

Secondly, I wish to contend that, owing to the circumstances of our country, the professions of law and medicine do not occupy the same relation to our subsidized universities as do the professions of engineering and agriculture. Engineering should be aided by public funds because the profession is not over-crowded. There is a very poor field comparatively, as yet, for engineers in Canada. So with farming. We are a farming country, and scientific farming is a desideratum which is very much needed and very loudly called for, and every farmer who can be induced to study agriculture scientifically is a clear gain to Canada. Not so with law and medicine. These professions are greatly over-crowded, and besides, it has been proven that the educational requirements in each case can be fully supplied by independent colleges without any public assistance. To the reflecting mind, it is surely very erratic logic which endeavors to prove that the government of a country should be called upon to supply a demand which does not exist; that the public funds should be used to furnish an article which is not only in demand but is actually a glut in the market.

Now please do not misunderstand me. When I speak of this article, the supply of which is immeasurably in excess of the demand, I refer, not to the half-educated young physician, but to the graduate who has been thoroughly and scientifically trained.

Now, let us admit for the moment, that public subsidizing is a necessity for the advancing of medical education in our Dominion, and in the light of that admission, let us consider, briefly, the existing condition of affairs. You say in a recent editorial: "If she (Trinity) recognizes the great advantages of the chemical and biological departments of the University, why does she not show a willingness to participate in the benefits to be derived therefrom? They have been offered to her; we believe they are still free to her."

It is not my custom, nor is it now my intention, to accuse a gentleman whose opinions may be at variance with my own, of wilful misrepresentation; yet, to my mind, it is simply inexplicable, that you, who must understand so well the present status of affairs, should so represent it in the statement just quoted from your editorial.

In the annual calendar of the medical faculty of Toronto University, which I have before me, I read the names of certain teachers whom we were in the habit of considering as members of the Arts and Science departments of our Provincial University, and who, as such are certainly salaried by the State; and yet they are represented in the Medical Calendar as members of the medical faculty. This calendar is sent to intending medical students all over Canada, in order to show them the supposed advantages possessed by this medical faculty over all other teaching institutions of a similar kind. And yet, "these advantages are free to Trinity"! Yes, forsooth, if she is willing to surrender her students to a competing rival, and certainly not otherwise. By what exclusive right are the names of these *province-paid* gentlemen who teach biology, etc., in our *Provincial* University, paraded upon the list of one particular medical faculty? Why has not Trinity an equal right, if right it be at all? Why cannot Trinity say to her students, "The schools of Science and Biology are open to all students of Medicine, and all are taught there upon equal terms and by professors who, being paid by the Province, have no connection whatever with any medical faculty"?

Suppose a student of Trinity, or of any independent college, desired to take advantage of the *supposed* Provincial institution, as at present constituted, his name would at once be added to the list of students of the Medical department of Toronto University, an institution competing actively for patronage with the independent college at which it was his desire and intention to pursue his purely medical studies. Moreover, I find that the fees which this supposed student would pay for instruction in these *truly Provincial* institutions, would go, not to the gentleman who taught him (they are paid by the public funds), but directly into the coffers of the medical faculty.

Now, I ask you, in all candor, is this not a fair statement of fact? And yet, "these advantages are free to Trinity"! I am willing to leave that statement to the unprejudiced reflection of the members of our profession and of all fair-minded and honorable gentlemen.

H. S. BINGHAM.

Cannington, July 5th, 1890.