

THE VARSITY

A Weekly Journal of Literature, University Thought and Events.

Vol. XI.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, MARCH 22, 1892.

No. 21.

Editorial Comments.



THE time has come for us to vacate the editorial chair and give place to another. To say that we are sorry is expressing our feelings very mildly, and does not adequately convey our regrets in giving up a position which has yielded us so much pleasure.

Whether or not we have given general satisfaction is a question we are unable to answer; still if we have done so in any small degree we feel satisfied and are fully compensated for our labors on behalf of our subscribers. We have done our best, be it small or great, to make THE VARSITY interesting and not allow it to fall below the high standard which it occupied before we officially took hold of the quill. We leave our readers to judge the degree of success which has attended our efforts on your behalf. We have had our trials and vicissitudes, our successes and failures, but this is the lot of editors in general, and by no means peculiar to us.

We must thank our many contributors for their great assistance in making THE VARSITY interesting to our numerous readers; our advertisers for their promptness in responding to our solicitations; our readers for their leniency in dealing with any indiscretion on our part; and the student-body at large for their enthusiastic support.

It yields us the greatest pleasure to leave the paper in such good hands for the coming year. Mr. Hellems, the newly appointed editor-in-chief, has been our right-hand man throughout the year, and under his control we prophesy a brilliant career for VARSITY during the next academic year.

The assistants who have been selected are, in our opinion, the very best obtainable, as each has contributed largely towards making the journal a success during our term of office. Mr. Anderson will make a good successor to Mr. Odell, who has brought the finances of THE VARSITY to such a happy termination.

The new new Directorate and Editorial staff are composed of good men; consequently, with the hearty support of the student-body, we may expect great things in the future. Among the names of the sub-editors will be found prominent that of Mr. R. S. Strath, whose sound and unerring judgment has been our greatest safeguard in the past, and we may predict a more than ordinary successful era in the history of VARSITY as the result of the happy coalition of his abilities with those of Mr. Hellems. Mr. D. M. Duncan will make a worthy successor to Mr. R. E. Hooper as Sporting Editor. The valuable services of Mr. S. J. Robertson will be continued next year, and Mr. S. J. McLean will be a worthy successor to Mr. Hellems as the chief editor's right-hand man.

The elections are over. Let us now in our calmer moments view the contest from an unprejudiced standpoint and note the lessons to be learned therefrom.

Firstly, the services of the "brute force" committee should be dispensed with for ever, as its usefulness, if it ever had any, is gone. We do not say this because we happen to belong to the vanquished party, but because we have seen the evils resulting from the existence of such a body.

We heard it said by a prominent member of the victorious party that their unusual success was due to the excellent service rendered by their "dynamics corps." Whether he was right in thus attributing their success to such a cause we will not venture to express an opinion, but we do say that, according to our view, their large majorities were due, in a great measure, to this cause. The successful candidates would not have defeated their opponents so badly had the voters been allowed to freely express their desires at the polls.

The leader of the successful "brute force" contingent asserted in our hearing that it had been his intention to block the door in such a way that after all his followers had voted, none other should enter, and thus close the poll before the vanquished party had time to record their votes. This may seem unjust on the face of it, but since there was no tacit understanding between the two parties respecting this, and such a custom was adhered to in former years, thus establishing a precedent, no blame can be attached to him for his actions.

The question is, should such a thing be allowed? Should "brute force" render null and void the voice of a large section of the University electorate? Besides this, how are the finances of the Literary Society affected by such proceedings? We venture to assert that the Society is at least \$75 the poorer on account of the actions of this corps, because a great many left the polls without voting and others paired off, the Society being the loser in both cases.

Is this desirable? The object of having an election is, according to some, the filling of the "iron boxes" of the Literary Society. Such a laudable object is not attained on account of the *valuable* services rendered by this "moral suasion" detachment. Why not have two doors of entry—one through which the pugilists may enter and another for the more peaceable citizens?

Another evil. The marking of ballots by scrutineers should be dispensed with. (Now, mark you, both sides did this.) Each voter should be compelled to go into a room by himself, mark his ballot, fold it up and put it in the box himself. If either scrutineer wish to pay the fees of a voter, let him do so, but do not allow him to interfere in any way with the voter's privileges. This delightful uncertainty as to how the voter marked his ballot would discourage these unchristian proceedings and this venerated sort of bribery. Our worthy Chancellor, Hon. Edward Blake, in his speech at Convocation last fall regretted very much that the Literary Society should resort to such means to fill its treasury.

In order that there may be no offence given, we have not allowed the name of either party to appear in this issue of VARSITY. We heard no grumbling about our last issue which appeared in the heat of the fight, and hope that this issue may have the same fate.