

Would Dr. Williams argue that the vital interests of the Established Church in England would be safe in the hands of the dissenting organizations? Even his temerity would scarcely impel him to take a position so obviously absurd. And yet in a communication intended to reach the medical electorate—so meanly does he esteem the intelligence of those whom he ventures to address, that he dares to contend that the vital interests of the general profession are safe in the hands of the schools and of a few medical sectaries which have scarcely a single concern in common with the great body of ordinary medical practitioners. He admits that both the President of the Council and the Executive Committee have power to jeopardize the vital interests of the profession. Is it then reasonable that the electorate or its loyal representatives in the Council shall tamely consent to see these positions systematically handed over to school men and homœopaths? The crafty doctor pretends that he does not know that every member of the Council is such, not in his capacity as a medical man, but by election or by appointment, and that he takes his seat in the Council chamber, not as a member of the profession, but as a representative or nominee sent thither to guard and maintain one or other of the three divergent and antagonistic interests which are there supposed to struggle for supremacy. His childish pretence that homœopaths owe, or profess to owe, allegiance to the medical electorate, and that outside their theory of dosage, they have no interests at variance with those of the general practitioner, if it be intended to be taken seriously, is on a par with very much of the baby-talk Dr. Williams is in the habit of prattling in the Council chamber, and which sensible men, who do not belong to the machine, there dismiss with a smile of derision and the expressive Turkish expletive, “BOŞ!” True, Dr. Thorburn, to whom he alludes by name, is appointed (not elected) by his colleagues of the Toronto School of Medicine. But he is sent to the Council as the representative of a close corporation, which, if it be still in existence, which is questionable, has not a single interest in common with the profession; and, in the Council, he is the exponent of the views and the guardian of the privileges and prerogatives, not of his fellow practitioners, but of the educational bodies of which he is one of the appointees. And he does his duty in this respect with a zeal and an intelligence and a fidelity that do him great credit, and at the same time shame the recreancy of all trimmers and traitors, who, being sent to the Council to look after the vital concerns of the profession, instead of loyally doing their *devoir* in that behalf, have, for the paltry lust of office or the empty desire to stand well with their official