

me financial aid to sustain the paper, should it be in difficulties.

Let me come now to the different complaints made by Mr. Palmer. He says an injustice was done by my having identified my associates with myself in the last article I wrote for THE GAZETTE. How could that be when they always insisted upon sharing with me the responsibility for what appeared, when they ceased to protest against the course I was taking, and when some of them even encouraged me in it? His assertion that I was the sole member of the staff, not only to hold the opinions which the past few numbers of THE GAZETTE have adopted, but even to have any sympathy with them, is not only entirely untrue, but in making it Mr. Palmer commits the very crime which he charges was perpetrated by me—that of speaking for others with whom he has had no communication. In making the further assertion "that for some time past it was seen by his assistant editors that Mr. Turner's views and their own as to the scope and object of a college journal, were widely at variance," Mr. Palmer is again indulging his peculiar talent for misrepresentation. It is indeed true that Mr. Palmer once or twice said he did not think a college paper should criticise the authorities; but I am happy to say that in this opinion he was in a minority of one, the other members of the board only differing with me as to the manner in which that criticism should be made. Had Mr. Palmer objected strongly to the policy pursued by me, and found his protest passed unheeded, the proper course for him would have been to resign his position, and so bring the matter before the shareholders. Had he wished, even at the twelfth hour, to repudiate his own share of responsibility for what has been said, it would have been more manly, as well as more honest, to have written for himself, over his own signature. Instead of pursuing either of these straightforward courses, he has attempted to shield himself behind a *nom de plume*, and has written as if he spoke for the whole board. Since his letter appeared I have been at some pains to learn its history, and have found it to be as follows: In the last article which I wrote, and which has been unfortunate in more ways than one, there occurs a sentence which has been held by one of the Medical professors to identify Mr. Palmer with the writer of a letter upon the dissecting room, which was published earlier in the session. This same professor went to the trouble of charging Mr. Palmer with the authorship of that letter and even, so I have heard, threatened him, saying the professors "would know what to do with him." Mr. Palmer, honestly enough, denied having written the letter. However, the threat I speak of, which was probably nothing but a grim joke, seems to have decided Mr. Palmer that his only hope of getting a sheep-skin next April would rest upon his success in discrediting me; and he has since worked steadily for that end. Notwithstanding the fact that he had placed his resignation in the hands of the directors (unfortunately he did not do so in writing, but through one of his friends) he, in a manner, seized upon the managing editorship. He was the willing horse—he took the "copy" to the printer, and read the "proofs." He persisted in inserting his letter in the face of the pro-

tests of the remaining editors of the old board; and then, when he had fired his bomb, he discovered that the pressure of his work necessitated the placing of his resignation once more in the hands of the directors. His action throughout was so manly that I am lost in admiration. He has developed a genius that even I had never given him credit for. His sheep-skin has been well earned.

The last of Mr. Palmer's falsehoods I have still to expose. He says the editorials in the last two numbers were published "without the knowledge of a single member of the staff." As a matter of fact, outside of the editorials in the second number, there were only two which were not seen by some one or more of the editors, before they were published, and they were unimportant. The editorial in No. 6, of which he seems to complain most, was seen by two members of the board, besides myself. They saw nothing objectionable in it, nor did I, for it contained nothing new.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words about one or two passages in the opening editorial of last number which seem to reflect upon me. In speaking to the writer of that article, I learned that nothing of that nature was intended, but that the passages were, as I suspected, infelicities merely. Had the last number of THE GAZETTE contained a report of the shareholders' annual meeting, no explanation from me would have been needed. The first unfortunate sentence is this: "At that meeting the members of the old staff were, with one exception, re-elected." In reality, the whole of the old staff, owing to a change of the constitution, were continued in office until May next. I resigned because, as I explained, I am about to leave the city and will be absent for several months. I did not think it fair that I should enjoy the credit of being editor-in-chief, while some one else did the work. Again, speaking of criticisms, the writer says: "All we ask is that these be given in a friendly manner and dictated by an honest motive." This sentence has been construed by some as an attack upon me, though I am satisfied the author did not so mean it. Still a few words in my own vindication will do no harm. What is an honest motive? In closely criticising the actions of Corporation and the Faculty, I have had nothing to gain and much to lose, for by it I have sacrificed the good will of several men, whose respect I highly esteem. From the information with which I was all along amply supplied, I knew that many members of Corporation were voting against co-education, either from prejudice, not having made any effort to study the question on its merits, or because they thought the Principal's judgment in such matters infallible. These men were so indolent, or cared so little about the matter, that they were not even reading the articles on the subject, which appeared in an evening paper. I believed that a little pithy writing, which would create some sensation, would rouse these men from their lethargy. I tried the specific and, in a way, it succeeded. It roused the sleepers to exasperation and a greater obstinacy than ever.

As to the other topics which I took up, I said nothing about them that I had not said in a milder manner last year. You say, in your last number Editors, Messrs. that experience has taught you "that little