

Prof. McLeod thereupon immediately produced a letter from the Registrar, countersigned by his clerk, certifying that the accusation made against him was unfounded.

Mr. Murray then made a full and complete apology for the publication of the article in question, and promised to give an equal publicity to the apology to that which had been given to the article, in the UNIVERSITY GAZETTE. He wished to state, however, that the publication of the article had been in good faith.

The meeting then adjourned.

Correspondence.

Editors of the McGill Gazette:—

GENTLEMEN.—Pray permit me to announce that I have retired from the contest for the position of Representative Fellow in Law.

When I was first requested to stand, I was assured that Mr. John S. Hall did not desire re-election. Although I have no reason to doubt that this assurance was given in good faith, I find that on the contrary Mr. Hall is seeking re-election, and in view of my very friendly relations with Mr. Hall, and as no one seems to have any grounds of objection to him, I have concluded not to oppose him and beg, therefore, to withdraw my name.

At the same time, permit me to offer my acknowledgments of the very generous support accorded me.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant.

R. D. MCGIBBON.

95 Union Avenue.

March 9th, 1886.

PRESENTATION TO THE UNIVERSITY CLUB.

Editors McGill Gazette:—

DEAR SIRS.—I have received from Mr. Dugald J. MacMurchy, of University College, Toronto, a handsome picture of the splendid buildings of that renowned College, accompanied by a note requesting me to forward the picture to the University Club, and to express his best wishes for the future success of our Club. This I have done, and it affords me much pleasure to chronicle the kindness and good taste with which a member of our sister University has shown the interest he takes in our new social organisation. Mr. MacMurchy, it will be remembered, represented Toronto University at the recent Arts dinner, and the favorable impression then created by the frankness and cordiality of his greetings to McGill men, will be increased by this substantial token of regard to McGill and McGill's new club.

Yours truly,

A. H. U. COLQUHOUN.

MONTREAL, March 10th, 1886.

Editors University Gazette:—

In your last issue you publish a letter by "Vox", which we refused. We do not feel called upon at any time to give reasons why we reject articles, not

even to the party whose writings are refused publication in our columns. But the tone of a "Vox's" effusion, and the heading which you gave it in the GAZETTE, might lead the public to believe that we were afraid to publish the article in the *Preshylerian College Journal* articles which professed to be 'hard on' theological seminaries. Well, we are not. We profess to edit a thoroughly independent college paper. This, of course, does not necessarily imply that we feel it our bounden duty to show how independent we are by attacking our College calendar and professor regularly. It only means that we are ready to publish that which we consider to be truthful and honest, be that favorable or unfavorable to our College.

But now for the reasons why we refused a "Vox's" contribution. We rejected it, because we have a supreme contempt for plagiarism and for plagiarists. If we had published "Vox's" article without stating that it was cribbed almost bodily from Huxley's "Lay Sermons," (pp. 31-60) we were afraid that he might think that we really considered him capable of writing such an article. We thought, also, that he might be led to suppose we did not know that it was in reality Prof. Huxley's.

We are ashamed to think that a graduate of McGill, however little credit he was to her as a student, should be guilty of endeavoring to pull off on the world, as his own, that which is another man's. Had he been possessed of even an ordinary degree of shrewdness, he might have suspected why we rejected his article. We are especially indignant as this is the second time that unacknowledged second-hand articles have been sent in to us for publication. We want it to be the last; and we feel confident that the editors of the MCGILL GAZETTE, do not want to be insulted with such compilations any more than we do. We are always suspicious of first-rate articles when sent in by third or fourth-rate men, and we do not think we are likely to be trapped by them.

What sort of opinion will honorable students and graduates entertain for such men as "Vox," when, the most contemptible plagiarists themselves, enable even to vary the expressions of the writers from whom they 'crib,' they yet set themselves up to discuss what is, and what is not, good teaching; and what should, and what should not, be taught in a college curriculum.

"Vox" uses some good phrases; but the trouble is, Prof. Huxley used them first. The following are a few of them: "One is tempted to think of Falstaff's bill and the half-penny worth of brad to all that quantity of sack." That is Huxley's *verbatim*. I wonder whether "Vox" ever read the fable about the jackdaw picking up the peacock's feathers and adorning himself with them. If not, he ought to.

One sees large traces of Huxley's composition, also, in the big talk about "the broad laws of morality," and "the application of those laws to the difficult problems which result from the complex conditions of modern civilization." So, also, in "the philosophic calm and meditative stillness," where "philosophy does not strive" and "meditation bears no fruit." In fact, these expressions are *borrowed* from Mr. Huxley.

But we must not trespass on your valuable space