

place the Rev. Father Teefy has been unanimously chosen by both parties as the President of the Literary Society for the coming year. We need scarcely say that we heartily congratulate the members of the Society on the wisdom of their choice, and considering our present successful and hopeful condition we augur for Father Teefy and the Society in general a most profitable and enjoyable year. Again, from present appearances both parties seem animated by a healthful and good-natured rivalry, so that, whilst the contest for the minor offices will certainly be a keen one, all will soon forget their party difference and look back with pleasure and satisfaction on the events that necessarily cluster around an election. Another feature of the present election is that by which those only who take an active interest in the Society to the extent of attending four meetings during the year, will be allowed to exercise their franchise. This we deem a wise and long-needed change in our constitution, since no man should be allowed to have a voice in the selection of the undergraduate officers unless he knows something of the Society itself and the candidates for office. This change will ensure less excitement and more order than has hitherto been the case on election-night.

One more feature claims special attention, viz., that both caucuses have almost unanimously decided to dispense with intoxicating drink in their respective refreshment booths. This certainly speaks well for our College and shows that the principles of temperance are gaining a firm footing in our midst.

Whatever may be said against parties and party contests, no one will deny that they are productive of immense good, especially to University students. Elections draw together men who have never met before around the College, and foster an enthusiasm which cannot fail to produce good results. Let each party then spare no pains to secure the election of their respective candidates, and whilst so doing let only the fairest and most honorable means be employed to gain the day, because the history of parties in general teaches us that a pure and honest policy is the strongest possible means to permanent success.

Editorial Notes.

This number of the 'VARSITY contains three letters on the Modern Language Department, based on our editorial of last week. Two of the writers are much agitated over the personalities which it is claimed the article contains, and one of them expresses his disapproval by indulging in personalities much stronger than those which had been charged on us. Now, for a moment, waiving all questions of the correctness or incorrectness of our statement, it must be allowed that personal questions can only be discussed in a personal manner, *e. g.*, lectures are delivered by lecturers, and the efficiency of the one cannot be called in question without canvassing the merits of the other. The personality which the 'VARSITY has always endeavoured to repress is a very different matter. Gratuitous disrespect for those in authority, sneers unsupported by facts and malicious allusions, we have censured and intend to censure. But the 'VARSITY will never hesitate to make any attack or bestow any criticism when and where attack or criticism seem necessary, and whether they may fall on *curricula*, lectures or men. For the subject matter of these letters, all agree that changes in the Department are urgently required, but differ as to the manner in which this should be effected. 'Grad' pleads for Anglo-Saxon. His plea seems valid as far as the absolute importance of the subject, though whether, relatively considered, it has claims to stand before Italian and Spanish, is another question. Mr. MacMechan insists that examinations and not education are the end and object of the training afforded in a university. It is, of course, unnecessary to say how diametrically different to his are our views on this question, as also they are to the opinions expressed further on, that we should read *about*, rather than peruse an author's own words. All our correspondents agree, then, that change is necessary, that somewhere in the

mechanism of the Department a screw is loose, and this acknowledgment shows an amply sufficient excuse for the remarks in our last issue. Further, let us have more open criticism of the Department and its work. If this is satisfactory in every particular, criticism will be easily repelled; if not, respect for institutions will hardly be a valid excuse for withholding it.

Since going to press we have received another communication bearing on the Modern Language question. The ideas of E. J. differ materially from those elsewhere commented on, in that he deems the system little short of perfection, and finds it impossible to criticize save in a few unimportant points. As to the objects with which the course was founded, and the kind of reading which should be pursued to gain them, we venture still to hold the views expressed in our article. E. J. is very persistent in his assertions that we have been entirely misinformed in our facts; it is our earnest hope, for the sake of the College, that he is correct.

Mr. Sykes, in his communication, goes a long way towards making clear the difference which has been debated of late on the possibility of applying the term 'didactic' to poetry. The discussion turns mainly on the vagueness with which the terms 'poetry' and 'didactic' are used. That poetry of the highest kind may convey moral truths cannot, of course, be for a moment doubted, and to prove this we need not go beyond American poetry, but have only to turn to the pages of Whittier, whose noblest efforts had slavery for their text, and its abolition for their avowed object. If the word 'didactic' be taken in its commoner sense—that which has teaching for its only end, to which end all else is sacrificed, it is, on the other hand, clear that imagination, and with it poetry, must vanish. The difficulty, therefore, seems to us a purely verbal one, and rests on nothing more than a looseness of application of words.

It is questionable whether such an important matter as the report of the House Committee should have been brought up at such a large and enthusiastic meeting as that of last Friday. In the uproar only those within a few feet of the secretary could hear what he said, or the names of the papers to be voted on; nothing was commoner than to hear questions to one's nearest neighbor as to the name and nature of the periodical. The voting under such circumstances could hardly be called intelligent. Some odd things happened in consequence. The Boston *Literary World*, which is devoted to exactly what the 'VARSITY has been advocating, the reviewing of current literature, was rejected. The coarsely got-up and vilely-coloured *Judge* was retained, while *Puck*, who, whatever may be said of his morals or politics, can at least draw and colour decently, was voted down. The putting on of the *War-Cry* was a joke, of course, but this was carried too far when sporting papers and *Frank Leslie's* were chosen instead of *Our Continent* or the *Saturday* for the reading-room of a University. This is a serious reflection on the good taste of the undergraduates, and makes one ask, Should the greatest ignorance of the greatest number decide such questions? But apart from this it is a matter of dollars and cents. Notwithstanding the statement by a member of the House Committee that the bill for periodicals was much in advance of former years, large additions were made to the present list; one example, *Truth*, the London society paper, which costs ten dollars per annum, and out of which all possible interest has vanished by the time it reaches Canada. It will be quite in order to reconsider the report, and perhaps it would be as well for the Society to do so before they are called upon to pay the bill.

University News.

MODERN LANGUAGE CLUB.

A French meeting was held in Moss Hall last Tuesday evening, with the Vice-President, Mr. Sykes, in the chair. Essays were read by Messrs. Rowan and Shearer. The former gentleman