

In the first place the organization of the editorial board could be improved. The present method of election by classes has proved itself a poor one. When the *FREE LANCE* was first published it was very different from the present *LANCE*. Its contents then consisted of editorials, news and jokes, with few or no literary articles such as essays, stories and verse. The election by classes was then a good method, since each class could then express itself in the editorials as it had a right, and each class would also be sure to elect the right men, i. e. those who did and would have the most to say about class and student rights and privileges.

But the magazine has essentially changed both in form and character. Literature now forms the principle feature, news takes a second place and editorials a third, while jokes have been relegated to the *La Vie*. This is as it should be. But although the magazine and the consequent requirements in the editor have changed, yet the old system of election still remains.

Now what does any class as a whole know of the literary ability of its particular members? Very little as compared with what the instructors in English know. These are the only competent judges of the best literary men in the class. It would then seem that a far better method of organizing the *LANCE* board would be to make selection to it competitive—some test being given to determine capability—supervised by a committee consisting, say, of members of the faculty and the existing board of editors. Some such competitive system of selecting the board is used by nearly all college literary magazines, and its efficiency is proved by their quality. Positions upon the staff would then become honors as they ought to be.

There would then be an incentive for students to write for the magazine. And to make the incentive still greater encouragement should be given them. Let the English department give credit on the required work for all articles