

insignificant. Disparity of numbers is a great advantage instead of an obstacle, and, providing that no local or national feeling be raised in anything connected with the organization, the Quebec Association must inevitably fulfil its objects. May the unanimity which characterized its preliminary meetings always prevail; and may a noble rivalry in all things worthy stimulate the two sister associations, and the work we are now doing for our profession be done so well and so thoroughly, that in future years, when we come to compare its state with what it was, our retrospection may be pleasant and congratulatory. W. G. B.

THE CONVENTION AT HAMILTON.—AN EXPLANATION.

We regret to learn that not a few members of the profession in Ontario have construed our remarks in the last number on "The Convention at Hamilton" as a rebuke to those who moved and carried the vote of censure on the Board, and as a defence of the latter. One correspondent says, "You must know that certain members of the Association and the Board did wrong, and why did you not lecture them as well as the correspondents."

In answering this query, we trust we shall make an explanation that will satisfy every member of the profession that this Journal did not and will not apologise for the wrongs committed by any of the members of the Association or the Board, and that in every respect it is an independent organ.

When the offending editorial was written, and indeed until about two weeks ago, we were entirely ignorant of the vote of censure and had not the least suspicion of any such action. The portion of the Proceedings which appeared in the August number of the Journal, was the only part in our possession, until about two weeks ago, when the balance came to hand. It must be clear, then, that we did not rebuke those who moved and carried the resolution, when we knew nothing whatever about it. On the strength alone of the contents of the letters before referred to, the editorial was written, and we had not the remotest idea of any action of censure on the Board, as not one of the said letters intimated it, and no one informed us. We distinctly stated that the lecture was especially intended for "the correspondents," and "any inclined to the same method of resentment," viz., wishing to publish abusive personalities, without a shadow of fact or argument.

We make no retraction of a word in the editorial of last month; but would rather add to it by suggesting that the correspondents who favoured us with their vulgar fulminations, be ridden on a rail out of the next