

nature, have been raised against the election of either candidate. The opportunity was certainly offered, yet no one ventured even the slightest disparaging remark. The point raised at the subsequent meeting, viz., that Mr. Elder was a member of a secret society was not even alluded to. Why not? Surely if it were admissible to raise this objection after the election, it would have been all the more relevant before it. Looked at from this point of view it certainly has the appearance of an after-thought, concocted by a minority chafing under defeat and at their wits' ends for arguments. To return to the meeting. The Chairman then called for a division, and the resulting vote gave a large majority to Mr. Elder, after which the meeting dispersed. No comments on these facts are necessary; it must be patent to the most sceptical that such an election was from every conceivable point of view valid and binding.

Secondly, could the election of Mr. Elder, granting its validity, be annulled? This, gentlemen, is what Mr. Elder's opponents call their strong point, but which I venture to term their stumbling-block. They invoke with great circumstance the Parliamentary procedure of Canada; I do likewise. They tell us that a resolution, or question, or motion, may be rescinded or reconsidered. All this I grant, and more, for I am quite willing to waive the doubtful question of who have the power to propose reconsiderations of motions, questions, or resolutions. There is no question here whatever of motions, questions, or resolutions. Nominations and elections are not made and carried in the form of motions or resolutions, and were not so made and carried at the meeting of Nov. 10th. Consequently, the mass of evidence drawn from Todd, Bourinot, and Cushing, and adduced by Mr. Elder's opponents in support of the rescinding or reconsideration of motions, falls to the ground as entirely irrelevant.

It is purely and simply a contested election case. Now, I in my turn shall apply parliamentary procedure to the case, but more to the point I trust than the gentleman aforementioned have done. The medical students, having no constitution or by-laws framed for their use in elections and other matters, must therefore, (as I pointed out above) on parliamentary procedure. What does this procedure say? I quote from the "Controverted Elections Act of 1874," (37 Vict. Cap. 10, Sec. 63).—"All elections held after the passing of this act shall be subjected to the provisions thereof, and shall not be questioned otherwise than in accordance therewith."

Now what are the objections that may be raised against the return of a candidate? The Act states "corrupt practices" during the election. Did any such exist at Mr. Elder's election. Surely it will not be urged that an attempt to convince an individual that our candidate is preferable to another is a "corrupt practice." Otherwise one would have to admit that ninety-nine hundredths of the present commercial, municipal, and political elections are actually illegal. Again the Act does not include as a "corrupt practice" that of being a member of a secret society at the time of election, and not even a fanatical clergy has succeeded in persuading the people of Canada that such an offence is a sufficient cause of disqualification for

election. On no legal grounds then could Mr. Elder's election be annulled.

To sum up—Mr. Elder's was duly elected by a majority of students; this election was binding unless foul means had been used to secure the election; I have proved that no foul means were so made use of and consequently that Mr. Elder is at this moment just as much elected to the office of Chairman of the Annual Dinner as he was on Nov. 10th at 6 o'clock p.m. This, gentlemen, is the argument of the defence. I have stated the case as it appears to me after mature deliberation, and as dispassionately as possible, I have incriminated no one, I have not even attempted to defend a friend from virulent accusations and personal insults, but I have attempted to show that a crying injustice has been done to him in duly electing him to an honourable position and then, in defiance of the rules which govern all civilized associations, degrading him from office without even allowing him the privilege of a voluntary resignation. To others who possess greater rhetorical powers and a greater command of pathos I leave the task of expressing the scorn and contempt they feel for the doings of a certain clique who have shewn themselves ignorant not only of the most elementary forms of procedure but even of the commonest rules of courtesy and gentleman bearing.

The chief object then of this communication is not so much to bring the blush of shame to the faces of the guilty parties, nor yet to attempt the redress of a grievance which is now past all remedy, but if possible to establish a precedent which shall in future preclude the possibility of occurrence of any dispute of a similar nature, which can have no other effect than that of causing much ill-feeling where a little consideration and less haste would bring about that harmony which should exist between individuals engaged in the same pursuits and living in a manner under our roof. In conclusion, gentlemen, supported as I am by authority of undoubted reliability I have no hesitation in subscribing myself, as every correspondent should, by my own name.

HENRI A. LAFLEUR.

*Editors McGill Gazette:—*

Sirs.—Permit me to take exception to a portion of your editorial remarks in last issue headed "Mediæval Wisdom." First, as to the action of the Faculty. The rule of submitting the questions for debate to the Faculty is not a new thing, and the undergraduates were reminded of its existence in the most courteous way possible, so that upon the necessary explanations being given, the society quietly acquiesced. The Faculty have a perfect right to a direct control over the proceedings of the Undergraduates Society when they both provide the hall in which its meetings are held, and are responsible for the general conduct of its members as students. A dictatorial mandate would undoubtedly have been highly offensive to the members, but the rule has been enforced in no such manner. Second, as to the action of the society. If submitting to constituted authority be "eating humble pie" then we must admit the soft impeachment, but if the present flourishing condition of the society is due to the energetic policy pursued by the undergraduates