

and Dispensaries, for all classes of sick poor, where the Physicians unite with the lay managers in giving them all the attention and attendance they require.

Unfortunately, in spite of such well directed organization, occasional sad cases of privation, and even death occur; but in referring to them we cannot see why medical men should be held up to obloquy as a class of inhuman monsters, having no regard for the sufferings of humanity. In this case, for instance, why were not architects, builders, merchants, coal dealers, grocers, butchers, and milkmen called in to supply a suitable abode, clothing, fuel, and food? Such a procedure, apparently, was not thought of: only medical men were asked "to lend their aid."

We have no intention at the present time to claim any special credit for Physicians, but we must protest against such charges of inhumanity, on the part of the public press. We would like to see the members of our Profession fully possessed of the greatest of Christian virtues, charity; but all successful Physicians are heavily laden with work: they are morally and legally bound to do the best they can for their paying patients, and in carrying out such contracts, it is simply impossible for them to answer every call at their doors. There is probably not a doctor in this city who does not do charitable work in connection with some of the Hospitals, Homes, Dispensaries, or in private practice.

The public should understand that they have no greater claims on the time of Medical Practitioners than they have on other classes of society; and on behalf of the latter we trust we may promise that they will always co-operate with others in preventing, as far as possible, such inexpressibly sad occurrences as the one recently chronicled.

Dr. Hughlings Jackson, in a recent address, says that too much specialism in teaching tends to produce prigs rather than practitioners.

TRINITY AND THE KINGSTON SCHOOL "TROUBLES."

Again we have a letter from Trinity, purporting to be an answer to an editorial in our February number, which we publish in this issue. This letter denies nothing contained in the article referred to, though it proclaims "falsehood," "falsehood," apparently with the hope of fastening a part of this *falsehood* on our shoulders. In answer to this we may say that the bare statement of facts therein contained was absolutely correct in every particular. We stated that a certain report about fees was current in Kingston, and an extract from a student's letter now published in Trinity's letter admits this fact. Supposing this report to be incorrect, still Trinity was getting the benefit of it, and the letter of the Kingston Dean, also published in this issue, shows that the Trinity Dean though afforded every opportunity refused to repudiate it. We showed in addition that Trinity was determined to ignore the right of the Kingston Faculty, to say whether its own students deserved certificates of attendance for the first half of the session, as evidenced by an offer to give certificates on *student's own declaration*. Under the circumstances the report about the offer concerning fees is a secondary consideration, and so much letter-writing about this "falsehood" is quite superfluous, while such evasion of the main points at issue is about as creditable as the original act of attempting to destroy a sister institution.

The true inwardness of the procedure is plainly visible in a sentence occurring in one of the *friendly* letters sent by the Trinity Dean to his *dear* Brother Dean of Kingston: "Of course if any of the young men go the length of leaving they may as well come west as go east." "East" of course means McGill, and Trinity appeared anxious to outbid what might prove a formidable rival in Montreal; this it accomplished with the utmost ease. The authorities of McGill at once declined to grant to