

The proceedings of the Council for the first few years showed quite clearly that the harmonizing of heterogeneous and discordant elements was no easy matter. The attempt to unite homeopaths and allopaths for legislative purposes was an experiment in medicine, and for a time it seemed that the attempt would be a failure. Some of the old school physicians objected strongly to the enforced association with those they had always regarded as medical heretics, and wanted the Act repealed, and others openly declared that their only reason for consenting to the arrangement was the hope and expectation that by its operation homeopaths and eclectics would be exterminated within ten years. Only a few had reached a moral plane high enough to treat the homeopaths with fairness and justice, and to recognize that whatever difference of opinion there might be in regard to therapeutics, homeopaths were as well educated and as honourable as they claimed to be themselves. Stormy debates, stimulated by professional prejudices, and emphasized by angry invective and paltry insinuation, were of frequent occurrence. Probably the worst feature of the new arrangement was the policy of protection for the Canadian colleges, under which no one was admitted to examination for registration until he had attended two sessions in Ontario. As the homeopaths had no college in the Province, this simply meant that their students had to attend an allopathic college before they could get a license.

In 1873, the Homeopathic Institute, which met in London, decided that if the dominant section of the Council persisted in its course of injustice, it would appeal to the Legislature for the re-enactment of the old law of 1859. The redress sought was not obtained; on the contrary, the evils of the situation were intensified by the refusal of the Council to advance Vice-President Campbell to the position of President, as was the usual custom, because he was a homeopath. A committee was appointed by the Institute to seek redress through the Legislature, but it never met. The Chairman, Dr. Campbell, without consultation with the rest of the profession, prepared a Bill for submission to the Legislature, asking, not for a similar law to the Homeopathic Act of 1859, as was expected, but for the incorporation of a homeopathic council and college. The measure was unsatisfactory to the profession and it was dropped. The amendments to the Act

embraced in what was known as the Ontario Medical Act of 1874, were adopted by the Legislature; among other provisions merging the eclectics into the general profession, and allowing homeopathic students to put in their full time at colleges outside of the Dominion. Under the amended Act, and as the fruit of experience, there was soon a visible improvement in the proceedings of the Council and in the treatment of homeopaths. But it took time for the old fires to die out, for old passions to be calmed, for peace and harmony to prevail. There came at last, however, a realization of the fact that only by harmonious co-operation, mutual forbearance and united effort could the profession be elevated in the public esteem and its individual interests subserved. Since the passage of the Act of 1874, the law has been amended in several important particulars. An Act of the Imperial Parliament was necessary to repeal a provision of the British Medical Act, giving a person registered in Great Britain the right to demand registration in any part of the empire. Amendments were secured to the Ontario Medical Act in 1887, empowering the Council to deal with regularly registered physicians charged with unprofessional conduct. This power has so far been exercised in two cases, while others are still under trial.

In 1891 the Act was further amended, giving the Council power to strike from the register names of physicians who have refused or neglected to pay their assessments for a year, due notice being first given them by registered letter. This law has given rise to very much discussion, and some attempts were made to secure its repeal. Whatever objections may be raised to it, there is no doubt that the action of the Council was based on the belief that an annual assessment was necessary; that the profession generally had no objections to paying the trifle called for, and would approve of any measure which would compel delinquents to bear their share with the others.

The first objection to the assessment is that it is unnecessary, and would not be required if the Council had not gone to the expense of erecting a building in Toronto. To this it may be briefly answered that certain accommodations were needed by the Council, and it was thought wiser to erect a building which would be a source of revenue as