

was not a matter for consideration at all. The homœopathic physicians in Ontario might have been equal in number to all other physicians, or they might have been only one-tenth, or one-hundredth. The point was, that they, as a body, had equal powers with any other class of physicians as a body—that the Homœopathic Board was in every respect equal to any other board or body, so far as conferring licenses was concerned. The Council was, with regard to the homœopaths and other physicians, a coalition of equal bodies. And the homœopaths might, with justice, have insisted on equal representation as a condition of union. The various colleges were in a similar position. They surrendered their rights in consideration of the representation given them in the Council: and they might have demanded that the collective collegiate representation should be equal to that of the profession collectively. That these various independent bodies consented to a smaller representation in the Council than the profession at large, should not, in fairness, nor in honesty, be utilized to-day to their disadvantage, nor made the basis of an argument for a further reduction of their strength.

The statement has been made that on account of excessive representation, the colleges and the homœopaths have a predominating influence in the Council, and that the territorial representatives are in such a minority that the profession at large is powerless, and is practically unrepresented. The men who make this statement either know that they are saying what is not correct, or else they are ignorant of the proceedings of this body. The best evidence of the untruthfulness of the charge can be found by examining our records. I have been unable to find, during my connection with the Council, a single instance in which the college representatives and the territorial representatives were ranged in full opposition to each other. There has been no important action taken to which the majority of the elected representatives were opposed. As an illustration: The acts of the Council most criticised—the annual assessment and the penalty for its non-payment—have received the unanimous support of the present territorial representatives. The facts in this connection have been misrepresented, and the course followed in this case is indicative of the general style of argument used by the more violent critics of the Council. It has been stated by these gentlemen, in the medical press, that on the motion to secure this law, thirteen voted for it, only five of whom were territorial representatives, the other eight being college men and homœopaths. And the inference, of course, is that these eight last-mentioned are the parties responsible for the law. But those who use this argument, omit altogether to mention that only one territorial representative

voted against the law, and he not now a member of the Council; while three college representatives were in the opposition with him. The facts are, that the proposition was initiated by the territorial representatives, and received the support of all but one, while the college representatives were equally divided—three for and three against. As to the homœopathic representatives, they voted for it mainly because it was the wish of the territorial representatives, and they had no disposition to oppose a proposition that seemed to be the almost unanimous desire of the profession generally. Had they joined with the college representatives in voting against the law, there might have been some ground for the charge that is now so freely made as to the unholy alliance between them.

Let me make another statement in this connection. There has been no instance in which all the college representatives voted together—unless where there was a practically unanimous vote of the Council. The most important question that has been before us of late years was the advance in the curriculum of 1892; and on such a question, if on any, the colleges might be supposed to have a special interest that would lead them to unity of action. Yet here they were equally divided—four voting for the advance, and four against it. The fact is, that while there are three separate constituencies represented in the Council, there has never been during my connection with the body any attempt at legislation in the special interests of one class as opposed to the interests of any other class. But one single purpose has always governed the actions of the majority of the representatives of each class, and of a majority of the Council, and that has been to advance the interests of the profession and the public.

Twenty-four years have passed since the Council was organized as the sole governing body of the profession; twenty-eight years have passed since legislation on the lines of the present Medical Act was initiated. What has the Council done in that time to justify its creation? What has it done to entitle it to the confidence of the public?

In the first place it has accomplished whatever of good may be expected to accompany a more advanced standard of medical education. Before the time of the Council there was no uniform curriculum; and the highest in the Province was far below what we have to-day. Then, the only matriculation examination was such as the colleges required—at most, a fair common school education with a smattering of Latin; while those who came before our examining boards from colleges outside of Canada might possibly never have passed any literary test whatever. Now, a University Arts matriculation as prescribed by Government is compulsory. Then, three years spent in ostensible medical study was sufficient; now, five years