

power in the Legislature, nor in the hands of the Government, to prevent any member from introducing a Bill amending the Medical Act on the *fourth* day of the session instead of the sixty-fourth. All that is necessary is two days' notice of its introduction. The attempt to cast the blame off the shoulders of the Council upon the members of the Legislature is unjust and cowardly.

I desire, in this letter, to call attention to the composition of the Council. The heterogeneous character of its component elements constitutes the main point at issue between that body and the general profession. This overshadows every other issue, and out of it have grown those abuses of power on the part of the Council which have roused the profession from centre to circumference. The question is, shall twenty-seven men be allowed to dominate over 2,300 medical practitioners of this Province, demand, take and spend their money, make rules to govern them, and secure laws by which to relegate them "to the common gaol," when only twelve of the twenty-seven are subject to their votes. That's the question. Must the medical profession stand out unique amongst all the professions as the only one incapable of self-government, or if not incapable of self-government, to be deprived of it? Let us recall the composition of this curious relic of other days. It is made up of two radically dissimilar sections, one *responsible*, because elective by the general profession; the other *irresponsible*, because non-elective and in no way whatever under the control of the profession. A glance at the following tabulated statement will make its composition plain:

I. RESPONSIBLE.	No.
Elected by general profession.	12
II. IRRESPONSIBLE.	
1. Appointees.....	10
2. "Selectees" of homœopaths.	5
	<hr/> 15
Total.....	27

The twelve responsible members of the Council were elected by the medical practitioners of the general profession in the twelve divisions into which the Province was divided. According to the old law, the elections were to be held once in five years; according to the new, once in four years. Here I must digress to ask special attention to the last arbitrary and unjust escapade of the Council. The Legislature, by the amending Act of 1893, fixed the life of each Council at four years, and every fourth year an appeal is to be made to the electors. The last election was held in March, 1890, and hence the Legislature fixed the next appeal for 1894, so as to carry out the four years' limit. If the Legislature did not intend disturbing the five years' limit of the present Council, then the Act should have fixed the next election for 1895, for the five years' term will not be complete until March of that year. But it was the evident intention of the Act that the Council's existence should close with four years and four sessions, and hence the law fixed the election for 1894, at the usual time, which has not been later than the first week in June for twenty years, and always before the annual meeting of the Council. But the Council which spent a day and over \$300 of our money last June in solemnly demonstrating that they were gentlemen and honourable men, hesitates not to take advantage of a mere technicality of law to steal another session in defiance of the evident intention of the Act. I am informed that Sir Oliver Mowat has given the opinion that the Council can hold another meeting under the Act. But Sir Oliver has not said that the spirit and intention of the law contemplated anything else than an appeal to the electorate on or before March, 1894, at the termination of the four years' life of the Council. There is, however, another and a graver wrong involved in this arbitrary determination of the Council to hold a fifth session. The Act of