

we feel that we will not be trespassing beyond the limits of propriety by placing our views upon the matter at issue before our readers and by asking them to first carefully consider the whole question and then to cast their ballots as they deem best in the interests of the profession and the public.

Previous to the formation of the Council a license to practice medicine could be obtained from the Governor in Council on presenting a diploma from certain institutions and on payment of the nominal fee then required. In the interest of the public these institutions on certain conditions agreed that their diplomas should no longer entitle the holders thereof to a license. One of these conditions was that these institutions should be represented in the Council. This right has up to the present been cheerfully accorded these institutions. Some members of the profession would now take from these institutions this right guaranteed them at the time of the formation of the Council and without which the Council would never have come into existence. Such an act would be a breach of faith, and we do not believe that the profession will be a party to the renunciation of a solemn pledge given to these institutions at the time they in exchange for representative on the council agreed to give up privileges previously enjoyed by them. We have sufficient faith in our fellow practitioners to believe that they will vote for candidates pledged to maintain the bargain made years ago and to preserve the honor of our profession. So long as these institutions and the homoeopathic practitioners demand that the rights guaranteed them at the formation of the Council be maintained so long must we in honour accord them these rights.