

deliberations and the plan of campaign jointly proposed. Nothing was said of differences, for these had been talked over and effaced, and no statements or suggestions were offered tending to exaggerate the lay estimate of the importance of the wide experience and profound learning of the Consultant or so-called Specialist. *During* the consultation in the endeavour to arrive at a unanimous conclusion, sight was never lost of the deference due to the Family Physician who had a special knowledge of the patient and his heredity, widely cultivated powers of observation, and a mind well-practised in the weighing of evidence. In the case of palpable or established error on the part of the practitioner, the educated consultant, quickly responsive to the dictates of the instincts of a gentleman, remembered the adage so well expressed by Pope :—

“Men must be taught as though you taught them not,
And things unknown proposed as things forgot.”

In brief the golden rule was the rule of conduct in consultations.

In those good old days the crowning disgrace of latter day consultations was utterly impossible. A man who then proposed in consultation, as has been openly advocated in a journal published in St. Louis, Mo., in the interest of the most absurd and irrational of all so-called specialties, Abdominal Surgery and Gynæcology, and, as has been done, I am told by at least two practitioners in our midst, that an operation should be performed by the consultant and a commission be extracted from the patient for the benefit of the practitioner referring the patient, would undoubtedly have been arraigned before a competent tribunal on a charge of conduct infamous in a professional respect ; yet this line of conduct is now openly urged on the plea of equity and justice to the family physician. Truly the commercial spirit, the instinct of the tradesman has infected a once noble and honourable profession with a destructive, nay, a fatal virus.

Now I venture to group these two crying evils of our time—the overcrowding of the profession and its decadence in Scholarship—together, because I believe the remedy for both is one and the same. Hear again what Mitchell Banks says upon the subject.

After referring to the failure of attempts to suppress quackery and illicit practice by legal process owing to technical quibbles and the sympathy of juries stimulated by the cry of oppression, and the inability of the General Medical Council to put down all the rascals in the profession, even if they sat all year round, he urged upon the attention of his hearers the expensiveness of the process citing one case in which the attempt to secure legal conviction cost the profession £600 and accomplished nothing. He then directs his attention to the suggestion that the severity of the professional examinations should be increased, and on