

Gazette,  
March 11, 1933.

## GRADUATES MAY BE STRUCK FROM ROLL

Case of Those Who Discredit  
University May Be Con-  
sidered at McGill

### RECENT EXAMPLE CITED

Sir Arthur Currie Makes  
Suggestion — Banned  
Periodical Believed  
to Be Involved

The question of whether university graduates who act in such a way as to bring discredit upon their Alma Mater should not have their names removed from the roll of the university was touched upon by Sir Arthur Currie, principal of McGill, in replying to the toast to the University proposed at the annual medical undergraduate dinner in the Mount Royal Hotel last night. In bringing up the subject, he said that he had a recent McGill case in mind.

"It is recognized that a professional man should be an honest man, that he has a duty to the people among whom he lives and works and that he has an obligation to the university from which he graduates," Sir Arthur said. "In commerce, for instance, every graduate makes the following declaration: 'I promise and solemnly declare that I shall with my best endeavor be careful to maintain the interests of this university and that to the best of my ability I will promote its honor and dignity.'

"Some similar declaration is taken by all graduates. They swear to do everything in their power to maintain the honor and dignity of their university and at no time to act in any way that will bring discredit upon it. I am sorry to have to admit that such obligations are not at all times religiously observed, for we have had graduates, and I ought to add the word 'recently,' who have been false to these ideals. Whether their names should remain on the roll of the university is something for serious consideration."

Although Sir Arthur made no mention of the "recent" case he had in mind, many of those present guessed that it was in reference to the publication of a magazine called "The Black Sheep," published under a McGill name and banned by the university. Several graduates are believed to have been connected with this publication, which was considered at a special meeting of the committee on morals and discipline at the university.

McGill officials may yet take further action in regard to this magazine.

Star, March 1933.

### FOULING THEIR OWN NEST

CONSIDERABLE unpleasantness has been stirred up by the publication of a scurrilous paper by an irresponsible group of students and ex-students of McGill University. The paper in question has been roundly condemned by the McGill Daily, the official students' organ of the University, which recently said: "It goes beyond the bounds of good sense and common decency to descend into the mire of filth and mockery." If blasphemy, slander, and the lascivious and pornographic fill that bill, then the indictment is well taken. The parents of many students have complained to the Governors of the University, and they in turn have drawn the attention of the Principal, Sir Arthur Currie, to the matter. Sir Arthur has done what he can by banning the paper from the purlieu of the University, but further action by him is difficult in view of the fact that the editor is no longer at McGill. There is ample ground for the police to step in, however, on the grounds of indecency. Police action would rapidly put an end to this stupid and offensive publication, which but serves to reveal the depravity of those who compile it, and which cannot but do the University harm in the eyes of those who do not know the facts. That it represents any but the most insignificant and undesirable vestige of the student body is of course unthinkable.