundred there are not enough baseball men besides the track men to make it unnecessary for the latter to enter the team, seems, at least, somewhat doubtful. As to training, they will get more than if on a track team, so that the danger from this point is reduced to the withdrawal of two or three men, at most, from track work.

It is, of course, obvious that a class team has no right to represent Tech against 'Varsity teams. The Freshman games with colleges are understood to be Class games, so that fear on this point should be removed.

As to the third point, can any form of athletics which assumes the proportions of the baseball arrangements of the Freshman and Sophomore teams be called unimportant? The three Sophomore games are regarded by the Freshman with nearly the feeling that football on Field Day inspires. The healthy spirit of rivalry between the two classes has been so small this year that anything conducive to it and tending to raise Class spirit is surely worth encouraging.

The question reduces, then, to one which will soon have to be settled by the Council. Shall other athletics interfere with track work? This, as we have said, is a serious question, for, since track work is now the most important followed, the subordination of other athletics seems inevitable. How soon shall it come?

1906.

Mechanical Engineering Society.

The annual meeting of the Society was held Tuesday evening at the Union. After the reading of the minutes the treasurer made his report for the past year. His accounts show a balance of over fifty dollars. Officers for the ensuing year were next elected. The results of the election are as follows: President, E. O. Hiller, '04; vice-president, R. O. Ingram, '04; secretary, A. M. Holcombe, '04; treasurer, W. A. Evans, '04; executive committee, E. O. Hiller, R. O. Ingram, W. A. Evans, C. C. Easterbrooks, A. W. Burnham, P. M. Arnold; program committee, Professor Miller, Mr. J. C. Riley, J. F. Ancona, E. W. Charles, W. L. Cronin, E. P. Tripp and E. Harrah.

After the election of officers Mr. Vosbury, '04, brought up the question of a pin for the Society. After some discussion concerning pins and shingles, Mr. Rott, '03, moved that a committee be appointed to investigate the shingle question. This was passed, and the committee consisting of J. T. Cheney, '03, W. C. Rott, '03, and E. O. Hiller, '04, appointed.

Mr. Holton C. Spaulding, '87, then gave a talk concerning the development of electric driving and uses of electricity. Mr. Spaulding is a fluent talker, and introduced a number of stories pertinent to his lecture that were very much appreciated.