

would be enormously increased by this change, without any corresponding benefit. In fact, there would be, in all probability, demoralization, instead of improvement, in all matters pertaining to public health.

Again, the character of the work does not demand a Minister and a special policy. The Legislature, which by the way, contains a fair proportion of able medical men, enacts certain regulations pertaining to the management of all such institutions as would come under a Minister of Health. If the Government appoint the right kind of officials, there is no reason why these institutions should not be run efficiently. If they are not, it is the fault of these officials, who should be promptly changed, if found negligent, and not the system changed for one far more expensive, inefficient and meddlesome. Dr. Hodgetts has not given us a single department in this whole field where competent officials could not do the work satisfactorily. Enough has been said to prove that there is absolutely no need for the Ontario Medical Association to take any such step as Dr. Hodgetts suggests in his paper.

II.

Is it wise for the Ontario Medical Association to even introduce any question that might divide its members into rival political factions?

I am not one of those who take the narrow view that the medical society, medical press and medical practitioner should consider scientific work alone, the very "Ultima Thule" of its, or his, existence. It is quite true that scientific or strictly professional work should, and does, imperiously exact a very large share of a doctor's time and energy, yet the demands of his life and his citizenship pre-empt the first claim, not only on his time and energy, but on all that he hath, for knowledge and skill alone can only make a good type of machine, never a high type of man. It is, therefore, quite within the province of the Ontario Medical Association to discuss a variety of subjects, and this brings up for consideration the character of Dr. Hodgetts' proposition. Is it such, that all our members, irrespective of their party leanings, could see "eye to eye," as being one of universal beneficence, or is it not, rather, one that simulates so very palpably a "plank" in a party platform as to at once arouse party suspicions? How are we to distinguish the appointment of a Minister of Health from, say the straight party announce-