

PLAGIARISM IN MAGAZINE ARTICLES.

Is a magazine or any department of the Press acting fairly when it reproduces an article from another publication and gives only the name of the writer—leaving its readers to infer that the article is an original contribution to its own pages? This question has been suggested by the reproduction in the FRUIT MAGAZINE of JUNE of the article on "The Spirit of Canada," which appeared in the April number of the WESTMINSTER HALL MAGAZINE.

Though the subject matter was in the main delivered in a public address, that article was got by special arrangement between the Managing Editor of this Magazine and the writer, Mr. B. Vincent Wardle. Our opinion is that apart from any question of copyright, any newspaper or magazine shows only reasonable and due courtesy to another publication in such a case when it acknowledges the source by at least giving the name of the magazine or paper from which the article is taken.

We do not interpret the FRUIT MAGAZINE'S omission as any deliberate slight, and we believe indeed that proof may be readily given that "others do it"; but we think it right to record that in our opinion the acknowledgment suggested is only professional courtesy, and that the omission is not excused by any evidence that other publications so copy articles without acknowledgment.

Incidentally, of course, such acknowledgment is also evidence, if not proof, that any production so acknowledging articles is not in the habit of merely clipping its contributions from other publications, but does ordinarily seek to secure original articles on its own account.

A CLEAN CITY.

This Magazine would be failing in its duty if it did not record that its sympathies are not only with those who seek "a city beautiful," but with those who are striving for a city clean morally.

Our representative was present at that now historic "Deputation Meeting," and, in common with others, could not but be much impressed by what passed. It is to be admitted by the independent mind that there was some danger of some members of the deputation or those supporting it becoming somewhat impatient in word and manner towards the mayor and commissioners; but whether or not that impatience was justified can be fairly judged only by those having a thorough acquaintance with what passed and what was promised by the authorities prior to that meeting, and by a careful examination of the attitude taken at the meeting by the mayor and commissioners.

Obviously the commissioners' danger lay—or lies—in the temptation common to humanity that "dressed in a little brief authority" they should set themselves to interpret and administer the law according to their personal choice and discretion, instead of according to the clear and unqualified letter and code laid down by the country's law-makers.

It is astonishing how many apologists may be found for those who would tolerate vice; but the reason is not far to seek. Men, consciously or unconsciously, think to heighten their own standard of morality by being ready to allow, or speak tolerantly of, a lower standard in others. The temptation is subtle, too, for it has an appearance of charity associated with it.

On the other hand, the basis of tol-