

out meanings and expressions, which even I myself had not previously discovered or thought of, has certainly never been surpassed, or, perhaps, equalled, unless by yourself on some former occasion. Where the whole forms a journalistic gem, probably without a parallel in English literature, it is, perhaps, invidious to single out the sixth paragraph for special commendation. Here the word "pulled" would, perhaps, have been more explicit than the word "laid" in the sixth line. With this slight exception, the diction is all as correct as the facts are all askew, while the really difficult feat achieved, you allege, by the Council and the Minister of Education and Mr. Seath, of increasing the stringency of the matriculation examination by "pulling down" the percentage of marks exacted, must challenge the wonder of all the educationalists of the Province. Possibly, what you intended to say is that the examination papers are being made more difficult to compensate for the lower percentage required; but every High School Master in the country will tell you that this, in point of fact, is not the case. In my September letter, I expressed my fear that the Council "organ" was out of kilter or not in tune, and suggested its reconstruction. It seemed to me that if you desired to elicit from it really grand journalistic symphonies which should touch the heart of the profession, and convince the recalcitrant and subdue the rebellious and restore harmony to all, it would be wise to put more soul and intellect and a finer touch on the music stool. You have convinced me that I was wrong. The lack was not of heart and brain, but of muscle—not of inspiration in front of the instrument, but of expiration behind it—not of artistic skill and knowledge at the finger-board, but of brawn at the bellows. Evidently, the only proper and truly effective way to play a Council "organ" is to double the force at the lever, while the organist sits on the keys, and invokes *Ventosus* by whistling "Blow, breezes, blow."

The Medical Council, in its published pamphlet, admits that it was created by the medical schools for the purpose of controlling admission into the profession, so as to secure to themselves a monopoly of the medical education of the Province, and that our twelve territorial representatives were taken into it, by the schools, not in the interests of the profession, but simply to serve as

a balance of power between the rival educational bodies. While testifying to the correctness of this account of its inception and design, my last letter proceeded to show that the Council still remains so far loyal to its original purpose, as to guard the privileges and immunities of the schools much more strictly than those of the profession—that it cares for and protects the profession only to the extent permitted by its more exigent fealty to the schools—and that where the interests of the two constituencies conflict, as, for example, in the determination of the matriculation standard, the requirements of the medical electorate are always subordinated to those of the educational bodies. As a profession, then, though confessedly in some degree protected by the Council, and therefore greatly concerned in its continuance, we are manifestly less stringently protected by it, and less vitally concerned in its continuance than the schools are, and consequently our moral obligation to contribute towards its maintenance is less imperative than theirs. For twelve representatives, not always loyal to its behests, the medical electorate is required to pay annually into the Council treasury some \$4,800. or \$400 for each. The schools appoint nine representatives. Do they also pay annually \$400 for each? Do they pay annually, or do they propose to pay, directly or indirectly, separately or conjointly, four hundred cents, or even one cent for all the fostering care extended to them by the Council? Emphatically, no!—they would scout the idea. Can you, then, fail to see the flagrant injustice involved in taxing the profession for the support of the Council, and letting the schools go scot-free? Do you not perceive that it was an unwise thing—because it was an unfair and an ungenerous thing—for the educational bodies to become parties to the Act of 1874, or to any scheme permitting an annual assessment to be imposed on the medical electorate without insisting that they themselves should be annually mulcted in an equal sum? And if a mere attitude, on their part, of simple passive acquiescence in an act of such palpable injustice would have been indefensible, does not the indisputable fact that the scheme was inspired by them, and actively promoted by them, render it execrable, and swell the wrong to the dimensions of an outrage? Can we wonder that thoughtful and self-respecting men