

have an efficient compulsory vaccination law. It is not necessary nor is it my purpose to argue the value of vaccination. No man, who has studied the question impartially and examined the evidence, can have but one opinion on it. The anti-vaccinationist will neither see nor tell the truth, will neither listen to argument nor be convinced by any evidence, no matter how strong. The only way to deal with such a man is to let him have smallpox if he wants it. Here the law should step in and prevent him giving the disease to others, including his own children, by enforcing thorough vaccination and re-vaccination. We, as medical men, as members of this important society, as members of a profession which has done something worth mentioning in the prevention and control of disease, as followers of that immortal man whose discovery has reduced the death rate of smallpox 72 per cent., should make whatever influence lies in us felt in the matter of the protection of our children and the children of the nation against a preventible scourge. The hope of the future in this respect lies in the enforcement, without regard to sentiment, and in defiance of wilful ignorance of the law regarding compulsory vaccination. Because the death rate in our country has in recent years been small from this disease, even in the presence of a considerable number of cases, we have no security that we may not sooner or later have a deadly form of the affection amongst us. This rising nation has a right to claim from us who are entrusted with their physical welfare the adoption of any and every measure calculated to ensure them, in a land teeming with a multitude of God's blessings, the greatest one, that of good health. If, therefore, lives are lost by reason of smallpox, or personal and municipal losses of a financial character result, through failure to carry out the wise provisions of the Act, the blame and loss rests with those failing to comply therewith.

PROTECTIVE ORGANIZATION.

The frequency with which malpractice suits are brought against members of our profession, the fact that they are often without foundation, and that such claims are generally made by parties financially irresponsible, are strong arguments in favor of some form of protective organization.

In the present state of affairs any worthless individual may institute an action against one of us, and no matter how innocent we are, no matter how unjust the action, no matter if we win our case, we are saddled with an enormous bill of costs, and because of the usual worthless character, financially, of the plaintiff, we have no redress. One of the advantages of a thorough organization would be to deter such actions, another would be to bring pressure on the Government to so amend the