

promoted by the Defence Association, but they did not then oppose the redistribution in the presence of their opponents. We learn from the proceedings of their last session, they afterwards opposed it in private, and after hearing what they had to say the Legislature decided on the arrangement of which they now so angrily complain. Contrast the open manner this redistribution was promoted by the Defence Association with the artifice by which the penal enactment against the profession was secured by the Council, the first knowledge of which was obtained months after it had become law, when members received a postal threat to submit or have their names erased from the register. A redistribution made in this open and straight-forward way is not likely to contain any very objectionable features, and none have been shown to exist. The following is the number of electors to each division, as taken from the register, including the forty-odd Homœopathists who chiefly reside in the centres of population:

No. 1 . . . . . 148	No. 10 } . . . . . 367
" 2 . . . . . 141	" 11 } . . . . . 152
" 3 . . . . . 129	" 12 . . . . . 133
" 4 . . . . . 115	" 13 . . . . . 104
" 5 . . . . . 124	" 14 . . . . . 109
" 6 . . . . . 130	" 15 . . . . . 106
" 7 . . . . . 146	" 16 . . . . . 118
" 8 . . . . . 150	
" 9 . . . . . 133	

Some difficulty was experienced in arranging the divisions retaining the county boundaries in tact; but whatever cause for complaint there may be in the divisions containing the greater number of electors, there is not the least justification for such complaint with regard to Divisions 15, 16 and 17, which are made the chief cause of attack on the redistribution. It is proposed to change these divisions so that they will contain, instead of as above, 134, 98, and 104 electors respectively. Dr. Rogers, who desires No. 16 arranged for his personal convenience, has figured out the numbers somewhat differently. He

no doubt accounts it a happy artifice, that while he has about the right number for No. 17, to make No. 16 contain twenty-three more, and No. 15 twenty-one less than are to be found on the register. The complaints about these and the prospect held out that a rearrangement of all the divisions, favourable to the re-election of the members of the Council, might be had for the asking, led the remaining despairing territorial representatives to join in the proposal, and they appointed themselves a committee to prosecute this object. The members of the profession need not concern themselves about this proposed gerrymander, for there is not the least likelihood of the Legislature entertaining such an absurd proposition. The expense connected with this committee is quite a different matter; we are at their mercy in regard to that. Their leader has had a foretaste of this profitable employment on committees, and may be relied on to work it to the best advantage. The profession have also got to know something of the power of committees to absorb funds, from the parliamentary return published in the last issue of your journal. When it required \$614.00 to pay a committee of five to secure the penal legislation against the profession of 1891, we may readily conjecture what the emoluments will be to a committee of twelve while engaged in gerrymandering territorial divisions that they may be elected to enforce their penal enactment.

In the above mentioned parliamentary return there is a feature which I confess to have overlooked, when criticising it on a former occasion, and which no doubt reflects the greatest credit on the Council. Their mismanagement of the affairs of the profession has been such as to necessitate some sharp criticism, from time to time, but when anything is done that merits approval we cheerfully extend to them all the credit due. We are all agreed that the social standing of our profession cannot attain to a position too high, and any