

half time at a salary of two hundred and fifty dollars. In Feb., 1899, it was decided to pay the general secretary one hundred dollars for September and October, and such time as he could give to the work throughout the year in addition. This paragraph of changes closes with the action of the association on Jan. 24, 1901, when the following recommendation from the executive committee was adopted: "That a general secretary be employed from Sept. 1st till April 1st at a salary of four hundred dollars.

This sketch would hardly be complete without some mention of the missionary work undertaken by the Association. On Feb. 16, 1888, it approved a resolution of the Missionary Committee that it was desirable that a missionary be sent out and sustained by University College. This resulted in very prompt action, for in October of the same year Mr. J. S. Gale, B.A., left for Korea. In December, 1891, Mr. Gale became convinced that his work could be made more effective if carried on under a stronger organization. For this reason he resigned his position as representative of the University College Mission. In March, 1892, the Arts Y.M.C.A. united with the Medical Y.M.C.A. to form a Canadian Colleges' Mission. With this Mission University College Y.M.C.A. is still connected. For a number of years its funds were used in the support of Dr. Hardie in Korea, but now its interests centre around Calcutta, India, where J. Campbell White is the representative.

THE DEBATING QUESTION.

The prodigious influence of debating talent upon humanity at large is one of the foremost reasons why this part of a liberal education should not be neglected nor minimized. The undergraduates of Toronto, thanks to the efforts of a few, in recent years have done much towards bringing into prominence this rare and enviable acquirement of debating talent, and we believe many have been benefitted thereby. The question, though, is: Have as many been educated to as great a degree as is desirable? It is in this endeavor for excellence in speaking and in discussion that we see several weaknesses in the method and procedure that perhaps might be remedied for the advantage of those who are coming our way, and even, forsooth, to keep apace with the progress in rival halls.

The importance of the subject is beyond question. A cursory survey of the social world leads us to ask if there is any other accomplishment for which there is so constant a demand in the Church, in the Legislature, at the Bar of Justice, in the *Lecture Room* or among the commonality of our rising, and we believe, world-leading populace? Or one which will produce equally such intellectual development of the people and raise its possessor to such a degree of power? We trow not. For it is quite evident to all that the mere latent talent of a human individual is useless so long as that power is uncommunicated. No progress was made in science until thinking man, seeing "the apple fall," applied the hidden force to the satisfaction of his wants. So also energy may be stored in fertile brains and powerful physique "to waste its sweetness" because of the lack of expression. Then, since any contribution to humanity, economically, physically, or morally, must be through some avenue of expression, we see the preponderating importance of an apt and fluent conversation. Every year that passes has its quota of those graduates who have ascended the mountain and have received a transfiguration in silent rapture but who are foredoomed to certain failure because they have not acquired the art of expression. Men with only a smattering of their knowledge and of inferior mental calibre easily surpass them in the race.

Hobbes defined a republic as an aristocracy of orators,

interrupted at times by the monarchy of a single orator. And it can not be argued with justice that skill in oratory and debate is identical with intellectual shallowness. It has often seemed that this approbrium has been attached to many, and in many cases perhaps rightly so, but the case in point is entirely different. We are here to learn letters, and it is as the accompaniment of such that I argue this necessity. And then can no one in sincerity remark of us, *vox et preterea nihil*.

How are we to attain this? A solution is sought for. But a few suggestions are perhaps not out of place. Apart from "election talk" and an occasional departmental discussion which are most useful, the average University man, and particularly the general course man finds little room for platform education during his four years' residence here. In the first place I think there should be a capable elocutionist on the staff of the University whose services would be included in the present fee system, and under whom compulsory instruction in voice culture and posture should be necessary during a part of the term.

Secondly, our debating clubs and unions could be equipped more efficiently. In other universities we find a struggle for position on debating teams, and a keen rivalry for distinction in debate. The result is by no means discouraging. We do not mean to tend towards "professionalism here," but to better and expand our own system. We note with pleasure the step taken by one of the lower years at present, and we predict personal, if not year, benefits therefrom.

As it stands at present the debates fall heavily upon the fourth year, and that also without previous training to any great extent. Election to the honored position is rather a chance game also, and even sometimes a "plum for service to the state." If a man has not been a stump speaker, a distinct teacher in whom is no guile, or a presumptuous and ubiquitous talker, he stands little chance of securing much forensic culture here.

Just a word as to judging of the debates, if I am not walking on forbidden ground. While we instance no debate as being wrongly placed, yet the weakness of present procedure is so evident that some other and restricted system ought to be adopted. We would proceed more on the lines of judicial arbitrations. In the Inter-University debates this would be feasible with a little extra expense, but in the Inter-College debates here it would certainly be workable. Again, circumstances are such, at times, that the number of judges has to be curtailed, a fault that should have a constitutional remedy. Judges might also have a graduated scale for judging, in which a recognized number of points for each part of an oration could be well understood and easily rated. The questions of "offset" and "counter" arguments, delivery, English, reply and oratory, would fall into proper rewards. In giving the debate decision I would require a summary of the salient points of the debate, together with reasons or precedent for awarding decision. This would be a two-fold advantage. It would satisfy the listeners and educate the speakers and intending speakers. The case of a debate resolving itself into a drawing-room event would end.

The subjects are generally of educational value and the training in study of them is very advantageous; and any impetus a university curriculum could give along this line would meet with the hearty approval, I venture to say, of the public. We look to a time when the means of speech, that great organ of social elevation which has yet done little for man except in its ministrations to the business of daily necessities, will rival books and be one of the media of intellectual progress as well as the ornament of conviviality.

F. MACKENZIE CHAPMAN, '01.