



UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

A somewhat breezy passage between the Medical Examiners and the Rev. A. A. Cherrier, Editor-in-Chief of The Northwest Review.

The following is from the *Free Press* with some emendations and additions, and constitutes part of the report of the work done at the University Council on Dec. 6th, 1900:—

FRENCH M. D. CANDIDATES.

Dr. Chown, speaking to a question of privilege, read two articles from the *Northwest Review*, and complained that these reflected on the examiners in medicine. He brought this matter up as one of the members of the examining board in medicine, and at the request of the other members, who did not believe that the insinuations made could be justified or verified. The articles charged the medical examiners with an anti-Catholic bias, such that a candidate who was a Catholic with a French name or an Irish name was likely to be plucked. The case was mentioned of Fortunat Lachance, and it was said if he had been a Protestant and had his name been freely translated into English, "happy-go-lucky," he would have been passed. One of the examiners was reported to have said: "I'm glad I plucked that Frenchman." Above the editorials, Dr. Chown went on to say, was the name of Rev. A. A. Cherrier, editor-in-chief, who was chairman of the board of studies, and the examiners were appointed by the board of studies. Referring to the paper as edited by the chairman of the board of studies, Dr. Chown was corrected by Father Cherrier, who said: "No, not by the chairman of the board of studies, but by Rev. A. A. Cherrier."

Dr. Jones said this was the first time he had heard the article. He had not been at the meeting of the examiners referred to, so the subject was new to him. He regretted this extraordinary article, reflecting on the honor and integrity of a class of men who had done a great deal for medical education, having started the college and worked for seventeen years, some of them receiving no remuneration. He was very sorry a paper emanating from so grand a church and under its auspices, should have cast such reflections. The examination papers being numbered, an examiner could not tell who was a Frenchman if he wrote in English. Two men whose papers he had received had written in French; he got Father Guillet to translate them, and these two men had passed.

Father Cherrier, in reply, maintained that it was not as chairman of the board of studies or as a member of the university council that he should be held responsible for the articles in question. He was editor-in-chief of the *Northwest Review*, and as such he claimed liberty to admit to publication articles that might come to him. Since the question had been raised, he was prepared to say, as a member of the university, that there was circumstantial evidence to justify the article. Thus, here was a student who had been very successful in the study of classics, and a regular attendant at lectures in medicine, having seventy tickets out of seventy-two; who had been successful in partial examinations carried on during the session; yet had been plucked, not in one subject only, but in all. There was a report in circulation that a certain doctor had boasted he would pluck all French students. A student in attendance at the same time stated three months before the examination that that student would be plucked. At this very meeting of the council a report of the board of studies had been adopted, whereby standing in chemistry was granted to two candidates who had been reported by a medical examiner as having failed. The board of studies found itself in justice bound to overrule in this case the report of

the doctor, who had failed to consult with his co-examiners as to the papers in question, and who upon being pressed to produce the papers, had no other excuse to offer than to say that he had burned them. The same examiner, it was, who once rose, on a question of privilege also, in the board of studies, to defend himself, and seemingly had his point carried in his favor. Circumstances, however, have since come to light which more than confirm the former charge. The members of the faculty may perhaps tell this council why the said doctor had turned out to be a disgrace both to them and the university. There was reason for feeling uneasy. Another case was that of Dr. Dubuc. He pursued his classical studies with extraordinary success; went east, followed a medical course and came out very near the most successful of the candidates. He came here and had to pass examination, and it was three years before he got a license to practice. Years ago he (Father Cherrier) asked Dr. Jones whether it was not possible to have some one who thoroughly understood both languages on the staff of examiners. The doctor answered that he would try. But so far nothing had been done. The French students were at a great disadvantage in being unable to write in French and have their papers examined. The article was perhaps strong, but they have suffered so much, and there are cases when men stabbed in the back will be exasperated. Belonging to an imposing body worthy of the praise of the whole civilized world, they felt they had suffered of late years from many different quarters.

Dr. England held Father Cherrier as chairman of the board of studies, responsible to the university. No cloak of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde could cover him. He (Dr. England) had come into intimate connection with Fortunat Lachance, and the latter had been a poor attendant on the lectures in anatomy when his duty was to be in the dissecting room and not visiting around the streets with a doctor. Here Father Cherrier interrupted: "Why, then, did you certify his tickets of attendance?" to which Dr. England vouchsafed no reply.

Dr. Laird held that if the chairman of the board of studies had the slightest inkling of wrong work done by any examiner, and especially if he could give the name of any man who had said Frenchmen were going to be plucked, he should give the information to the council. If any member of the board of studies knew of an instance in which an examiner had been dishonest, he should state the facts, or he should not retain his position.

The chancellor said it was very unfortunate that this had occurred. He thought Father Cherrier had made a very great mistake in allowing such an article to appear in his paper. Whether he should have given information of the names of individuals depended upon the evidence. He might have suspicions only; if that was the case, still less should he have brought them through the vehicle he used before the public. He, had done a wrong and unfortunate thing in allowing such an article to appear. No doubt if Father Cherrier had inquired he would have found out that there were good reasons for the unfortunate positions of these students. Students might take a good position in one branch and be a failure in another.

Rev. Dr. Patrick thought His Grace had admirably interpreted the sentiment of all. He thought Father Cherrier had misconceived his duty. The fact that he was chairman of the board of studies gave the article weight and authority it would not otherwise have had. It was incumbent on him to raise in the council the important question that he had raised in the newspaper. He was responsible for the appointment of the examiner referred to, and he would have been within his rights in raising the question. The aspersion was on the university. The broad charge was against the medical examiners, not one merely, that no Frenchman, and especially no Roman Catholic, could get justice. They wished to exclude racial, denominational and social considerations.

He moved, in conclusion, seconded by Dr. Sparling, that the council express regret that the charge has been made.

The council then adjourned.

The members present were the Archbishop of Rupert's Land, chancellor; Dr. Laird, registrar; Rev. Dr. Bryce, Prof. Hart, Canon Coombes, Prof. Kenrick, Prof. Cochrane, Prof. Riddell, Dr. Barrett, J. C. Saul, W. A. McIntyre, Dr. Jones, Dr. Todd, Dr. Bell, Dean O'Meara, Rev. Dr. Stewart, Rev. C. B. Pitblado, Dr. Clarke, A. Cherrier, Rev. Dr. Patrick, Rev. Dr. Chown, Rev. S. Cleaver, Rev. A. Dr. Sparling, Rev. Father Drummond, Daniel McIntyre, Archdeacon Fortin, F. W. Russell, Dr. W. S. England.

THE CATHOLIC BAZAAR IN CALGARY.

A Large Sum Realized as the Result of the Week's Labors.

The spacious store in the Norman Block, which will be occupied next week by Messrs. Glanville & Robertson, has been a busy centre during the past week. As readers of the *Herald* are already aware, Messrs. Glanville & Robertson kindly placed their new and handsome premises at the disposal of the ladies of St. Mary's church, so that the bazaar in aid of the church might be located in a central position.

As a result, the bazaar has been largely patronized throughout the week, and every evening it was somewhat difficult for the unwary visitor who found himself inside, to work his passage out again, a poorer but wiser man.

Every temptation was placed before the unsuspecting visitor. A really choice assortment of fancy work hung upon the walls at the opening, and was disposed of without difficulty. Raffles without number were organized, and one might tempt fortune on any side in the hopes of winning a horse, or a cushion, a cow, or a cosy, or even a town lot. Indefatigable workers awaited the arrival of the visitor and swooped down upon him with the most brilliant offers, abandoning the pursuit only when the lone unprotected man was left with "the clothes he stood up in," as one visitor was heard to say.

The most exciting as well as the most successful feature of the bazaar was a contest between three young ladies for the right to be known as the most popular young lady, the outward and visible sign being a handsome gold watch valued at \$135 and presented by Mr. P. Burns, the well known cattle king. The ladies engaged were Miss M. Grace Cameron, chief of the C. P. R. Commercial Telegraph department; Miss Mamie Robinson, of the Elbow Park ranche; and Miss Walker, a young lady recently arrived from Medicine Hat. The lady last named was very much handicapped by the fact that she had been a resident of the city for only a few months, but in spite of this difficulty she polled quite a respectable vote. The real contest, however, lay between Miss Cameron and Miss Robinson, and each young lady had many friends who took a very deep interest in her success, and who now had an opportunity of showing that even in the matter of admiration "money talks." Every vote cost ten cents, and every available ten cents was gathered in. Mr. G. N. Toller, of the Bank of Montreal, acted as returning officer, and Mr. P. J. Nolan as his election clerk. Each candidate was represented by an agent whose duty it was to hand over to the returning officer all the money he could get hold of to buy votes for his candidate. The poll opened at 9 o'clock, when the figure stood Cameron 700, Robinson 500, Walker 200. At frequent intervals up to 10.30 the figures fluctuated. Sometimes Miss Cameron led, sometimes Miss Robinson. Between 10.30 and 11 the excitement was intense. Each party was believed to have a large sum in reserve to be rushed in at the last moment, and the question on either side was: How

much? As the hands on the returning officer's timepiece pointed to the fateful hour of 11 o'clock, there was quite as much excitement as during the counting of the votes at a Dominion election. Two minutes later the final returns were posted as follows:

Miss Cameron.. . . .	5,570
Miss Robinson.. . . .	3,536
Miss Walker.. . . .	1,371

And the friends of the successful candidates sent up a rousing cheer.

Mrs. Costello, president of the bazaar committee, made the presentation to Miss Cameron, as well as of a handsome jewelled ring to Miss Robinson, and a service of silver plate to Miss Walker.

Miss Cameron was the recipient of numerous congratulations from her many friends on her success, which was certainly well deserved. In her frequent relations with the business community of the city Miss Cameron has invariably proved herself a courteous and obliging official and many more votes could have been polled in her behalf had they been needed.

Miss Robinson, although not being a resident of the city, did splendidly, and her total was not a little of a surprise, while Miss Walker's total after a few months' residence was highly creditable. The competition incidentally meant \$1,037.15 for St. Mary's church, for which the three young ladies are alone responsible.

The proceeds of the bazaar are expected to reach a total of \$1,900.—*Calgary Herald*.

MEAN SPORTSMEN.

Gunners Who Impose Upon the Generous Occupants of Country Convents.

The hunting season is at its height in New Jersey and in New York State, and as a consequence the country convents in one way or another are suffering from invasion of their property by sportsmen, who pay no attention to the printed notices to trespassers.

A few days ago a couple of wealthy merchants on shooting bent crossed a wood lot owned by a Sisterhood in the northern part of Jersey. There they saw at the top of a tree a mass of wild honey. The sportsmen went to the convent door and told the Sister Superior that if she would lend them two axes for the purpose of hewing down the tree they would give her one-half the honey. She gave them the axes and a good dinner. Then the men went into the woods, cut down the tree, gathered seventy odd pounds of honey, threw the axes into the bushes and carried the honey to the nearest town, where they sold it for a good price. Not an ounce of the honey went to the Sisters.

At another convent in New York State, near the New Jersey line, a number of huntsmen went into the woodland of a Sisterhood, though trespass notices were posted all about, and shot a great many birds and rabbits. Then they went to the convent and asked for dinner, which was served to them, in accordance with a rule of the Sisters to give food to all who came along, as there is not a hotel for miles around. Well-bred persons who accept the hospitality of the Sisters always put something in the poor-box, as the Sisters make no charge for meals. These huntsmen put nothing in the poor-box, and after resting themselves drove away to the nearest town and sold most of the day's beggings for thirty odd dollars.—*Catholic Standard and Times*.

PROTESTANT TRIBUTE TO THE CONFESSIONAL.

(From the *Christian at Work*.)

There is no question that the confessional as a means for relief to a sin-burdened soul has its advantage. It must be a great relief to one bearing the burden of some peculiar sin, to be able to go into a closet, and there, through a small screen door, whisper into the ear of the faithful priest the story of the sin, and ask what he shall do. To be sure, there is the feeling in Protestantism, "Go and tell Jesus." But even here perplexity and doubt sweep over the soul as the questions arise: What must I do? What reparation must I make? The tempter assails me irresistibly at times; what shall I, what can I do? The agonized cry often comes up from the troubled soul that seeks relief, but in vain. We thus throw out the subject for the consideration of those having interest in the matter. Of course, many may say, "Go and tell the minister." But often the minister is the very last one to whom one would confide the distressing secret. So far as the Roman confessional is concerned, it is inseparable from the dogma of priestly absolution with which it is connected. But it would undoubtedly be a great source of comfort at times if some sin-burdened one could find some judicious friend who could serve him in this critical time of spiritual depression and conflict.

IS THIS TOO RADICAL?

A reader, noting the following passage in a recent issue, asks whether it is not stating the case too strongly:

"The son of the man who says, 'I don't read a Catholic paper,' will say, 'I don't go to church.'"

In the middle ages this statement would not be true; nor would it, perhaps, apply to the conditions existing in a Catholic country. But, here, in the conditions of society which surround us, it has its force:

The young people of the family will read something—perhaps the dailies, perhaps the weekly story paper, perhaps some "sporting paper." Their reading, then, is *without Catholic influence*, without anything to suggest interest in Catholic progress or to cultivate a Catholic spirit; on the contrary, the influence furnished by their reading, may be such as to withdraw them, or even antagonize them against the spirit of the Church. Then, add to this the influence of their non-Catholic associates.

In the first place, the Catholic family that is without Catholic reading, is apt to be a *very worldly-minded family*—quite milk and water in its religious views.

The influence of such "a Catholic home" is hardly calculated to stand for much as against the influences of outside society and association. And these are so multiplex (when we come to consider them), that every available influence and circumstance which makes for the Christianity of the home, are hardly enough.—*Catholic Citizen*.