



# The Meteor.

Edited by Members of Rugby School.

No. 25.

RUGBY, FEBRUARY 27th, 1869.

Price [With Extra  
Half-Sheet.] 6d.

AFTER the numerous suggestions which appeared in our columns last year for improving the way of awarding the Athletic Cup, we had hoped this Term to hear something more on the subject. Disappointed in this, we wish to recall some of their proposals; in the eleventh hour, certainly, but there is still a fortnight before the Athletics, and the subject is not so very complicated that it cannot be settled in that time.

All our correspondents seemed to agree on one point, namely, that the present plan of allowing all events to count alike, is wrong, and that some system of valuation ought to be resorted to, a certain number of marks being assigned to each, in proportion to its importance. We heartily second this proposal, in the belief that there would be no great difficulty in adopting it.

On a second point however,—what should count at all—a good deal of controversy took place. There were two proposals put forward. The first was that of “Aquila,” “That the Cup be obtained only for what is done on the ground during the two days of the Athletics.” But we think that few would like to see the School Steeplechase, the Racquets, and the Fives, excluded from the Cup, or even, as “Aquila” suggests, provided for by a second Cup.

The other opinion is that of “Trebla,” who would have Football and Cricket to count for the Cup, saying that they are Athletics of the highest order. This is very true, and the scheme looks well on paper; but it would, we think, be impossible to work. By means of the batting and bowling averages we certainly can decide on the

best cricketer, and award him marks towards the Cup: but how are we to settle on the best football player? The only test of merit which will give any definite result is that of running in or dropping goals; but this would utterly exclude the “forwards.” Thus we see it is quite impossible to put Football on the same level as Running and Racquets, and such being the case, it is fairer for Cricket to share its fate. Our own view is that no change is required in the number of events which award the Cup, if only their comparative value is settled.

Another proposal we must notice; it is to allow winners to win a second time, counting their victory towards the Cup, but not taking the prize. This, we think, would be beneficial; we should see our best man win, and the very clumsy and unfair expedient of counting up all a fellow has won in previous years, would be no longer needed.

The Stewards have already made several improvements in the programme, and we hope they will turn their attention to this very important question.

WHATEVER blame the unlucky remarks at the commencement of our last Number may justly incur, they have at least this merit, that they have stirred up our Correspondents from the languid condition into which, from want of a grievance, they had gradually fallen. Vials of wrath are poured on our devoted head. Our transgression has had no parallel since the rash moment when we ventured on our Double Acrostic of immortal memory. But in the depths to which we

have sunk, some gleams of hope that from this a controversy may arise, have penetrated to us. For, though one correspondent blandly assures us that we are going headlong to ruin, another thanks us warmly for having mooted the matter. "Who shall decide when Doctors disagree?" But they all seem to unite in one error: namely, that they only allude to the *Meteor* as either a simple School record, or else as a School Magazine, compounded entirely of original effusions, not dreaming, apparently, of the possibility of a combination of the two.

### RUGBY SCHOOL DEBATING SOCIETY.

The February Debates have been a decided advance upon the January ones. Whether measured by the number and brilliance of the attendance, or the vigour and spirit of the speeches, there has been a continual and marked improvement. The eagerness, indeed, with which the public have availed themselves of the free entry to the gallery has given rise to grave fears respecting the safety of that structure. For the future, we understand, each member of the Society (now further increased to 33) will be able to admit one visitor to the floor of the House, and one to the Gallery; and none will be admitted in any other way.

On Saturday, 6th February, Mr. SHIRLEY moved.—

"That the vote by ballot ought to be adopted in parliamentary elections."

The Honourable Opener dwelt with much force on the imperative necessity that voting should be free, and on the serious obstacles to that free exercise which still exist in many constituencies.

The debate was ably sustained by Mr. DAVIES, who pointed out the importance of publicity in voting;

Mr. GARRETT, who denounced the corruption and intimidation which made the Ballot desirable;

Mr. BARING and Mr. HASLAM, who cleared the way on either side by a clear and effective criticism, on arguments alleged by their respective opponents, which appeared to them invalid.

Mr. ROBERTSON also took part in the Debate, speaking strongly against the motion.

On a division, the motion was lost by a majority of four, the votes being

For the Ballot .....	11
Against.....	15

Majority against ..... 4

Among the Visitors were Miss Temple, Mrs. Moberly, Mrs. Powlett, Miss Moberly, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Warner, Mr. Potts, and Mr. Robertson.

On Saturday, 13th Feb., the Debate was opened by Mr. PEAKE, who moved:—

"That the proceedings of the Jamaica Committee against Mr. Eyre were impolitic and unreasonable."

Arguing, after a wide and careful survey of the general question of our Colonial relations, that Mr. Eyre was placed in a position of much difficulty, and deserved much consideration; and he concluded by pointing out the grave stigma which his opponents endeavoured to attach to him by the charge of murder.

Mr. GARRETT opposed, dwelling with emphasis and power on the illegality of the so-called trials, notably in the case of Mr. Gordon.

Mr. KENNEDY reminded the House that the question had been submitted to the Grand Jury, who had decided in Mr. Eyre's favour; a decision, of which the importance was canvassed by—

Mr. H. LEE-WARNER; whose arguments were in turn subjected to the searching criticism of Mr. EASTWICK.

Mr. SIDGWICK supported Mr. Garrett, and was replied to by

Mr. COTTERILL who, in an interesting speech, remarked on the number of eminent men who had supported Mr. Eyre, such as Mr. Tennyson, Mr. Carlyle, and others. Although Mr. Eyre had doubtless made mistakes, they ought not to be regarded, he contended, as crimes. In conclusion, he feared that if strong and decisive acts were thus severely censured, it might result in the suppression of masculine individuality of character, and the promotion of a dead level of mediocrity.

After the due replies, the House divided:—

For the motion.....	14
Against.....	8

Majority for Mr. Eyre ..... 6