

mistakes, for I am convinced that there has been either:

1. Gross injustice done me, either wilfully or unintentionally, by the presiding examiners, or
2. Some mistake in transferring the marks.

In either case, sir, I trust that the error will be erased, and that the injustice done me will be promptly rectified.

I am, etc., etc.

I waited for an answer to the above for four weeks, and then wrote the Registrar as to the result of my appeal, which I was beginning to fear had either found the waste basket upon its arrival at the office or was beginning to blue-mould in his pigeon holes. He replied at once, "I beg leave to inform you that the Medical Council decided as follows: That they have very carefully examined your appeal and cannot see any reason for changing the decision of the examiners." I immediately replied, that as I still felt that there was a "snake in the grass," for I could swear that I had done very well indeed at my oral examination, I ask permission to see my examination papers and also to have access to the marks for the oral examination. This he partially granted a few days ago.

I appeal to you, sir, before I carry out my determination to expose the fraud, if necessary, by other means, in order that you may insist upon a thorough investigation that the injustice done me will be promptly rectified.

From the examination of my papers and marks I am led to believe that

1. They have not been re-read, indeed the bare figure on the back of my physiology paper would lead me to think that that paper had not even been read, although I was told that they would be re-read. The Registrar also informed me that there had not been a single change made in re-reading my papers, or even those of any other, a very unlikely thing unless the examiners pre-conceived the defeat of all appeals. Then again, I hold that no examiner, however expert, could re-read, even a few minutes later, six or seven sheets, as a whole, and give the second time the same number of marks, unless guided by the former figure.

2. What has evidently been the safest plan of causing my failure has been adopted, viz.: low marking at the oral examination. Dr. Pyne has

told me that the oral questions are gone forever, such it seems has been considered, but I was wise enough to keep a list of the oral questions asked me, and will take oath as to their correctness and also as to the manner of answering, if necessary, and, contrary to what he said when I first intimated my intention to appeal, tells me now that the oral marks cannot be reconsidered.

3. That if the examiner in anatomy can make a change during the first reading of a question, he is certainly not incapable of doing so during a second reading; yet Dr. Pyne emphatically wishes me to understand that there never are any changes made. However this may be, he was forced to acknowledge that there had been a change made during the first reading in my second answer in anatomy, the figures for which being written 12, which, when I asked the Registrar the meaning, said that the 12 had been changed to 14.

4. Had the papers been re-read it would not have been necessary to call upon the Registrar for an answer to my appeal.

5. The practice of deducing the marks for a wrong answer, that is the loss of twice the number of marks for that question, is unjustifiable. The Registrar could give me no information as to the authority the examiner had for such a method, but I don't think it necessary to discuss either the injustice or want of authority for such a course pursued by them in this connection, as it must be plain to all.

6. As the examination in anatomy and physiology has not even given the Registrar the values for the several complete answers, they have purposely left me in the dark as to the number of marks which have been deduced in each question.

7. It is just possible that the examiners have deducted marks for other just as absurd reasons as for spelling, writing, etc., etc.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

J. A. SANGSTER.

Dr. THORBURN—I know something about that letter, and the young gentleman who wrote it. In July last year I received a communication from the Registrar asking me to come down and be present at a conversation with an applicant, who complained he had not been treated fairly at the examinations. I came here not knowing exactly