

council contend that it is under the control of University College, and, as a consequence, they have power to admit or exclude whom they please. There appears to be a difference of opinion on this point, and we understand that certain legal experts declare that the authorities of University College have no such powers as they claim.

Apart from the legal aspects of the case, we regret that the college council considered it expedient at the present juncture to show that the students in arts have rights which shall be denied to other students of the university. There are plenty of empty rooms in the residence. It scarcely looks considerate to choose such a time to inform some students of the faculties of medicine and law that they are not of the elect, and therefore must depart. We had hoped that there was a general disposition to place all the students of the university on a common basis, but we have received a rather rude awakening from what appears to have been simply a pleasant dream.

The "evicted," as the unfortunates designate themselves, promptly petitioned the college council, and prayed for better terms. The following answer (*Toronto World*) was returned:

"The registrar is directed to reply that the council, after full consideration of all the circumstances, adhere to their former decision in the matter. They hold that the residence should be maintained solely in the interests of undergraduates in arts, in accordance with the original object of its establishment. They find that there are, amongst the present occupants, sixteen who are undergraduates in arts, while there are thirteen who are not, the latter number being made up of five law students, one engineering student, six university medical students, and one Trinity medical student. The council, having regard to the legitimate purposes of the residence, consider that these members (thirteen to sixteen) are so disproportionate that they do not feel justified in allowing such a state of things to continue; their plain duty being, as they conceive, to carry out without further delay the programme of improvements already begun, with a view to make the residence attractive to students of University College."

THE TRIALS OF UNPROFESSIONAL PRACTITIONERS.

Up to the present time two names have been struck off the Ontario Medical Register—Drs. Washington and Lemon, who were tried according to the statutes which give the council powers to deal with parties accused of unprofessional conduct.

According to The Ontario Medical Act, the council has power to erase from the register the name of any practitioner who has been guilty of any infamous or disgraceful conduct in a professional respect. In each case it is necessary that an application for an inquiry shall be made by four medical practitioners. A committee of the council, composed of not less than five members, shall take evidence, and report thereon to the council. On the reception of such report, the council have the power to strike the name of the offender off the register. The party whose name is erased has the privilege of making an appeal to the higher courts. Dr. Washington appealed against the decision of the council, and the appeal was heard early in December in the Divisional Court before Chief Justice Armour and Justices Falconbridge and Street. Judgment reserved.

The committee of the council which recently held inquiries in Toronto consisted of Drs. Day (chairman), Bray, and Logan. The parties charged with unprofessional conduct were Drs. Wm. Anderson and S. E. McCully. The latter, Dr. McCully, threatened a vigorous defence, and the trial created a good deal of interest. Something like thirty witnesses gave evidence against the accused. Among these were some laymen, such as Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of the *Telegram*, and the Rev. D. J. Macdonell, who both expressed the opinion that some of McCully's advertisements were not fit for publication. To the surprise of all, or at least many, no evidence was offered in defence. Dr. McCully acknowledged that the charges were correct, and left his case in the hands of the council.

It is admitted on all sides that Dr. Day, the chairman of the committee, showed marked ability while acting in his capacity as a judge. The committee will meet June 11th and prepare their report on the evidence in the two