

of the bulletin, charge the Halifax Medical College with having "putrid cadavers."

That all such statements in this bulletin regarding the Halifax Medical College are absolutely without any justification in fact, can be vouched for, and is vouched for, by many Halifax men who are quite as trustworthy and reliable as any connected with the Carnegie Foundation (or any other body.)

And here I may call your attention to a significant little incident.

You will recollect that it was noted in the Halifax statement regarding Anatomy at the Halifax Medical College, that "Every student is supplied, free of expense, with a set of bones for use at home."

This fact with all the rest of the Halifax statement, the Foundation have deliberately ignored and suppressed.

Some might suppose that this fact was passed over as of small importance; but if you turn to page 83 of the bulletin, you will find that when the College is "Cornell (Ithaca)" and not the "Medical College (Halifax)," the Foundation consider such a fact of so great importance that a very special statement of it should be made in the bulletin. Thus you will find on page 83 the following foot-note:

"At Cornell (Ithaca) a complete set of bones is given out to each student."

Thus you will see that a practise which is worthy of special note and credit in the case of Cornell (Ithaca) is only worthy to be ignored in the case of the Halifax Medical College.

Just ponder that incident for a moment, inconnection with all the other harsh statements and determined omissions, and see what you will be forced to conclude regarding the

spirit, reliability, fairness, and purpose of this Carnegie Foundation report.

When you find a critic deliberately and persistently making statements tending to the disparagement of an institution; when, at the same time, you find that critic persistently suppressing facts which would clearly tend to the credit of that institution; what conclusion do you come to regarding the "spirit and ideals" of that critic?

Do you find the spirit of truth and justice, or the spirit of prejudice and preconceived purpose?

Now, let us turn to another paragraph of the delegates' or Foundation's draft report, and the Halifax "Comment" thereon.

The draft report asserted that "three fourths of the *total income* are distributed among the instructors."

The Halifax "Comment" admitted that three-fourths of the fees (not the total income) were *sometimes* distributed among the teachers, but it added this important statement:

"A larger percentage may be required for expenses, in fact on occasions the whole fees for the year have been surrendered by the teachers."

As a matter of fact it was by paying the teachers nothing for two full years, that the College was able to put a new wing to the building and provide the pathological laboratory and equipment.

But the Foundation utterly ignored this important statement of fact thus brought to their notice in writing. The important qualifying statement finds no place in the Foundation's report.

Why?

Perhaps you can furnish an answer.

But you will at least note that such a statement about the teachers getting