

he was to go. It is now an open secret that his name was not to appear on the report of the committee; and, had it not been for the effort made for him, the outrage of leaving his name off might very probably have been accomplished. Had this been done to either Dr. Richardson or Dr. McFarlane, I opine there would have been such a storm of indignation as would have shaken the work of the committee to pieces in a remarkably short time. These gentlemen are too highly esteemed for their many friends to have stood idly by and seen them displaced, and for no better reason than that of giving their places to others who have not done a tithe of the work for medical education that these have performed.

13. It ought to be carefully noted that the amount standing to the credit of the Medical Faculty of accumulated surplus is \$6,842. A proportionate share of this was earned by Drs. W. W. Ogden, M. H. Aikins and J. Ferguson. This sum is set aside by the committee for contingent expenses, or retiring allowances that may have to be provided for, while not a dollar is awarded by the committee to the above gentlemen. It will thus appear that these three have really assisted to provide a sum that may be used in the future for retiring allowances to others, but do not receive any themselves. Of course I do not know what code of ethics the committee followed.

In a recent letter to the lay press, Dr. A. B. Macallum objected to the remarks that were made in the August number of the *ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL*. He states that the article complained of "contains base insinuations even against the Committee on the Medical Faculty, which is composed of the Chancellor of the University, Honourable Edward Blake, Mr. Vice-Chancellor Mulock, Sir Daniel Wilson, the Hon. Chancellor Boyd, the Hon. Justice Falconbridge, Principal Sheraton, and others." Now, the editorial to which Dr. A. B. Macallum takes so much exception contains no "insinuations." It contained, on the contrary, the statement of a few facts which Dr. Macallum does not undertake to deny. To shout wolf, wolf, does not prove that there is a wolf, and Dr. Macallum will have to try some other method of convincing the public than stating the words, "base insinuations." In his letter he appeals to the presence of "Mr. Vice-

Chancellor Mulock" and others on the committee, but the report of a recent alumni meeting states that he was out as a candidate to oppose the policy of Vice Chancellor Mulock. This is refreshing to all who understand the first elements of logic. In this letter a few additional facts have been given, and Dr. Macallum may rest assured that the storehouse is not yet emptied. Dr. A. B. Macallum surely possesses sufficient knowledge of journalism to know that the editors of any journal have a perfect right to criticize any public question, and the Provincial University cannot hope to be exempted. Dr. Macallum obtained his M.B. in 1889, just three years ago! and is not a practising physician.

Dr. A. McPhedran has been promoted in the Faculty, and now receives \$750 a year, provided the earnings permit of such a sum being paid. In the present senate elections he has assumed the duties of chairman of the committee engineering the campaign of Drs. Cameron, Mullen, Reeve and Macallum. Some distinguished cerebrolologist might be able to tell us what molecular movements have taken place to induce Dr. McPhedran to assume the chairmanship of this committee? Is he hoping for better terms still, if there should be returned to the senate four medical men whom he thus assisted? or is he only afraid that some day he may, like some others, lose what he has, and wishes to be as solid as possible in the inner circle? or, again, is he doing it all for the good of the University, believing that medical men are not capable of selecting their own candidates, and consequently much evil would come to the dear old University if he did not help guide the choosing of candidates? Or, is it just possible he may be anxious to keep some others off the senate, who, if there, would not be docile, or, to use a vulgarity, "they would be no good?" At all events, there is some motive, for the late T. H. Green, of Oxford, says, in his *Prolegomena to Ethics*, "An unmotivated action of the will is unthinkable," and this the late Prof. G. P. Young endorsed.

There is one thing that all are agreed upon, viz., that whatever rights a man has to be his own keeper, he has no right to set himself up to be the keeper of every one else. Now, during the present senate election there has been a good deal of this sort of thing. Because some are not able to see