

have a perfect right to hold a different opinion. The Council may have been, and may be, mistaken in its views on this matter. Presumably, the members of the Council, knowing its necessities, and being required by virtue of their office to give its affairs special consideration, should be not less competent to form a correct opinion, or initiate a wise policy, than those gentlemen who have had no responsibility in the medical administration, and who confess now that in the past they have been either ignorant or indifferent. Admit, however, for the sake of argument, that we were wrong, and that this building was not necessary, yet the fact that it could to-day be sold, leaving the Council with a large cash balance as a result of the operation, may be accepted as an indication that we have not been unfaithful or imprudent trustees, and that the profession has not suffered loss by our management of its affairs.

But I wish to point out in this connection that whether it was right or wrong, the present representatives are not to be held responsible for the erection of the building: for it was constructed and occupied before our election in 1890. The necessity for a building of its own was recognized by the Council at an early date in its history. But the first movement was made in 1878, when it was moved by Dr. Browse (a territorial representative), and seconded by Dr. Grant (at that time a territorial representative), that a committee be appointed with power "to erect or secure a permanent building" for the use of the Council. The result of the appointment of the committee (a majority of whom were territorial representatives) was the purchase for \$13,500 of the site we now occupy, with the church building that then stood upon it. So far as the records show, this action was acquiesced in by the entire Council, including one gentleman who to-day is denouncing our "real estate speculations."

The old building was utilized for a time, but with the increasing work of the Council, was found to be insufficient for its needs, while its general appearance was stigmatized by medical men not in the Council as a disgrace to the profession. In 1882, it was moved by Dr. Allison, seconded by Dr. Burns (both territorial representatives), that "in consequence of the present college building not being properly adapted for the purposes for which it was originally intended by the Council, it is deemed desirable that said building should be sold, and the proceeds applied to purchasing grounds and erecting a building thereon; or to wait on the Government and ascertain whether the Government would be willing to assist in carrying out the above scheme, or any other plan that may be deemed expedient." And a committee was appointed to consider and report on this matter. This committee reported progress at the session

of 1883, and was continued year by year, with much discussion at each session of the Council as to the best way of carrying out the original instructions, but without action on account of the difficulty of disposing of the property at a sufficient valuation. In 1886, the committee reported in favor of erecting a building on the old site. The report was adopted, and on motion of Dr. Bray (a territorial representative), the committee with the treasurer, was empowered to proceed with the work, according to plans selected. And in 1888, the work was completed, and the building occupied.

Now, it has been charged that the Council, without the sanction of the profession, and being instigated and influenced by the collegiate representatives, unlawfully and unwisely erected an extravagant building. The facts are, that every movement in the Council in favor of securing a building, from first to last, was initiated by territorial representatives, and was sanctioned by the profession. The original property was purchased in 1878; an election was held in 1880. No objection to the action of the Council was taken by the electorate, and the old members were nearly all re-elected. From 1882 to 1886 the proposition to secure new premises was yearly before the Council, and the discussions were reported in the medical journals and the Toronto newspapers. In the midst of this discussion, an election was held in 1885. No voice was raised in all the Province, so far as I can remember, in protest against the "real estate speculation," and no member who went to his constituency for re-election was defeated because of his opinions or his actions in this connection. Again, in 1890, an election was held. The new building had been occupied for two years. The profession outside of Toronto knew something of its extravagant dimensions and of its cost, but no voice was heard in censure or in criticism; and no member of the Council was refused re-election because he had favored the erection of the college building.

Am I not justified, then, in saying that not this present Council but the profession at large must take the responsibility in this matter? This building has been erected with the knowledge and approval of the profession. Every step taken has been on motion of territorial representatives, who must have known the views of their constituents, and who are accepted by the other members of the Council as the exponents of the views of the profession at large. And it is not just for men who either directly or indirectly endorsed the Council in all its building operations to censure this body for doing what these critics themselves have sanctioned.

I have thus briefly referred to the main charges brought against the Council. And with regard to the actions censured, I claim that, whether they