

astrously to the former." Let us come down to particulars. Take, for instance, the University of Toronto. Its senate elected as its representative in the Council—Dr. Britton. Will any one who knows Dr. Britton intimately, or who has followed his course in the Council, seriously assert that he has ever shown the slightest inclination to oppose the interests of the profession? We think not. Apart from Dr. Britton, is the University of Toronto likely at any time to endeavor to choose a representative who will be antagonistic to the profession? No; a thousand times, no!

To try another "school man," we might take Dr. Thorburn. Did he ever act as an enemy to the profession? We think not. Indeed, he has shown himself to be a friend, a faithful worker in the interests of the profession and higher medical education. It is unnecessary to go further. The majority (at least) of the remaining collegiate representatives have, as a general rule, followed the lines of Drs. Britton and Thorburn. Under the circumstances, we think we are justified in saying that the profession and the schools are not "essentially antagonistic."

---

#### MERITORIOUS WORK.

---

The work of Drs. J. E. Graham and A. B. Macallum, of the Toronto University Medical Faculty, upon the question of *Molluscum Contagiosum*, particularly its etiology, has been received with great favor by the profession at large, judging by the favorable criticisms that have appeared upon their article published first in the *Journal of Genito-Urinary Diseases*, and since then widely quoted and reproduced. The great probability of the theory they advance as to the cause of the disease leads one to hope that some day the etiology of carcinoma, and even sarcoma, may be definitely settled. An abstract of their paper, recently printed in the *Manchester Medical Chronicle*, after speaking highly of the conservatism and "safeness" of the view advanced by Dr. Graham, proceeds to mention at much greater length the microscopic investigations of Dr. Macallum, and after giving him much credit for the skill of his technique in preparing his specimens, agrees in the main with his conclusions, finishing a generally favorable abstract of his paper with the regret that Dr. Macallum "had not shown more familiarity with the literature of the subject" by seeing certain German papers upon the same subject before publishing his own. This was written evidently in ignorance of the fact that these German investigations were not published until after Drs. Graham and Macallum had written their paper. One of our Canadian journals has recently printed an alleged abstract of the abstract appearing in the *Manchester Medical Chronicle*, which, inadvertently of course, rather fails to do justice to the original and highly meritorious work of our Toronto professors.