

straints and amenities of reputable journalism—gray-beards, in touch with public sentiment, who know the professional pulse too well to attempt to substitute personal detraction for argument, or literary high-tumbling for sober discussion. Now may I, without thought of offence, suggest the advisability of your accepting the assistance of these men in the present conjuncture, and, for the next few months, placing the preparation of your editorials exclusively in their hands. Possibly you have already taken steps in this direction and the “four new men put on” are of the kind required. If so, let us see the cunning of their handiwork in your next issue. It would be a mistake to take umbrage at my suggestion, for I honestly assure you, it is made in good faith and with good intent. It is dictated by a simple desire to let the profession arrive at the truth. I, and those in sympathy with me, have no more unworthy object in view, than to advance the best interests of medical men and medical education, and to secure the welfare and good government of the profession. Consequently we cannot, and we do not, desire that our contentions shall prevail except to the extent that they are right, and able to withstand honest assault. We are content, therefore, to give you the privilege, if you care to have it, of placing our views before the profession, accompanied with the corrective of such fair and honest editorial comment and refutation, as honorable men may make and submit to. It appears to me, you can afford to accept these conditions. We simply stipulate for just and courteous treatment—for such an elevation in the character and tenor of your editorials as will show that we no longer have to deal merely with men of straw. You have plenty of material behind you. Bring your best men to the front, and put both heart and brain into your management, so that it may be worth any honest man’s while to carry on a controversy in your journal.

On our side there are scores of men who, by position, attainments, influence, and use, are better qualified to champion our cause than I am, but in the absence of an abler pen, mine is at the service of my fellows. It is in no spirit of presumption that I undertake the task. Were it not for my strong and abiding conviction that we propose nothing but what is just and proper, I would not write at all. Believe me, Sir, I am keenly alive to

the disparity of the forces engaged. On the one side yourself, and the “four new men put on,” having unlimited space and plenty of leisure and moved by a lively conviction that the \$600 subsidy is at stake, and, behind you, the whole personnel of the Medical Council struggling to piece together the ragged remnants of its damaged prestige, its salaried officials—with their fat stipends trembling in the balance, and all the learning and ability of the educational bodies, and their dependents and allies, ready to fall to when occasion requires. And on the other side—what? An obscure country doctor, without assistance or advice—occupied in a hard struggle from day to day to win his bread and butter—who can devote to the discussion only an odd hour, here and there painfully snatched from needed rest and sleep, and whom you, yourself, have, by a few masterly touches of your editorial pen, described as a harmless lunatic, a crank with a bee in his bonnet—so hopelessly illiterate that even his orthography is not above reproach.

Now, Sir, you say I dared you to publish my last letter. If you look again you will find that I did the very reverse. I wanted it, as I want this, published in full and without mutilation. I felt then, as I feel now, that if, in view of the fact that you have invited these communications and have grossly misrepresented my statements, you were, on any plea, to refuse the insertion I ask, it would be said that you were afraid of its effect on the profession.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN H. SANGSTER.

Port Perry, Sept. 9th.

LODGE DOCTORS.

To the Editor of ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,—In your July number I see an article from Dr. MacKinnon, of Guelph, on lodge doctors, and in the same number a reply by Dr. Oronhyatekha, Supreme Chief Ranger of the Independent Order of Foresters.

Dr. MacKinnon’s article is an able and trenchant exposure of the contract system of doctoring. This system of cheap doctoring is not only adopted by the Foresters, but in cities is also adopted by large manufacturing and other companies employing many hands. The remuneration is very inadequate for the services rendered, and the only way the