

work and a greater amount of practical instruction in connection with the sciences of medicine and surgery. We must take care that, in affirming the principle that the endowment now devoted to the arts faculty must not be entrenched upon, we are not understood as affirming that no further endowment is needed for the faculty of medicine. It surely is not to be admitted that these sciences have come to a standstill; that we are not to keep pace with the advances they are making elsewhere on this continent and in Europe; that we are to take our information at second hand; that our students must forever take post-graduate courses at institutions in the United States and Europe if they wish to do the highest work. And if this is not to be the case, more money must be provided, for the things which are required cannot be obtained without money. From whence is it to come? Let us consider the possible sources; they may be classified thus:

- (1) From the fees being raised.
- (2) From increase of fees resulting from increased numbers of students.
- (3) By diminishing the salaries of the professors.
- (4) By private bequests.
- (5) By state assistance.

Those who say that the fees of students should be raised argue that, the profession being already overstocked, students seeking to enter its ranks should not be assisted. Now, if this argument means anything it means increase the fees and diminish the numbers; and, if this be done, how is the amount derived from fees going to be increased? But, supposing there are too many men in the profession, would it not be better to make the entrance depend upon a higher intellectual qualification standard rather than a higher money standard? But we have already shown that an adequate amount cannot rightly be expected from this source. Nor will the increased number of students, with an increased number of fees, sufficiently meet the case, for our experience has shown us that more students means more demonstrators, more material, and more laboratory accommodation. Of course the increase will mean some improvement, for the number of students listening to a didactic lecture can, within certain limits, be increased without detracting at all from the ef-

ficiency of the lecture. But as our teaching is becoming more and more practical, training the eye, hand, and powers of observation of the student, the number of demonstrators, amount of material, accommodation, and apparatus must increase.

Then, as to deducting the funds from the salaries of the professors, you will see by a reference to the Report of the Standing Committee on the Faculty of Medicine that two of these, devoting their whole time to teaching, receive \$1500 per annum, and the rest from \$300 to \$750. You can make your own deductions—I do not mean from the salaries, but from the facts.

With regard to the next source—private benefactions—we are quite free to say that we consider it a very proper and commendable one; and we hold up as worthy of admiration and imitation the acts of Blake, Mulock, and Rossin, graduates of the university, and of the late Mrs. Mulock, of Mr. Ramsey, Dr. Balfour, Dr. Richard Noble Starr, the bankers of Canada, and, last but not least, both in arts and medicine, those of the late Hon. John Macdonald, all of whom have shown themselves in such a substantial manner to be friends of the university.

But, notwithstanding the hopes we may entertain from the good example of these and other benefactors, there is still ample need of the assistance of the state—the people—if we are not to fall behind. And we maintain that it is a duty the people owe to themselves. The public cannot afford to neglect those means which shall bring to them the best results in regard to public health, whether we apply that term to preventive or to curative medicine and surgery. Statistics there are in abundance to show that states have received back, in the saving of life and loss of time, an hundredfold—or hundredfolds—for investments made in hygienic measures. The same holds true of all judiciously expended aid to scientific advance in the medical sciences.

Against the granting of public money in the directions I have indicated, it has been urged "that it is not the duty of the state to use public funds of any kind in educating students for a special profession, such as medicine or law, any more than for any other calling by which people