

the left was occupied by counsel and professors; while in front of and above all these were the seats reserved for the students and visitors in general.

Tuesday morning, April 8, the commission began its labors. The proceedings were of a very formal nature. The instructions having been read, some discussion took place as to the mode of procedure, and the commission then adjourned until Wednesday, when the charges laid by Mr. Tucker were taken up. These charges, forming part of the historical statement of facts leading up to the friction, were twofold: (1) "That it was beyond the power of the University Council in law to suspend Mr. Tucker;" (2) "that if the power existed it had been unwisely and unfairly used against him." Mr. Tucker was called to the witness stand, and underwent a rigid examination of one and one-half day's duration. To Mr. Riddell he related the circumstances of his resumption of the editorship of THE VARSITY, and of his subsequent suspension from lectures. Following Mr. Riddell, Mr. Blake conducted a very searching cross-examination, taking up from their beginning the VARSITY articles complained of. Mr. Tucker when questioned as to the views expressed in these articles did not for a moment hesitate to give the explanations required or declare his readiness to stand by them. Evasion and quibbling are accomplishments in which he is completely deficient. Mr. Scott also indulged his proclivities for cross-examination, seeming to manifest a strong affection for minute particulars, precise words, phrases, sentences and intonations, and a lively interest in the exact hour and moment when a certain event transpired. He may possibly, as the investigation proceeded, have become aware of his mistake in expecting the students to have memories more retentive and acute than those of the faculty. After a re-examination by Mr. Riddell, in which was brought out very emphatically the feeling on the part of the students of distrust of President Loudon, Mr. Tucker was allowed to go, and Mr. T. H. Greenwood, President of the Political Science Club, took his place in the witness box.

He detailed the difficulties arising out of the programme of the Political Science Club, including the misunderstanding with Professor Mavor over the insertion of the names of Messrs. Jury and Thompson; the printing and distribution of the programmes containing their names; the rejection by the council of the draft programme and its return with the names erased; and the letter dealing with the whole matter finally written by the Secretary of the Political Science Club and forwarded to the council, which Mr. Blake designated "an abominable piece of impertinence." Questioned as to the reason for boycotting lectures, both Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Tucker said that the boycott was inaugurated as a protest against the action of the Government in dismissing Professor Dale. We think, however, that many regarded it as a protest against the refusal of the Government to grant a commission until specific charges were made by the students; and that the dismissal of Professor Dale was only the immediate cause of its being put into operation. Mr. Greenwood also deposed as to the feeling prevalent among the students of a lack of confidence in the President, attributing this feeling to alleged discrepancies in statements made by the President on two or three occasions. The witness repudiated the accusation that he was an agitator; and endeavored to disabuse the council's minds of the notion that he was present in Chicago two years ago during the great American railroad-union strike.

The next witness was Professor Dale who was dismissed by the Government for writing and publishing the letter, so severely criticising some recent appointments, especially that of Professor Wrong, which appeared in the Globe of February 9th. Mr. Dale's position was certainly rather an extraordinary one—that of making charges against his colleagues and the Chancellor through the public press.

It would be unreasonable to hold that because a man is in the service of the Government he must be silent concerning any grievance from which he considers himself suffering; but surely he should avail himself of the proper channels for making his grievance known. It is but justice to the Professor of History to say that the charges made against him by Mr. Dale were proved to be entirely without foundation. Hon. Mr. Harcourt,—the minister that Mr. Dale said had told him that Mr. Blake had interposed on behalf of his son-in-law, Professor Wrong—when placed in the witness box, stated under oath that Mr. Blake had never "approached" the Government nor interfered in any way to advance Mr. Wrong; and that he had refused to discuss the appointment to the Professorship of History. Mr. Harcourt further said that in conversation with Mr. Dale some weeks before the publication of the latter's letter he had sought to clear his mind of the idea that the Chancellor had interfered. While regretting the loss sustained by the University of one of the most efficient members of its staff, and one who enjoyed the esteem of the student body, we cannot, nor could not, from the first see how his action could have resulted otherwise than in his dismissal.

Messrs. R. F. McWilliams, G. M. Standing and J. G. Merrick, officers of the Political Science Club, corroborated Mr. Greenwood's evidence concerning the programme. They also declared that the feeling against President Loudon was spontaneous, and was not instigated by a mere fraction of the students, headed by Messrs. Tucker and Greenwood.

Mr. J. L. Murray, secretary of the Literary and Scientific Society, substantiated the contention of the Political Science Club that it alone had been required to submit its programme for the approval of the Council, by saying that neither the Literary and Scientific Society nor several other societies to which he belonged had ever been required to submit their programmes.

Mr. Edward Gillis, business-manager of THE VARSITY, gave evidence bearing on the shed, VARSITY and gymnasium matters. He knew of students who had been fined for being implicated in pulling down the shed, though they had had nothing to do with the affair. He declared his want of confidence in the President, and cited as his reason therefor the latter's action in regard to THE VARSITY office. The Athletic Association, he said, thought they were entitled to have control of the Students' Union Building, as the students had contributed \$9,000 or \$10,000 to its construction; and the Literary and Scientific Society (the only other student organization that could be a claimant) had waived its claims and expressed its willingness to have the control of the building vested in the Athletic Association. This latter statement was supported by Mr. O. E. Culbert, vice-president of the Literary and Scientific Society. After twelve or fifteen other witnesses had been called to corroborate various parts of the evidence already given, Mr. Riddell declared the case for the students closed; and Mr. Scott opened the defence by calling Professor Pike.

Interrogated by Mr. Scott, the professor dilated at some length on the question of discipline, expressing himself in favour of a very rigorous code of rules. Just how such a code would tend to develop the character of the student by allowing him to exercise discretion was not made very apparent. Surely a university should do more—or at least provide the opportunity of doing more—than develop the merely intellectual and furnish book-learning in bulk. Up to 1891, Dr. Pike thought hustling was "a harmless and boyish freak"; but since then his opinion had undergone a change, owing to the proportions the custom had attained. He would substitute for the comparatively mild hydropathic treatment the more drastic ones in vogue in English and American universities, or, perhaps, that adopted in Germany, of commitment