

slight culling shows how far the doctor is mistaken, to put it mildly, in his views.

His very first sentence is a straight error, in that he speaks of the Council ending its official career on the 16th of June last. If he would only think a moment, if he ever knew as on second thoughts, we probably think it is his gross ignorance, prompted by some spite which is accountable for his sayings, he would remember that the Legislature only required a new election before January, 1895. Thus he would see that they still have another session to hold in which to carry on their work. If we could fathom the depths of his mind we would probably find that his spite, for there surely must be some, was due in part to that same force of indebtedness that is moving Dr. Sangster and his adherents of the Medical Defence Association.

For a "moribund" affair, the Council is still a very lively and able body, quite efficient enough to carry on the business matters of the medical profession for a few more suns, in spite of the ravings of such men as Dr. Bingham.

We relieve Dr. Sangster of any part of the composition of this letter, though his ideas are most likely involved. Dr. Sangster surely would not commit to paper any such swashbucklerism as we have before us in this letter of Dr. Bingham's. He simply attempts to go over the matter in connection with the Defence Association we have answered time and again. The charges made by Dr. Sangster were referred to in previous issues. They were put in front of the House, and through them an attempt was made to cut off the life of the present Council, which failed totally—the members seeing the great injustice that would be done by so acting.

He has made one statement which has truth in it—let us quote:—"The subsidy to the ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL has been again granted;" but he leads us through a very wrong track as to the reason for granting it.

Before the JOURNAL was in existence, the Council published the report of the meetings, with the annual statement, themselves, at an expense of a little over six hundred dollars. Now, in place of doing this, they subsidize a paper, to a slightly smaller extent, to do the same work, on the condition that it shall be supplied free to all the medical profession. The amount of the subsidy is practi-

cally used up by the JOURNAL in publishing the announcement, so our readers can see how very much there is in the transaction.

Rightly again, Dr. Bingham quotes that "*The Practitioner* and *Lancet* offered to publish all the proceedings free of charge," etc., but he gives us no clue as to the time or style of the offer. Let us explain: On its being awarded to us, these other papers changed the style of their offer and at the end of the Council meeting made this proposition, when they must have known that it could not be acceded to at that hour. Many valid reasons arose to show the wisdom of their act in giving the JOURNAL the work. As an example one: The other papers are only taken by a limited number of subscribers among the profession, and the JOURNAL is sent to all. That in itself should have carried enough weight to make the Council vote as it did.

Without its usual just method of dealing, the *Lancet* gives Dr. Bingham some right to quote from its article by its manner of showing its spleen. By reference to what they call "the former cliqueism" in the Council, an attempt is made to insinuate that it still exists, with the managing editor as a member of the clique. We think if the *Lancet* would read thoughtfully the reports of the meetings of the Council, both now and formerly, it could hardly fail to see the independent spirit in which each member acts and speaks with very little reference to the thoughts of the others. Not only the elections to the offices, but all appointments to different committees, show an absence of a ruling body of three or four. We presume the thought was brought forth by the fact of the subsidy being given to us instead of to it. We can give a distinct denial to the statement that any member was approached or canvassed for a vote for the subsidy to this paper. As a matter of fact, the only member with whom it was talked over at all, both spoke and voted against the granting of a subsidy to any one. As for the question that it is queer that the managing editor is a member of the Council, we must ask, Why should he not be? Who is in a better position to understand its affairs or to make a defence of any action, if any defence is considered necessary?

Why the *Lancet* should undertake to attack us without just cause is a mystery, as our relations