

THE CANADA LANCET:

A Monthly Journal of Medical and Surgical Science

Issued Promptly on the First of each Month.

Communications solicited on all Medical and Scientific subjects, and also Reports of Cases occurring in practice. Advertisements inserted on the most liberal terms. All Letters and Communications to be addressed to the "Editor Canada Lancet," Toronto.

AGENTS.—DAWSON BROS., Montreal; J. & A. McMILLAN, St. John, N.B.; J. M. BALDWIN, 805 Broadway, New York, and BALLIERE, TINDALL & COX, 20 King William street, Strand, London, England.

TORONTO, APRIL 1, 1874.

UNIONISTS VS. DISUNIONISTS.

We consider it a matter for regret that various members of the profession, who have of late been figuring in the *Globe* and *Mail*, did not consider the pages of Medical Journals a fitter arena for a warfare of this kind, than the columns of daily newspapers, and thus limit at least the ridicule of the public. In a medical journal such a discussion, temperately and courteously conducted, would be to the "manor born"; in a newspaper the disputants are always open to the suspicion of an endeavour to exalt their own personality. The violence of some of these gentlemen in uprooting, or upholding, plainly indicates their respective objects. Some are incensed at the power proposed in Dr. Baxter's Bill of collecting annually from the registered members a paltry dollar or two, for the purpose of creating a fund to provide the Medical Council "a local habitation and a name," and also to establish a museum and library open to the whole profession. Another shudders at the possible desecration of the Temple by the admission of members whose views in theory and practise differ from their own.

It is a well established fact that medicine has never flourished and been cultivated in the highest degree in any country where it has had no legal recognition, and yet in the face of this some of our prominent members have, in the journals above mentioned, recently advocated Free Trade. No man can assume to be a responsible minister of the Gospel without a course of study and ordination from some church organization. No man can practise law without having matriculated and

passed the yearly and final examinations at Osgoode Hall, and afterwards contributed a yearly payment of \$20 to the law society. No school teacher can be employed by a board of trustees who has not obtained a certificate of qualification. No man can sell whiskey, or peddle goods, or drive a hack without registration and license.

The State then recognizes the right to defend the public from the impositions of certain classes, but not from quack doctors and patent medicine vendors. In this view two members of the profession of different belief in theory and practise, would appear to concur from their letters in the *Mail* of March 7th. One of the correspondents writes: "It is a confession of weakness, nay more an expression of downright cowardice on the part of any sect in medicine, or of any medical man to ask to be legally protected from the competition of others." The other *medico* terms the Medical Council "A mongrel monster, because it was the union of three dissimilar bodies."

This union, so emphatically denounced, was brought about by the disastrous results to the public, from the numerous licensing boards to different schools of Medicine, but was only a union of examination on all the fundamental subjects, Theory and practise of medicine being left to the *representative examiners of the three schools*.

The Cobourg correspondent, an Eclectic, says "The principal studies common to the profession are chemistry, physiology and anatomy, and in these the Reform school now acknowledge no superior." In our ignorance we were under the impression that neither the Eclectics nor the Homœopaths had as yet established schools in the Dominion, that the students of these dogmas repaired to the United States for their peculiar teachings, and we have yet to learn that at these Homœopathic and Eclectic seminaries "no superior professors are acknowledged." The general purport of the letter would also imply that Allopaths are men of one idea, a common condemnation! Is it not possible, however, for the so-called men of one idea to appreciate fully the relative value of the doctrine, and to be unwilling to apply it in season, and out of season? Commenting on this subject, a writer in the *Saturday Review* thus speaks: "Really to possess a single idea and to be capable of impressing it on the world at large is to be a man of genius. To possess two or