

some amendments which should be made in the constitution, amendments which would remove any feeling of dissatisfaction and prevent any likelihood of friction arising because of any decision made in connection with any of these forensic contests. In these suggestions, no reflection is intended to be cast upon the decision made in the recent contest by the worthy and learned gentlemen who acted as judges on that occasion. The aim is simply to present some changes which might possibly be an improvement upon the present methods. In the first place each of the three universities represented in the Union should nominate a judge to act on each debate, and the judge selected by the non-competing university should be the chairman of the three appointed, and consequently should give the decision arrived at by his colleagues and himself. Such an amendment could be easily carried into operation by each university empowering its representatives on the Executive of the Union to make all such nominations necessary for each collegiate year, and such an amendment would be an absolute guarantee of fairness because each college directly engaged in any contest would have its interests safeguarded by its own nominee, and because the final decision in case of a difference would be with a strictly impartial judge. A second amendment, which should be made is that the presiding judge shall in declaring his award sum up the arguments actually adduced, and give the reasons for the decision. In this way both sides will see the relative worth of their respective arguments and the justice of the judge's decision. In the recent debate, according to the report of the *Kingston Whig* this was not done. Moreover the representatives of our university are, strange to say, given all the marks in oratory, and the Queen's debaters all the marks for argument; that is to say the former's

argument was worth nothing, and the latter had no power of oratory, a peculiar anomaly in debating. Again the debate was largely decided on an argument introduced in the reply of the leader of affirmative, namely, "that the negative had not suggested anything to take the place of trusts." Now apart from the legitimacy of introducing new arguments in the address given by the affirmative we may ask if it is the necessary business of the negative to propound a constructive line of argument which may take the place of the affirmative position which they seek to overthrow. The very essence of the terms affirmative and negative shows that the primary and necessary task of one is to build up, and the other to tear down. With the affirmative the constructive element is obligatory and the destructive optional, and with the negative either method can be used. Accordingly, in the debate on Trusts it was the *duty* of the affirmative to show by a constructive argument that trusts were in the best interests of society, and it was the duty of the negative to overthrow their opponents' structure of argument by one of *three optional* methods. They either could use the *purely negative* methods of showing trusts *were not* in the *best interests of society*, or they could propound a system, if such did not already exist, to replace trusts, or they could combine the *negative* and *constructive* methods. Hence the above quoted argument of the leader of the affirmative should not have had any weight with the judges because it is based on a wrong conception of what the negative side has to do to establish its case. We hope these changes will commend themselves to our representatives on the Executive of the Inter-University Debating Union, and that they will seek to have them embodied in the constitution of the Union.]

The Letters of John Harriman jr., to Mrs. Price Mansington.

This being the second of a series of letters from the above, who has just returned from doing the continent, to one whom he met by the way.

THE CARLTON,
New York, Jan. 10th, 1902.

My Dear Mrs. Mansington,

I have always flattered myself that I am a pretty good judge of human nature, so when on my return I wrote you, expected to hear from you sooner or later. Perhaps you wonder how it is we got along so well together over there in that bustling English metropolis. It is just like this: Women are without doubt an uncertain quantity; they either bore you or else make you feel that you are smoking the best tobacco. The first class I invariably cut out, but the second deserves a further classification, and in that you know just where you are at. A man doesn't like to fill in a dance speculating on the dress, theatre and book problem. He wants to have a jolly "give and take" chat, which may incline to the *risque*, and herein comes the weeding out process. Some of those women don't know how to take you, and as a result help themselves to a large amount of rope, becoming familiar, and you do likewise. Others enjoy the jollying, and will prove as good heads as men who smoke the best, and see that their friends appreciate the tin from which it comes. In other words, in the first case

you don't know when it is time to go away back and sit down where you can kick yourself for wasting the dance, and in the second case you realize the moment and incidentally how much you have enjoyed yourself. But that is only by way of remark.

As for that old *bon mot* of yours about being a widow, I have heard it before. The pater you know always warned me when I was at college and since to beware of widows. That if one makes up her mind to have him he might as well climb up an orange tree and pull it up after him. Of course in your case I would suggest that we climb up together and let me look after the tree. There we can see what effect the law of gravity will have upon it. I guess that ought to hold you for a while.

In referring to my visit at Paris you say "In gay Patee. Let me draw a veil anent your wiles in that fair city. Had I been your parents I would have had a qualm or two until I had you safely back into the fold, especially with such a — disposition as yours (missing word competition)." Well I don't know I am sure. The more you travel the more ready you are to acknowledge that the world is a pretty small world after all—and incidentally so are some of the people. I suppose there were occasions