

It may be said without fear of contradiction that the first duty of man, in relation to his fellow-man, is to be strictly honest. Here, at least, is a rule which applies equally to the man who sells stock, manufactures a machine, dispenses drugs, or raises his voice in the endeavor to establish social or moral reform, or to bring a criminal to justice. It may also be claimed that even an honest man should *know* whereof he speaks, before he ventures to make assertions relative to any given subject. In other words, it is no excuse for even an honest man to say, "I did not know," when the veracity of his statements is questioned, or his data are shown to be founded on error.

The writer in question has sought to show that the onus of responsibility for criminal abortion, as practiced by a few members of the medical profession in this province, rests on the Ontario Medical Council, and therefore, indirectly on the members of the profession who elect that council, and furthermore that it is their duty to see that such malefactors are brought to justice. And the reasonable inference one must draw from the fact that the Medical Council is not periodically dragging various and sundry offenders before the bar, is that Council and profession alike are shielding the said offenders. This, we claim, is not only an unfair attitude for this Editor to assume, in so far as it concerns his personal belief, but is also a conscious misapplication of the facts calculated to mislead the mind of the masses.

What are the facts of the case, as he must, or ought, to know them? Doubtless some few practitioners exist here and there, who, for a consideration of gain, will stoop to commit crime. The criminal records of the Province might justify such a supposition. But to imply that these offenders are well known to the profession at large, is at once absurd and unjust. Is the medical murderer—if such one might justly style the professional abortionist—such an inborn idiot that he will proclaim to the world at large, and his professional brethren in particular, his criminal practices? Does he call in any of his confreres to assist him in his nefarious work? Not likely! How, then, are his brethren to *know* of his wrongdoing? (And mark you, he has a right to style himself our "brother," until such time as he has been unmistakably proven to be unworthy of our noble fraternity.) The trouble is, we do not *know* him to be a criminal, and *may* never know him as such in this world. The Editorial writer in question says very glibly, "These men are well known." To whom are they known? Not to us. To the Editor himself? Then if so it is his bounden duty to lay the matter before the officers of the Crown, for this is a criminal