

UNIVERSITY GAZETTE

Vol. X.]

MCGILL COLLEGE, MONTREAL, DECEMBER 1st, 1886.

[No. 4.

University Gazette.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

JEFFREY H. BURLAND, B. Ap. Sc., F.C.S., *President*.
 EDWARD P. WILLIAMS, Med. '87, *Vice-President*.
 J. F. MACKIE, B.A., B.C.L., *Sec.-Treas.*
 CHS. W. HOARE, Med. '88.
 W. A. CAMEON, Arts '87.
 A. DRUMMOND, Science '88.
 R. B. HENDERSON, Arts '87.

EDITORS.

RALEIGH J. ELLIOT, B.C.L., *Editor-in-Chief*.
 J. RALPH MURRAY, B.A., B.C.L.
 ARTHUR WEBB, B. Ap. Sc.
 ALFRED P. MURRAY, Arts '87.
 W. A. CARLYLE, Science '87.
 HENRY FRY, Law '88.
 JOHN H. BELL, B.A., Med. '88.
 C. L. WHEELER, B.A., Med. '89.

The UNIVERSITY GAZETTE will be published fortnightly during the College Session.

Rejected communications will not be returned, to which rule no exception can be made. The name of the writer must always accompany a communication.

All communications may be addressed to the Editors, P. O. Box 1290.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
EDITORIALS	45-47
POETRY	47, 51
CONTRIBUTIONS	47-50
MCGILL NEWS	51
SOCIETIES	51-52
SPORTING	53-54
PERSONALS	54
BETWEEN THE LECTURES	54-55
COLLEGE WORLD	55
CORRESPONDENCE	56-58

NOTICE !

Subscribers who have not yet paid in their subscriptions for the current year, will please do so as soon as possible.

All moneys and communications with reference to the address of papers sent by post, should be directed to Mr. Mackie, Sec.-Treas. to the Board of Directors, Box 1290.

Editorials.

ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE FELLOWS.

We publish in this issue a letter from Mr. Wilfrid Skaife, B. Ap. Sc., professing to be a reply to our article upon this subject in our issue of November 5th. The subject is a very important one. It is unfortunate that Mr. Skaife did not see fit to treat his subject in a little more serious style: his criticisms are unfair. We endeavoured to treat the subject in a candid and unbiassed spirit; this letter does not meet us in the same spirit, and if it pretends to give the views of those who differ from us in this matter, it is evident that they recognize the truth that the less the question is understood the stronger will their position become. However, we invite our readers to examine carefully Mr. Skaife's letter, and convince themselves to what straits our opponents are put in their endeavour to carry through a measure so little called for and so very objectionable as is this one. Mr. Skaife's letter abounds in inaccuracies. He writes,—“The first statement which I have to challenge is the writer's assumption that the Science men might, on account of their fewness in number, be more likely to consider their own good than that of the University in general.” Now the writer of that article assumed nothing of the kind. We do not believe that Science men are any more likely than Arts men, or Law men, or Medical men on account of their fewness in number, to look more towards furthering the interests of their own faculty than those of the University at large. But we do believe that they are just as likely as other men. Now let us explain “by what series of mental gymnastics we arrive at this remarkable conclusion,” merely promising that if our friend Mr. Skaife had trusted more to his reasoning powers, and less to his ability for conjecture, he might perhaps have been more successful in following our argument. The more diverse the interests of the constituency to which a candidate appeals for suffrage the more difficult is it for one man or any set of men to impose their individual projects and schemes upon the electorate. The very fact of there being among the electorate many very different views and opinions upon the matters to be regulated by the man of their choice, will have the effect of selecting a man of broad views, a man thoroughly representative. Now, the smaller the