

Queen's University Journal

Published by the Alma Mater Society of Queen's University in Twelve Fortnightly Numbers during the Academic Year.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF - - J. C. McConachie, B.A.
ASSOCIATE EDITOR - - A. M. Bothwell.
MANAGING EDITOR - - D. A. McKeracher, B.A.

DEPARTMENTS :

LADIES	- - -	} Miss K. Tesky, M.A.
ARTS	- - -	} Miss D. Cathro.
MEDICINE	- - -	W. W. Swanson.
SCIENCE	- - -	J. P. Quigley, M.A.
DIVINITY	- - -	O. M. Montgomery.
ATHLETICS	- - -	H. T. Wallace, B.A.
EXCHANGES	- - -	J. Fairlie.
		D. A. Mcgregor.
BUSINESS MANAGER	- - -	J. A. Donnell, M.A.
ASSISTANT	- - -	Dennis Jordan.
		Miss F. O'Donnell.
BUSINESS COMMITTEE	- - -	Geo. Richardson.
		Dan. MacKinnon.

Subscriptions \$1.00 per year; single copies 15c.

Communications should be addressed to the Editor or to the Business Manager, Queen's College, Kingston.

Editorials.

ALMA MATER ELECTIONS.

THE turmoil of another election has ceased. The most keenly contested struggle for Alma Mater honors that the University has witnessed in years before has been ended, leaving no very serious "bad taste" behind it. Every member is satisfied that a competent Executive has been secured for another year, and as a consequence all have accepted the result of the vote with composure. This is one of the commendable features of University elections. Students may fight hard for victory for their side but when the contest is over only the unwise treasure up any bitterness. All hatchets are immediately **buried and** all disagreeable references to the struggle are suppressed.

Many valuable lessons have been learned, however, in the election just past. The demand made for a recount of the ballots has revealed to the students the extreme looseness of the whole procedure, both at the polls and in the counting of the ballots after the

close of the polls. The discussion at the special meeting, called to deal with the question of a recount, showed how very inadequate the Constitution of the Society is to meet the requirements of our elections. The Constitution demands that "as far as possible the rules governing the election of members of Parliament shall govern this election," but does not state whether it is the Provincial or Dominion Act that is to serve as our guide. Evidently the Dominion Act is the one preferred, since that was the one referred to at the special meeting. But that same Act was deliberately disregarded in at least six sections, any one of which it is quite *possible* to comply with. The request for the recount itself was doubtless irregular, and had it not been for the high feeling that prevailed would probably have been refused until made definite and in proper form. Should the election have been voided as a result of these irregularities? Not by any means. Should the recount have been refused? We think that would have been quite unwise. Everyone is glad it was held and, moreover, everyone is glad that it did not necessitate any change in the personnel of the Executive.

Although the recount did not materially alter the results but rather proved the carefulness and correctness of the original count, yet the discussion regarding it and on the manner of conducting our elections, has clearly revealed the necessity of some very radical changes in the Constitution.

We venture here to make a few suggestions that may be worth thinking over:

(1) The Constitution should be amended to require definite instructions to be posted at the polls, to effect