

1893 provided for an addition of five members to the territorial representatives, increasing their number from twelve to seventeen. But the Council's action robs the general profession for one session of these five additional members, and for one year longer their voices must not be heard, nor their votes recorded against the maladministration of the Council. What think ye, men of the profession, that not one of our twelve representatives raised his voice against this gross infringement of our rights? But the Council boasts that those dissatisfied with their management of its affairs are only "a mere handful of disgruntled men." Then why do not these gentlemen, without delay, appeal to the great majority who are satisfied with their administration, for re-election? Why? Simply because they know their cup of wrong-doing is full, and they dare not. Another year's extravagance, with longing eyes turned upon the tribute box, is more congenial employment.

Let us now return to the consideration of the irresponsible section of the Council. As seen by the above tabulated statement, there are two branches: First, appointees, of whom there are ten. These are appointed by university senates and medical faculties. I have before me the names of the professors constituting one of these faculties, and I think I may fairly take them numerically, as representative of all the appointing bodies. This faculty is composed of twelve medical men. It must not be forgotten that these twelve gentlemen reside in one of the territorial divisions, and their voices are heard and their votes recorded for one of the above twelve representative members. But not content with this full measure of justice, this privileged class sits around its Faculty Board, and appoints another member of the Council. In round numbers, two hundred medical men in the territorial divisions elect one member. But these dozen men have the

same power as the whole two hundred, and each member of the faculty has, therefore, sixteen times the voice and power in the Council that one of the general profession has. And still farther, in thus exercising the franchise twice, they violate the principle of "one man one vote" established in this Province.

Let me now introduce the "selectees" of the homœopaths for consideration. A careful examination of the register reveals the names of forty-seven homœopaths in this Province. But it is said, in some way or other, there are more than this number. Let us assume there are sixty. These three score select five members of the Council, or one member for every twelve homœopaths in Ontario, and consequently, like their favoured comrades, the appointees, each homœopath has sixteen times the power in the Council as one of the general profession. Or, to take another view, these sixty well-favoured gentlemen select as many members of the Council as one thousand of the general profession. And yet, with this knowledge before him, the present homœopathic president of the Council has had the assurance to assert that "the profession has, under the present law, full power of self-government, and whatever it desires can be carried out through its representative body, the Council." What a farce to talk about a "representative body," when more than half of its members are appointees and selectees of two favoured classes. But this gentleman grows bolder, and goes farther, when he declares that if the profession dare to go to the Legislature for relief of these glaring wrongs, "then the Legislature should abolish the Council and vest the control of our affairs in the Education Department, which looks after the welfare of children, or in the Inspector of Charities, who looks after the feeble-minded." Now, the question is, shall these favoured appointees and selectees be longer allowed to sway an arbitrary sceptre