

acknowledged association, i.e., that THE ALARM CLOCK was designed, in the first instance, for student consumption, that its editorial board is composed wholly of students, and that the contributors are entirely University people, either undergraduates or members of the staff, - are not, to my mind, sufficient justification for what you are asking. It surely cannot be maintained that any group of students may join in the issue of a publication and claim the right to use whatever prestige association with the University has to offer.

You advance another reason, - that THE ALARM CLOCK is the organ of "the McGill Labour Club". This seems to me to be slightly at variance with the sentence in your first editorial, reading as follows:- "Neither is it officially linked to any campus organization, though the editors are all members of the McGill Labour Club." You will doubtless be surprised to hear that, as far as I am aware, the Labour Club (it is not properly called the McGill Labour Club - see the Students' Handbook) has never applied for, nor has it been granted official recognition by the University or the right to use the word "McGill". The question has not been raised, because I have never wanted to do anything that could be interpreted as evidence of a lack of sympathy with labour and its problems. I have looked upon McGill University as an institution in whose moral integrity, intellectual sympathy and honest, unbiassed judgment, all classes, parties, races and creeds have complete confidence. McGill has no party affiliation. It is above party, and seeks to retain the respect of all parties.

In your first issue, you state that you are adherents, on the political side, of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, which is a political organization definitely acknowledged as such. I think I am justified in believing that one of the reasons why THE ALARM CLOCK has been produced is that it may further the interest of that political party. There can be no objection whatever to such support. What my own political views are does not matter, and, as I have said, the University, as such, can have no political views. But it undeniably follows it is unfair to the University that association with a political paper should leave in the minds of the public the impression or conclusion that the University supports or encourages the support of that particular party. That the public would form such conclusions I have no doubt, in the light of past experience. You will note that only yesterday a member of the House of Commons, in discussing the political party you support, linked the name of a certain professor with McGill, whereas that professor is not on the staff of McGill, was not engaged by McGill, and is not paid by McGill.

As I told you on Monday, I believe that what you will write will be regarded - possibly in many quarters - as worthy of quotation, and someone is sure to rise on some