

with which every privilege and immunity of the schools is guarded. Access to the profession, in Ontario, is practically closed against all but the students of Ontario medical schools. The Council has acquired and holds the vested right to "enact by-laws as to the terms upon which it will receive the matriculation and other certificates of colleges and other institutions not in the province of Ontario." Partly by means of the regulations and by-laws thus made, and largely, also, by the partial composition of its Examining Board, it teaches even McGill students that candidates, seeking for its diploma, who have had the good taste to attend one or other of the local schools, occupy, in the examinations, a vantage ground not accessible to outsiders. Howsoever eminent or distinguished graduates in medicine from recognized colleges in the United States, France, Germany or other foreign lands, may be, they can qualify themselves to practise here only by attending one or more sessions in an Ontario school, and passing the matriculation and other prescribed examinations. Graduates in medicine from Oxford, Cambridge and other British universities, are required to pursue the self-same course, unless they have become British Registered Medical Practitioners, in which case, provided they can prove that they have been domiciled in Britain for five years after becoming so registered, they can qualify by paying all fees and passing the intermediate and final examinations. Can you suggest, sir, any more rigid system of protection in favor of the schools, than these Council rules and regulations secure? "But," you may say, "do not these regulations in some measure prevent a greater influx of candidates for admission into the profession in Ontario?" Unquestionably, yes; and thus, incidentally, they benefit the medical electorate. My argument is, not that the profession is not thus benefited indirectly, but that the schools are thus benefited more largely and more directly—that these regulations and restrictions were devised, primarily, not to protect the profession, but to preserve the privileges of the educational bodies. In a word, I am seeking to show, and I think I have conclusively shown, that the schools are protected and fostered by the Council more stringently and more directly than the profession is, that they are more vitally interested in the maintenance of the Council, and that they are bound, at least

equally with the profession, to contribute to its support. Had it been the object of the Council to lessen the influx of aspirants to an already greatly overcrowded profession, it could have effectually reached the desired end, by elevating the matriculation standard to a university degree in Arts, or even to the second or first year's University Pass Examination. This, however, would have deprived the educational hoppers of their all-important annual grist, and so, in place of being raised, the requirements were lowered.

Now, Sir, in commenting on my letter, let me beg you, if possible, to avoid posturing on the editorial trapeze. Do not deny the degradation of the matriculation standard, and do not insult the common sense of your readers, by seeking to shift the onus or the odium of that degradation on to the shoulders of either the Minister or the Deputy Minister of Education. And, above all, do not dishonor your associate territorial representatives by attempting, in this connection, to vindicate their honesty at the expense of their intelligence.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN H. SANGSTER.

Port Perry, Oct. 18th, 1893.

---

DR. BURROWS.

*To the Editor of ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL.*

SIR, I am one of those who are pleased to have an official organ, and as well that its columns are open to communications from the members of the medical profession, and reach every practising physician, as they are thus placed fairly before the profession and judged by a jury of compeers.

In your issue of September last, I thought right to offer some thoughts that presented themselves to my mind, at that time of excitement, "Crumbs by the Wayside," as it were. Not perhaps palatable food for the Council, they were not intended to nourish its vanity to any very great extent. However, they were my individual views, and I am free to state, were accorded a full, free insertion in your journal. From the number of letters I have received, it would appear that there are other members of much the same way of thinking.

In your September issue is a letter from Dr. Sangster, followed this month by one from Dr. Lovitt. Dr. Sangster may honestly feel that he is cham-