

In the light of to-day, does this not seem somewhat prophetic? The only part of this letter Sir Daniel quotes, is the very end, "I think it will be ample time to give the subject full consideration, when we learn that the Government of Ontario, with the cordial support of our Provincial Legislature, has fully decided to create, equip and endow liberally, a new medical teaching body; and to provide for it a staff of the best teachers the country can furnish; each of whom shall have a salary secured to him of not less than \$2,000 a year, for each of the principal chairs; and suitable retiring allowance, when, from age or ill-health, he is no longer able to discharge his duties. Till this is done the project is a mere "castle in the air"

This letter ended as it did, only because on indubitable authority I was informed, and then believed, that the "conditions" pre-supposed by me, of "endowing and equipping," the giving of salaries and retiring allowance, etc., were just as likely to occur, as would be the appointment of Sir Daniel Wilson, as Admiral in Chief of Her Majesty's Navy, or the extension of the Toronto Street Railway to the moon, and no more so. The old letter is filled with all sorts of reasons showing that matters had much better be left as they were, and that the proposed scheme would be very unlikely to work well, and that the carrying of it out, bristled with many real and most practical difficulties. Has this not proved to be the case?

In answering my letter, Sir Daniel has left entirely out of sight its principal feature, viz., the huge injustice and impolicy of subsidizing with public funds, *one and only one* of our six medical colleges. Yet this is one of the main points of the whole discussion—not only so—but he defends all the outlay of public funds connected with this injustice, and has shown himself ready, and even anxious, to increase it, and he never so much as mentions the crippling effect of the recent unprecedented expenditure on the other departments of the University.

In the absence of sound, and often of any, arguments against my contention, he has resorted to all sorts of detraction, and has, as I have already said, put into my letter as used by me, against the authorities of the University, words I never wrote or spoke, and thoughts that never once entered into my mind; whether the words I allude to are Sir Daniel's own, or merely quoted from an official letter addressed to him, and endorsed by him, or not, I do not know, but in either case they are, to use the mildest word possible, entirely and most mischievously incorrect, and misrepresenting. He has dragged all sorts of subjects into this discussion, which have nothing more to do with it than the fixed stars.

In this reply, much longer than I could have wished, I have striven to confine myself closely to the subject under consideration. I close by

sincerely hoping that very soon a settlement of this question *just* to all concerned, may be reached by the Government.

I have the honor to be,

Yours with the greatest respect,

WALTER B. GEIKIE,

Dean Trinity Medical College.

HOLYROOD VILLA, MAITLAND ST.,

TORONTO, March 10th, 1892.

ADDENDA.

I.—The Present Position of the University Law Faculty.

Also authorized by the Act of 1887, has perhaps, however, given the best clue of all, to a wise and just solution of the whole matter. Entirely unlike the University of Toronto Medical Faculty, the Faculty of Law is most properly constituted as not to be in direct, or in any kind of competition either with the present law school in Toronto, or with any branch of it, which may be hereafter established elsewhere. On this ground alone, were there no other, the Law Faculty is quite unobjectionable.

The Law Faculty of the University of Toronto, in striking contrast to the Medical Faculty, has not cost the University or the public one farthing, for buildings, equipment, or for anything else. So far as is known neither any lawyer, nor the law school can justly make any objection to the present constitution of this faculty, of which the legal profession may well be proud. The law professors in the University, as well as the lecturers are unsalaried and honorary only—and the occasional lectures they give are of so general a character as to be a proper study for any one claiming to be well educated in the proper sense of the term. The members of the Law Faculty have evidently been selected for their acknowledged eminence, a feature worthy of all commendation. If the University of Toronto *must* have a State Medical Faculty of some kind, there could be no objection fairly brought against it were it constituted exactly on the model of the Law Faculty as this at present exists. With the professors and lecturers made honorary only—selected from the very best names in the various teaching medical colleges of the province. The occupying of this position need not and should not at all affect the relations of the professors so appointed to the medical colleges to which they respectively belong. Such a faculty could well act as University examiners in medicine, and being provincial in its character would be not only in keeping with the character of the University, but would be sure to attract students for