

tion extended to the Defence Association to appoint a committee for conference with one nominated by the Council for the purpose of harmonizing views diametrically opposed.

As is known, the meeting occurred in September last; and, after considerable discussion, the Association's committee was requested to formulate its grievances. This was done, and the memorandum is here reproduced, together with the reply, as it appeared in the next issue of the press:

"Dr. McLaughlin then set forth the demands of the Defence Association, which were as follows:—

"1. That Section 41 A be repealed.

"2. That the matter of annual fees be held in abeyance until the medical profession are properly represented in the Council.

"3. That the teaching bodies, viz., the universities of Queen's, Toronto, Trinity and the Western University, have one representative each, and the profession seventeen."

The Legislative Committee met immediately afterwards, and agreed to the following propositions, which virtually leave the Defence Association the masters of the situation:—

"1. We consent to 41 A remaining in abeyance until after the next election, and the electorate pronounce upon it.

"2. We do not consent to suspend Section 27 (the levying clause), but will still rely on the honour of the profession to pay the fee.

"3. We will favour adding five additional territorial representatives.

"4. We will not object to institutions which neither teach nor grant degrees being deprived of representation.

"5. We are in favour of protested elections being referred to the senior county judge in the division in which the election took place."

Unfortunately for the good name of the profession the overtures of the Council were not accepted; and we think we were credibly informed that the only impediment consisted in the fact that, while almost every request was granted, it was only on condition that the honour of the profession might be relied on for the payment of the paltry two dollars a year. We cannot imagine why the Defence Committee declined a settlement on this basis unless it was actuated by motives which

cannot harmonize with a conciliatory spirit; it was evidently determined to take all or nothing, and accordingly has gone on in battle array. Hence the circular over the names of Drs. Sangster, Armour, Hillier and Coburn; and we take it as the crystallized argument and supreme appeal for the support of the profession. Coarse reproach and innuendo will carry conviction to no fair-minded man; and we dismiss the vocabulary employed in the drafting of the circular with the suggestion that it would have been improved in decency had a few superlatives in Anglo-Saxon been eliminated to make room for more moderate phraseology. Verily, if the language is warranted by facts indisputable, the Council must be a sink of corruption, and nothing short of annihilation of the Medical Act would adequately purge its iniquity.

Dr. Sangster and his coadjutors claim that the Council is not representative in character, and present a host of reasons which we shall endeavour to deal with in detail: That the ten school representatives (eight only attend council meetings) have as their constituents a handful of but forty or fifty, comprising the medical faculties, is a statement utterly without foundation. We will take a solitary example, that of the University of Toronto. Would any sane person for a moment assume that the gentlemen who are senators of that or any other Canadian university, would so belittle the dignity they possess as to obey the mandates of their servants, the Medical Faculty, and sink their right of judgment in the appointment of a representative? We think not. As a matter of fact, before the present incumbent received his credentials there were no less than three nominees for the position, and the medical members of the Senate were pretty well divided in the voting. We take it for granted that the Senate of each of the other universities professes to understand its own business, and makes all appointments on its own responsibility.

Note the contrast: Dr. Sangster says that forty or fifty members of medical faculties elect ten representatives. Our position is this: Every graduate has a voice in the Constitution of the Senate (few practitioners in Ontario are not graduates of one or the other university); the Senate makes the appointment and is responsible to its