

grander and more philanthropic aims of the profession, the bond of union between us would be much stronger, and, as a consequence, we would be much more helpful to each other in the struggles so common to our calling.

Various circumstances are the occasion of these professional jealousies. A very prominent one, here, has grown out of the existence of rival schools of medicine. We do not desire to be understood as intimating that professional jealousies are a necessary element of the existence of rival institutions; although we do think it will be granted that they are a pretty constant characteristic of their history in this country. But we see no good reason why, when such institutions *do* exist, their relations with each other should not be of the most friendly character. Their aims should be, in all respects, precisely the same, namely: to render their character such as to afford the most abundant facilities to their patrons for the pursuit of their education, and so attract as many as possible within their walls. No one would object to a rivalry so generous as this. On the contrary, the school established and conducted upon the basis that no lawful expedient should be omitted which can in any way contribute to the thoroughness of the discipline offered to its students, is entitled to the largest share of consideration. But when this rivalry is degraded into that kind of petty jealousy which prompts the advocates of any school to resort to the most questionable devices in order to secure an advantage over the rival school, we have a condition of things very much to be deprecated. Bitterness must, of necessity, spring from such a line of conduct, and it will develop itself among individual members of these rival bodies, and be carried into private practice. Surely there can be no reason why feelings of animosity and general distrust should be created between members of the profession because they happen to be actively engaged in rival institutions labouring in the interests of medical education. It were, doubtless, well if, in a place of the population of Toronto, only one efficient medical school existed. The work accomplished by both of the schools now in existence might be quite as well done by one. But even this much is not certain. A fair and

honourable rivalry has many wholesome features connected with it. The very existence of a vigorous opposition often results in a degree of energy on the part of both contending parties such as would not exist but for that opposition. We are not, therefore, inclined to deprecate the existence of rival schools so much as the manner in which the rivalry is conducted, and its inevitable consequences.

Another of the sources of professional jealousy is the disposition on the part of many medical men to underrate the abilities and general professional attainments of their neighbours. This is, undoubtedly, a grave offense. Public caprice is so great towards our profession that the bare intimation by one physician that another has exhibited a want of skill in the management of a case is taken as a *bona fide* assurance of gross incompetence. We all know how easy it is, in case of the fatal issue of disease, for the friends to be impressed with the idea that if Dr. B—— had only been called in when Dr. A—— took charge of the case, a very different result would have followed. In the great majority of cases such reflections are groundless. And if a medical man has conscientiously used every effort which commended itself to his judgment, and has not been guilty of a reckless disregard for the life or safety of his patient in any way, he ought not, upon a mere probability that he has committed an error, be subjected by a professional brother to the imputation of unskilfulness. The fair presumption is, that no one passes through his entire professional career without making some mistakes. To intimate the contrary would be to presuppose that medical men have attained to a degree of perfection not known in any other sphere of human activity. So long, therefore, as the most skilful and the most judicious are liable in this respect, it must be manifestly unfair to attempt to make one man more responsible than another so long as his general professional career is marked by a satisfactory acquaintance with his calling and an honest devotion to its various objects. Well, it is this disposition on the part of many men, calling themselves respectable, to make capital out of the accidental failures of their professional brethren, which is constantly creating breaches that often widen rather than otherwise. We are prepared at all times to expect such treatment from professional quacks who live and often fatten upon misrepresentation and vilification. But we have a right to expect that every medical gentleman, professing to follow the same general system of treatment with ourselves, shall not, by depreciatory inuendos, damage the reputation of his neighbour for the sake of elevating himself in public estimation.