

A copy of the weekly returns can be kept for future reference.

From the data thus collected, it is proposed to prepare and issue fortnightly reports, containing information regarding the prevalence of disease in different localities. These reports are to be forwarded to all the Health officers, and other interested persons, and it is assumed that when it has been publicly proclaimed that an epidemic prevails in any locality, the authorities will take the necessary action to prevent its spread, "not only for the benefit of humanity, but for their own credit." In addition to the fortnightly reports, special reports are to be issued whenever an epidemic prevails. An annual report is to be prepared for the use of the Government, containing a disease chart of the country, diagrams of the course of special diseases, and a comparison between these returns and the Meteorological reports, in order to ascertain the influence of the weather on health.

We have not space to go more fully into the scheme; but since it meets with the support of the public, the profession and the press, we may feel assured that it will obtain the assistance of the Government, and be put into operation at once. That it is a matter of public interest there can be no doubt, and no one will dispute its necessity. It has always been admitted that mortality returns are very important; but, hitherto, few have recognized the value of statistics regarding the prevalence of disease. The relation between the two has been well illustrated by the Right Hon. Lyon Playfair, F.R.S., who said, that "registration of deaths represents the wrecks which strew the shore, while that of sickness would tell us of coming storms, and enable us to trim our vessels to meet them. Till we have such a system of disease-registration, public health cannot be administered with full intelligence."

#### RECIPROCITY IN MEDICAL REGISTRATION.

In another column will be found a letter from the President of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, which requires more than a passing notice. We are sorry to trouble our readers with any further discussion of a subject which has

already been pretty well ventilated in these columns, but as there are one or two points which do not appear to be properly understood, we venture to return to the subject once more.

The President seems to think that we take every opportunity of writing "hard things" about the Council, and that both Judge Hagarty and the LANCET speak of the institution with "undue severity." While we most respectfully disclaim all intention of either speaking or writing with what may be termed undue severity, we cannot refrain from commenting from time to time, on the acts of the Council when they are of such a character as to call it forth. The Council has at times seemed so obstinate and so disposed to go headlong into difficulties, despite the advice and entreaties of some of its best friends, that it is not to be wondered at, if those friends should become a little disgusted and say things which may appear rather harsh. To give a few instances, we might refer to the continuance for years of the vicious system of appointing the examining board from among the members of the Council, in spite of the remonstrances of the LANCET and the profession; the illegal exclusion of a duly accredited representative of the Council, involving unnecessary and expensive litigation; the refusal to register a Canadian graduate with British qualifications and registered in the medical register of Great Britain, also involving great expense, all to no purpose; the passing of a by-law which they were told was *ultra vires*, and the attempt to enforce it, compelling practitioners registered in the medical register of Great Britain to pay a fee of four hundred dollars for registration in Ontario; a second attempt to prevent the registration in Ontario of practitioners with British qualifications, (Drs. Mallory and Skirving); the constant tinkering with the curriculum, and rules and regulations, until "confusion was worse confounded"—all this unnecessary and inexcusable blundering (chiefly caused by the manipulations of two or three members of the Council who arrogate to themselves the right to rule in everything,) has done more to bring the Council into disrepute than all the "hard things" ever said by Judge Hagarty or the LANCET.

The reference by the President to the Law Society does not improve his position. Law and medicine are widely different; no practitioner of law in England could practice here until he had