

Queen's University Journal

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

N. M. LECKIE, - - - Editor.
J. J. HARPELL, - - - Business Manager.

L. W. Jones, W. E. Playfair, P. W. Wilgar,
G. F. Weatherhead, W. C. Brown, A. Redmond,
G. B. McLennan, T. H. Billings, Miss H. Smirle,
Miss L. Vaux, Miss M. Redden.

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

Communications should be addressed to the Editor or to the Business Manager, Box 141, Kingston Post Office.

Editorials.

AN article which was published recently in the *Varsity* with regard to the affairs of the Inter-University Debating Union has been read carefully here by those who are interested in this Union, and the JOURNAL has been asked to take up its parable and offer some comments upon the matter. The article in question first quotes the Kingston *Whig's* report of the recent Varsity-Queen's debate, and then proceeds to make the following statements:

1. That no reflection must be cast upon the decision made by the judges in the recent contest.

2. That a new method of appointing judges should be introduced; each of the three Universities naming one, the representative of the neutral College occupying the position of chairman of the board of judges.

3. That in stating the decision of the judges the chairman should sum up the arguments adduced and the reasons for the decision.

4. That the method employed by the judges in the last debate, by which Queen's was given seventy-five per cent for arguments and Varsity twenty-five per cent for style, was a

peculiar anomaly, since it implied that Queen's had no style and Varsity no arguments.

5. The remainder of the article is concerned with some details of the recent debate, the writer claiming that the debate was largely decided on an argument introduced in the reply made by the leader of the Queen's side, namely, that the negative had not suggested anything to take the place of Trusts. This argument, it is asserted, should not have had any weight with the judges, because it is based on a wrong conception of what the negative has to do in order to establish its case.

Of these five opinions the first is the only one which we can unhesitatingly endorse. In all contests, whether of muscle or wit, in which judges are appointed beforehand, and especially in such circumstances as the present, the word of the judges should be absolutely final and decisive. Neither in public nor in private is it graceful for the contestants to challenge the judgment which has been passed upon their efforts. It is a little strange, however, that after such a dignified statement the writer in the *Varsity* forgets the maxim which he has set forth, and in his fourth and fifth opinions openly questions the wisdom of the gentlemen whose judgment was to have been accepted without question. We must thus deprecate most emphatically the last two opinions of this writer. The method of awarding marks to the opposing sides was simply a device used by the judges to represent roughly the weight of the addresses given, and is capable of no such mechanical interpretation as that put upon it by our contemporary. The concrete numbers were employed