

sent simply educational institutions. Does not that make it a representative body? Further, the actions of the Council which appear most obnoxious to you and your correspondents were initiated by the territorial representatives, and unanimously supported by them. Does this not prove that the actions of the Council were those of a representative body, and strictly of the elected representatives in the body? Now, when you criticize the conduct of the elected representatives you criticize the medical profession—the electorate which has chosen these representatives, and which still supports them.

You have no proof to offer of your assertion that a large section of the profession now repudiates the Council. Prior to the session of the Legislature in 1892, after a vigorous canvass on the part of a few dissatisfied physicians, they secured about four hundred signatures to a petition against the Council. A number of the signers, to my personal knowledge, have withdrawn their names; and after a year spent in inquiring into the sentiments of their constituents, the territorial representatives now confidently assert that the Council has the support of the great mass of the profession. It is true the astounding statement was made some time ago, that more than half the physicians were opposed to the Council, and were members of the so-called Defence Association. But, like many other statements from the same source, its extravagance was its own contradiction.

Nor did the Legislature stamp the claim of the Council to be a representative body as “spurious” by any action taken last session. Are you aware of the fact that the bill, as passed, instead of granting the changes in the composition of the Council asked for by its promoters, actually gave less than the Council was willing to accept? Last year the Legislative Committee of the Council expressed its willingness for an increase of five territorial representatives, and for the disfranchisement of all corporations that neither taught medicine nor granted degrees. The Legislature added the five territorial representatives, but at the same time retained all the collegiate representatives, including those the Council was willing to drop. In fact, while the Council was opposed on principle to any change in the Act until the profession could have an opportunity to pronounce on the questions

at issue, yet there was not a clause of any importance in the bill, as passed, to which the majority of the Council would, or did, object—unless it might be the gerrymandering of the constituencies. Let me correct another error into which you have fallen. You say your correspondents had “vainly endeavoured to sting the Council into a reply” to the charges made; that the Council “remained dumb as an oyster.” Are you really ignorant of the fact that the charges brought against the Council were answered in the addresses of President Williams before the Ontario Medical Association and the Medical Council; in the discussions of the Council at its 1892 session, and in articles in medical journals; all of which were sent to every member of the profession in Ontario? The Council may have failed to use your columns; but it availed itself of methods of reaching the profession which your columns could not provide.

In conclusion, you accuse me of “insinuating” that some of your correspondents were inspired by personal grievances; and you call on me to rise above cowardly inuendo, and say what I mean. I have no desire, and had no intention of hiding behind inuendoes. I advised you, in discussing medical questions, to “familiarize yourself with the facts, instead of following the lead of any disgruntled correspondent who may air his personal grievances in your columns.” I repeat the advice, and supplement it with the plain and emphatic statement that all your medical correspondents whose lucubrations I have seen were inspired by a personal grievance. That grievance arose out of the action of the Council in securing legislation intended to make these gentlemen pay their long overdue debts. All other complaints centred around this one. Some of these gentlemen had been members of the Council, and employees of the Council in past years. They had willingly taken all the money out of the Council treasury they could get, but had carefully abstained from paying in the dues they owed, and which were no more than their neighbours paid. Year after year they allowed the Council to pursue the course they now denounce, and never uttered a word of criticism. Election after election was held, and they never took the field against the Council, nor endeavoured to secure the defeat of any of those men who, they now say, so vilely misrepresented them. If the