

surgeon's attention, as well as that of house surgeon and physician, sisters, nurses, attendants, laboratory workers, etc. When a bed is so endowed does not the philanthropist lay out his money to good advantage? The question is not why is such cheap charity so largely bought, but why is it so cheap to buy? Why can every philanthropist who thinks of building a hospital or founding a dispensary be confident that he can secure unlimited medical service free of cost?

Is it because the members of the medical profession possess a spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to the cause of suffering humanity even greater and above that of their fellow-citizens? The orators at functions of medical men and others repeatedly assert this, and no medical man ever takes it upon himself to deny it. All sit with composure and gulp the compliment. This is not enough; some more satisfactory explanation must be found. The motives which lead medical men to give their services so freely to charitable institutions are "experience, advertisement, and honor." Here is something to gain which may be set over against the injustice of medical charities being run at the expense of the medical men who work them. Thus is afforded to a small section of the profession experience, advertisement and honor—the chief cause of the cheapness of medical charity. Thus is created a small, privileged class of the profession, and it is for the profession as a whole and the public to determine how it is really for the general advantage. Anything like a ring or corner in medical experience cannot be for the common good. In the public interest arrangements should certainly be made for the privileged class freely to share their experience with their less favored brethren by securing constant co-operation between the staffs of hospitals and the practitioners engaged in private practice amongst the neighboring population.

In commercial life advertisement is ultimately paid for by the consumer. In medical life—advertisement by charitable medical practice—the first cost is borne not by the advertiser but by his less prosperous colleagues, to whose possible patients he gives free service. In this way is vicariously paid by the general practitioner large amounts for the consultant's advertisement. It is probable that in the long run the public pays the profession as a whole for the advertisement. The general public and the main body of the profession are justified in looking askance at an arrangement which is largely responsible for the flood of medical charity.

Then there is the failure of medical charity to restrict its bene-