

for a great many years been giving special instructions in dermatology. The committee have not considered the great value of these services, and in their report give no place for the teaching of dermatology. Should Dr. Graham continue to give such instruction in future, he must do it without recognition and without pay. There is another strange feature about Dr. Graham's case that applies also to some other members of the staff, and it is this, that his work is largely clinical. Now, by the report of this famous committee, it takes two hours of clinical work to equal one hour of didactic work. It would appear from this that Drs. Primrose, J. M. McCallum and John Caven who are amongst the young men on the staff, get as much for one hour's work as Dr. J. E. Graham does for two hours' work, while he has been connected with medical education for about twenty years. Judging by the report of the Committee on Medical Faculty, one might say of it, as Dan O'Connell said of Lord Brougham, "If he had only known a little about theology, he would have known something about everything."

6. Dr. A. H. Wright has been treated in a rather strange manner. The students who have passed through the school during the past twelve years will all remember how energetic and devoted he was to his duties as secretary. In spite of all this, however, he has lost his secretaryship, except a mere nominal part of it. Now, who has got his duties? They have been divided up between Drs. John Caven and A. Primrose.

7. In the cases of The Dean, Dr. W. T. Aikins, Drs. L. McFarlane, J. H. Richardson, and U. Ogden, it could be shown that they have been reduced in pay to the level of the junior members of the staff, and that, if they should give any clinics, they must put in two hours to be equal to one hour of even a junior member of the staff, who stands behind the desk and "talks."

8. Drs. O. Avison and H. Wilberforce Aikins have been treated with rank injustice. They were on the staff prior to either Drs. J. M. McCallum or A. Primrose, and yet they are accorded only lectureships good for three years only. They receive a low scale of pay also. In the case of Dr. J. M. McCallum, who had only been on the staff some two years, \$15 a lecture are paid, while in the cases of Drs. Avison and Wilberforce Aikins, only \$5 a

lecture are paid. Could anything smack more of favouritism?

9. The report is badly balanced in some other respects. On surgery and surgical subjects there are Drs. W. T. Aikins, I. H. Cameron, L. McFarlane, G. A. Peters, R. A. Reeve, G. R. McDonagh, G. H. Burnham and U. Ogden, involving an outlay of over \$4,000. On medicine there are only Drs. J. E. Graham, A. McPhedran and W. P. Caven, with an outlay of \$1,850. Surely any man who has been but one year in practice has learned that the number of medical cases far exceeds the number of surgical cases in any community!

10. It might further be noted that on the staff there are three specialists on the eye, ear, throat and nose. But no place has been found for dermatology, neurology, or orthopædics. A little more medicine, and less theology and law in the committee might possibly have caused the scales to assume a position more nearly the horizontal of just weights and measures.

11. While Drs. O. Avison, Wilberforce Aikins, W. P. Caven and B. Spencer, are called lecturers and receive the magnificent fee of \$5 a lecture, Drs. Cameron, Peters, McPhedran, J. Caven and A. Primrose are called professors, and receive \$15 a lecture. This looks very much like a case of "friends at court." As Dr. J. Caven has to give time, over and above mere lectures, it must be admitted that compared with others he is still underpaid. It may be mentioned for the benefit of medical men generally that there was an attempt in certain circles to have Dr. L. McFarlane dropped off the staff, but, fortunately, the effort failed, and brought to certain, overly ambitious persons "naught but grief and pain, for promised joys." It is well known that no other medical man did more to promote the organization of the Medical Faculty, and then to make it a success. He was to be rewarded, however, with time "to muse in solitude over his good works."

12. But the case of Dr. J. H. Richardson may astonish medical men most. It is well known to all that Dr. Richardson has lectured on anatomy for about thirty years. As an anatomist he can safely be said to be one of the finest living. Further, all who ever heard him, can recall the zeal and energy which he ever threw into his work. Yet