

Correspondence

The Editors are not responsible for any views expressed by correspondents.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN MEDICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—In looking over your issue for April two ideas attracted my attention: First, your editorial, "The Patrons and Medical Education;" and second, Dr. Sangster's letter. In the one, "Another attack to wreck vested rights;" and in the other, a fulsome excuse. For what? I ask this question, that your readers may answer according to the evidence.

You rightly, to my mind, give credit to Dr. Ryerson for his prompt action in notifying the profession generally, and in successfully repelling assault. Now, Mr. Editor, I ask you, and I ask the profession in general, Why did Mr. Haycock attack the Medical Act? Was it not simply that he wanted to do something? He wanted to pose as a redresser of grievances, and he thought the medical profession were a disorganized body. He had read the *Farmers' Sun*; he had read the imbecile twaddle of discontent. He in his innocence, thought it weak and disorganized, and coward-like attacked it. If this was not so, why did he not turn his artillery against the legal profession? The daily papers give flagrant instances of excessive charges. It was plainly shown that the poor client, even if he won a case, lost in legal expenses. It is about as expensive to win as to lose. This fact makes it of interest to every individual—every Patron. Why not attack the press? A paper is sent; you return it. It is sent again; you do not want it; yet, in the end you have to pay for it. Is this just? Is it right? As it affects the individual it affects the Patron. Why did not Mr. Haycock try to remedy this grievance? Yet he would pose as a saviour of citizens' interests. Is he really better than the agitator, the Anarchist?

Dr. Sangster, in his letter, does not thank Dr. Ryerson, although every thinking reading member of the profession will. Oh, no; he does not even censure Mr. Haycock. Why? I answer that he well knows Mr. Haycock's action was the natural logical result of the articles written by himself and his friends, and the lengthy articles in the *Farmers' Sun*, so freely distributed, and marked copies sent to the electorate at the time of the medical elections. I ask Dr. Sangster, Who were the writers of these articles, and in whose interest were they published? At that time I intimated in my letters that subjects interesting to the profession alone should be confined to the