

that a good man who has determined to obtain a college education will succeed in doing so no matter what may be the difficulties he has to overcome. This is no doubt true. But why increase the difficulties of a financial character. In the interests of a large percentage of those, then, who have entered upon a medical course, we feel that it would not be wise to increase the length of the session from six to eight months.

There is another consideration which induces us to believe that the Council acted wisely in this matter. We freely admit that in a matter which affects the educational status of the profession, the Council may or even ought to disregard public opinion. In such a case the Council ought to lead public opinion, and not be led by it. In the matter of lengthening the session but not increasing the time spent in actual professional studies, the Council was wise in going slowly. It is well known that there exists in the minds of a good many of our citizens, a feeling that the Medical Profession is now or is endeavouring to become a close corporation. This belief has found expression in the public press, and in the attempts made to so modify the Medical Act as to practically remove from the profession the power to regulate medical studies and the license to practise. Had the Council decided to adopt the eight months session and thus have made it more difficult for those in financially poor circumstances to pursue their studies and obtain the license, those who are already disaffected towards the Council and the profession generally, would at once have raised the old cry of the rich *versus* the poor. They would have said that such legislation was intended to keep out of the profession poor men and to preserve this field of labour for the rich. We are confident that the supporters of the proposed change in the duration of the College Session had no thought of making ours a rich man's profession; but why run the risk of stirring up such a feeling, or why give even the semblance of the colour of truth to such a charge, unless there is to be gained some great advantage to the profession and the public by the proposed change? The present course requires the student to spend thirty-two months at College during five years; the proposed course would require him to be at College thirty-two months in four years. Which course will make the better practitioner? It is for the advocates of the change to show that by their plan the student will be better prepared for his life's work than by the present arrangement. Till this is clearly demonstrated we will feel that the Council in this matter has acted wisely.