

medical director thinks otherwise. There is a deadlock and nothing is done. The *hands* of those *elected* to *represent* the *profession* are *tied* by the *non-consent* of *one* who is *appointed* by the *Government*. Or, on the other hand, he may of his own accord think that some one should be prosecuted, and so directs the Medical Council to proceed. Suppose the Medical Council does not see eye to eye with him, there is an immediate conflict. The whole thing would fall to the ground unless he has power to go on with the action over the heads of the Council. This duality of authority does not look attractive to us, and we think it would end in confusion, obstruction, delays, and friction that would very seriously hamper the wheels of progress and good government. Here, again, we see no good reason for the appointment of a medical director.

(9) *Nurses*.—The report also intimates that he should take a hand in the education of nurses, the standardizing of their education, and interrelation of the various training schools. On page 43, it is stated that the nurses had advocated the formation of "a council of nurses." The report goes on to say: "This is a matter of detail which is, however, most important in view of the apparent necessity of inspection." The creation of such a council of nurses would establish a responsible body which could take charge of all matters concerning the training and education of nurses, the relationship of training schools to each other, the question of fees, etc., much better than could be done by any medical man. We believe that if any medical man attempted to direct the training and discipline of the nurses throughout the province, and to formulate rules governing the many training schools, he would soon realize that had he had an impossible problem on his hands.

(10) *Sloth and Inefficiency*.—There now comes a most momentous statement on page 65. It is as follows: "In addition to this, the profession requires to be protected against itself, against sloth and inefficiency in the conduct of its preparation, as well as in its practice, and against inability or unwillingness to receive or try new ideas or new methods."

This is a mighty big job to hand over to any one person. Why should the Medical Council and the universities bow to his judgment regarding the conduct of the preparation of any one for the practice of medicine? These bodies would have a right to say that "we think our plan is better than the one suggested," and here the matter would end, unless the medical director is also a medical dictator. Then, further, by what conceivable route could he proceed to stimulate members of the profession to diligence in study and to adopt the latest and best plans of treatment? It would seem to us that no man could exert any power over the profession in this way. The only stimulus of value lies within the practitioner himself, and that which surrounds him through competition, and the for-gathering in medical conventions, or the taking a period of post-graduate