

have lately shown how excellently they can carry out this custom in a satisfactory and creditable manner, while the students in Arts and Science have also just put upon record for this session their adherence to the long-established institution. As befitting a young Faculty, still comparatively small in numerical strength, Science may be regarded as a unit upon the subject, and its dinner was therefore successful. But Arts has had its annual problem to face—the difficulty of inducing the attendance of a sufficient number of theological students to ensure the performance of the usual preliminary devotional exercises at the dinner. Some from constitutional disability to be sociable, some from conscientious scruples, some from praise-worthy economy, and some for no reason at all, have always declined to participate in the mirth and enjoyment of their fellows, and their ranks are yearly growing larger, until the near future may see a minority of the Arts students holding a Faculty dinner.

This year the ambitious and admirable arrangement of securing the presence of the patrons and professors of the University is justification for believing that the dinner was conducted in a proper manner, and therefore worthy the support of every undergraduate possessing a little public spirit, and the sum of two dollars. Those undergraduates who held aloof from the beginning of the enterprise, through lack of these two requisites may fairly be left in their self-imposed obscurity, and even the eye of the public censor should

No farther seek their merits to disclose
Or draw their frailties from their dread abode.

But what shall we say of those who lent the sunshine of their countenances to the meetings held to discuss the project, who descended upon the propriety of admitting graduates to a share of the good cheer (the condescension to be duly paid for at ruling rates) who assisted in appointing an efficient committee of management, who perhaps allowed their names to go down on the programme of toasts, and who then—stayed away?

WORTHY OF IMITATION.

Brief mention was made in the final issue of the GAZETTE last session to a modest presentation made by the graduating class in Arts of 1885 to the College. This was a sum of money voluntarily subscribed as evidence of the goodwill of the members of that class towards their University. It was resolved to present the money to the Library, where in the shape of books or in any form decided upon, it would remain a last-

ing and practical testimony to the generosity and good sense of the class of '85. We understand that the money which was subscribed when the class was breaking up, (thus delaying the collection,) is now ready for presentation to the Library.

It is not the amount of this gift, insignificant beside the splendid donations made to the College in endowment funds and buildings, which entitle it to any extended notice. It is the spirit which prompts such offerings that we heartily commend. If McGill could draw upon the spontaneous service of her graduates in this way, no matter how small might be the extent individually of their pecuniary assistance, the college could tread more rapidly the path of progress, and effect reforms now impossible through lack of funds.

We hope sincerely that the innovation made by the Class of '85 will be continued by future classes until it becomes an approved custom. We shall chronicle with pleasure a similar movement by the class of '86.

Let the graduates do their share in aiding their University. And then when they have done something to prove that their asseverations of affection are really sincere, they may justly inquire into the motives of others who prate about being "the friends of the University" but who are found to be as ingenuously as they are mean-spirited, whenever a subscription is mentioned.

LECTURESHIP IN ENGLISH LITERATURE AND LOGIC.

We congratulate the University upon the appointment of Mr. F. A. L. Lafleur to the Lectureship of English Literature and Logic. Mr. Lafleur, who has for some time past been engaged in teaching at the Collegiate Institute, Ottawa, is a man of great ability, and large experience. His course in McGill was a distinguished one. He graduated with first-class honours in English Literature and obtained the Shakespeare gold medal. We welcome Mr. Lafleur as a Canadian, as a scholar and as a graduate of our own Alma Mater, and we feel certain that in his new position he will do honour to himself and to McGill.

But while recognizing the excellence of this appointment, as far as the person appointed is concerned, and while believing the appointment of one of our own graduates to be one great step in the right direction, still we must say that we do not like the system of appointing professors at present in vogue. In the present instance we have had a good appointment in spite of the system, but the system is none the less bad. We do not say that in this particular case any man as fit to be appointed would have applied even if the appointment had been made publicly and com-