

petroleum on it? Are you going to refuse to extinguish it with water because water is too wet? Or are you going to attempt to quench the fire by squirting at it a half-and-half mixture of coal oil and water in the shape of an independent representative? Have your independent candidates any strong convictions on the burning issues of the hour? If not, what do you want with them? And if they have strong convictions and are afraid to express them, what do you want with them?

*You have been assured that the Defence men are hot-heads prepared to imperil the essential features of the Ontario Medical Act. Do you believe it?*

4. We affirm the principle of self-government and firmly believe we shall eventually secure it, but we propose to do nothing rashly. We design to proceed warily—patiently and undeviatingly working towards the desired goal and going just as far and as fast as we can carry the whole body of professional and public and legislative opinion with us. We have at our command now means of moulding and arousing professional and public and legislative opinion that were far beyond our reach in the past, and we propose to use them ceaselessly till our end is attained. We have learned that by concerted action on our part we can bring to bear a pressure on the Government, and a force and influence on the Legislature, that assure us of success. Say the emissaries of the schools, "We doctors in Ontario in our Medical Act have a good thing and we do not want to lose it." And this is urged in a manner to imply that we have a superlatively good thing—that we have, in the way of legislation, more than other professions have, and more than justly belongs to us, and that in trying to improve it we run the risk of losing what we have. We deny both these propositions. We deny that we have more than is justly ours, and we

deny that we have as much in the way of legislative privileges as other professions have, and we deny that the Legislature could be induced to treat us less justly than other professions, by taking away what we have, or by refusing us what we ask for, always provided we ask only for what is justly ours, and can show that, in granting our requests, the Legislature will be doing nothing detrimental to the well-being of the community or to the interests of the public. Our Association contains hundreds of the most conservative and cautious and clear-sighted men in the profession, and we propose to proceed only as far and as fast as we can develop a general consensus of professional opinion to give weight to our demands and a general consensus of public and legislative opinion in favor of granting the relief we seek.

*Have you any guarantee or proof of wisdom and moderation on our part?*

5. On that point the history of the Legislation of 1893 is suggestive. Before that was obtained, you were assured on every hand that we proposed to do dreadful things. By means of *Medical Journal* editorials, and Medical Council pronouncements, and *procured* Medical Association resolutions, and the agony headings of petitions circulated among you, and peripatetic calamity prophets like the independent candidates and old Council emissaries now at work, you were warned and assured that we intended to overthrow the Medical Council, and to destroy the Central Board of Examiners, and to tear down the curriculum, and to upset the Medical Act. And we were told that we could not carry one of the amendments we were asking for. Yet with but one exception, for refusing which there was at the time a strong political necessity, we carried every provision in our bill? Why? Because we were careful to carry with us the public opinion.