

istered practitioners; it was similar to competing with quacks.

Dr. DEWAR referred to examples in his locality, in which the Judge refused to acknowledge a practitioner as a medical man because he was not registered.

Dr. BERRYMAN believed in vested rights, and he believed that if the case to which Dr. Dewar referred had been carried to a higher court, he would have been sustained, if the person alluded to had obtained a Provincial License.

Dr. HALL and Dr. HAMILTON both differed from Dr. Berryman in the matter of vested rights. Parliament could take away many rights and substitute other rights in their stead.

Dr. ALLAN continued the discussion on the matter of Registration; he said either those who registered have been wronged in paying their registration fee, or otherwise those unregistered should be compelled to register.

Dr. AGNEW did not think that we could compel any of those licensed practitioners to register.

Dr. MCGILL asked what action can this Council take? These men cannot collect by law, and cannot hold certain official positions—these are the only punishments provided in the law. He deprecated this Council attempting to prosecute. He thought it was really too bad that 500 out of the 1,800 practitioners residing in Ontario had not registered.

Dr. CLARKE read from the Act, showing that all unregistered practitioners are regarded as unqualified and liable to all the penalties of the Act.

Dr. HAMILTON thought that under any circumstance, there appears to be a great diversity of opinion in reference to what power the Act grants. He thought before any action was taken they should consult a law officer of the Crown.

Dr. OLDRIGHT pointed out that certain men, such as "Dr." Andrews, of Toronto, adopt a course in which it is difficult to secure a hold upon them, viz.—in not charging for their services or advice, but make up for it by charging for their medicines.

Dr. DAY referred to another case of an individual who never was able to obtain, and perhaps would never have been able to obtain a diploma here; yet he practises and imposes on the public by issuing large posters and flaming advertisements, representing himself as a great physician. This man had, however, not long ago received a license, and by means of it, registered, and by force of law, was able to secure arrears for six years past. This man was a perfect quack. Something was needed to prevent this sort of thing.

Dr. CAMPBELL pointed out that no penalty existed for practising without registration, but for falsely pretending to be registered. The first clause was then carried.

In discussing the clause, having reference to fixing the residence of the Registrar in the city of Toronto—

Dr. HAMILTON thought the committee had failed to show why it was necessary that the Registrar should live in Toronto.

Dr. BERRYMAN considered that, as the Registrar's business was chiefly through the Post Office, it mat-

tered but little to the Council whether he lived in Hamilton or Toronto, while it might greatly discommode the Registrar.

Dr. MOSRYN explained that Dr. Aikins had acted for four years gratuitously as Treasurer, and had frequently to come to Hamilton to do business with the Registrar. It was, therefore, to enable them to consult and transact business with as little disadvantage to each other as possible.

Dr. MCGILL thought that it would be imprudent to fix the residence of the Registrar in Toronto, until the Council permanently met in that place.

Dr. AIKINS cited instances where the difficulty was very great; as one instance, he mentioned the fact that a letter had been sent to the Registrar, asking certain information in reference to a business matter with a gentleman some distance from Toronto. One month after he had sent the letter to the Registrar he received a letter from the party saying that the Registrar told him to remind the Treasurer of it, intimating a slackness on the part of the Treasurer in performing his duties, when he (the Treasurer) had actually waited for a month for a reply from the Registrar. He frequently, of necessity, had to go to Hamilton to transact business at a loss to himself, while if the Registrar lived in the same place as the Treasurer, these things would not be so frequently occurring. The two officers should reside in the same place, whether it be Hamilton, Toronto, or any other place.

Dr. AGNEW pointed out that the report advised the change as a matter of convenience.

Dr. MCGILL also referred to the non-payment of a printing account which he did not understand, but which might be obviated by the two residing together.

Dr. AIKINS explained that the account referred to by Dr. McGill, was not audited, and therefore could not be paid.

Dr. CLARK and Dr. ALLAN explained that the Registrar was unable to pay all the accounts when called upon to do so, owing to the fact that they were not audited, and he had no authority to pay an account that was not audited.

Dr. CLARKE thought that all would allow it would be advantageous for the Treasurer and Registrar to reside in the same place, but until the Council was permanently located in Toronto, it would be better to wait.

Dr. ALLAN considered that the location of these two offices had nothing to do with location of the Council meeting.

Dr. HAMILTON advocated the fixing of the place of meeting in Toronto, and would be willing yet to aid in erecting a building for their own use. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. AIKINS explained that he would feel compelled to resign, if he was not placed in a position to obtain readily, without detriment to himself as Treasurer, information due from the Registrar.

Dr. STRANGE, Registrar, was heard in reply to the charge of Dr. Aikins, and explained that as he had not been notified by Dr. Aikins, he was not in a position to say whether he had received the letter of Dr. Aikins or not. He acknowledged that he had written the letter read by Dr. Aikins, but did not intend to convey any censure by using the word