

of my time in connection with the Bill, but for which I made no charge whatever. If J. P. Armour, who has thus proven himself such a prince of veracity, such a righteous investigator, had enquired of Dr. Pyne, the Registrar, he would have secured these facts, but careless of truth and manly decency he has maliciously maligned me by twisting a parliamentary return and drawing conclusions from it which no honourable and fair-minded man would.

Respecting your correspondent's scurrilous insinuation that I used a couple of champagne suppers to influence the vote on the Bill, the very grossness of the insult to not only me but to the members of the Legislature renders it beneath contempt; but if he will abandon insinuation and specify a charge of this character I shall offer him an opportunity of proof with startling celerity. There are only two courses open to him in the matter, either make a plain specific statement or apologize, if he has any courage or respect for himself as a gentleman.

No public body is so perfect but what it may be improved by intelligent, fair and honest criticism, but when any man descends to licentious fault-finding, making false and misleading assertions, then we must conclude his object is to destroy; and I appeal to the members of the medical profession throughout Ontario to be on the alert and guard their interest, for nothing can be plainer than if the object of the active members of the Defence Association is not to destroy the Ontario Medical Council and the Ontario Medical Act, then the tendency of their conduct is the destruction of these.

Yours, etc.,

A. F. ROGERS.

Ottawa, Oct. 12th, 1893.

THE TORONTO "MAIL" AND THE MEDICAL COUNCIL.

To the Editor of ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR,—At the last meeting of the Medical Council the opinion was expressed that some answer should be given to the editorial articles of the *Toronto Mail*, in criticism of the actions of that body. In accordance with that view, I wrote a brief letter in reply to one of the first articles appearing in the *Mail* after our adjournment.

This letter was published, with comments. These comments I tried to answer under date of July 20th. That letter never appeared. After waiting several weeks, I inquired of the publisher the cause of its non-appearance; and, in course of time, was informed that it must have gone astray, as they knew nothing of it. As it was mailed in a sealed envelope, with my printed address on the outside, and the usual request to return if not delivered, it is not unreasonable to suppose that it was duly delivered at the *Mail* office, and got astray in that building. I suppose the Council will hold me excused from writing letters to a newspaper whose correspondence goes astray in this manner. But, as I kept a copy of my letter you may perhaps find room for it.

CL. T. C.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—Your notice of my letter appearing in your issue of the 7th seems to invite the reply I send. You say you accept my assurance that the action of the Council, in the case of Dr. McCully, was in accordance with the precedent established in the case of Dr. Washington and others, and in the same paragraph repeat your former assertion that the leniency in one case was in marked contrast with the severity in the other. That is, you accept my assurance that we followed the same line of procedure in both cases, and yet declare the two cases were in marked contrast. While you do not deny that both men were, under similar circumstances, treated exactly alike, yet because one was disciplined on the repetition of an offence which the other has not repeated, you renew your former assertion that they were not treated alike. Do you really think this is a fair mode of argument. Or is it a specimen of that "good Anglo-Saxon" which you say I do not understand?

Having thus tried to wriggle out of a situation which I supposed you would frankly accept, you call my attention to certain misstatements which you think I made, in charging you with criticizing the profession, and in calling the Council the representative body of the profession. One answer applies to both. The Council is, and always has been, a representative body. Of its twenty-six members, seventeen are elected by the registered physicians of the province; and four are appointed by medical colleges; only the remaining five repre-