

As the Medical Act stands now, however, they can still go on, even after that, trying me as often as they choose without giving any decision, and leaving me each time to pay my own costs. Under such circumstances one is afraid to go to much expense in defending himself, and I think the Act should be amended in that respect, and also so as to render the council liable to an action for libel when they print defamatory statements about any doctor that they cannot bring reasonable evidence to support.

(DR.) A. CRICHTON, B.A.

Castleton, August 10.

THE MEDICAL COUNCIL.

To the Editor of the *Globe*:—Without in any way defending Dr. Crichton's advertising exploit, this might be an opportune time to review briefly the attitude of the Medical Council toward the medical profession, not only at the present time, but also in the years gone by. It is curious, too, that all the members of the Council in private life are excellent gentlemen and an ornament to society, but immediately organized into a council, they drift into evil ways. In the trial of Dr. Crichton, for instance, the Council has made some clumsy movements. They tried the doctor at Cobourg, where they acted as judge, jury and prosecutor. One party tells us that the doctor was tried for "infamous and disgraceful conduct in a professional sense," but the President of the Council on the seventh instant, in a letter to the *Globe*, said they tried the doctor for fraud. Now, fraud is defined to be deceit, treachery, artifice, and this implies design on the part of the actor, and it will keep all the Council busy enough to prove whether the doctor is acting from design or delusion, or from full confidence in his cures. Then, the President, with full steam on, makes a header for the Medical Act. He informs us that the Council never had the power to discipline a doctor for breach of medical etiquette, but section 33 of the Medical Act states distinctly that the Council has power to do so.

Again, there is a general impression among men of judicial training that the Council is not competent to try a fellow-practitioner on any charge, because that traditional rivalry among all men of the same craft has touched the medical profession in an acute form. A juror must be unprejudiced and impartial, and the lack of these qualities in the Council would, in a court of justice, cause them to be requested to stand aside. But the Council in Dr. Crichton's case, without waiting to prove intentional fraud, and without waiting to see if utter failure would snuff out the delusion, put on the black cap. In taking