

every reasonable member of the profession. There seems to be a feeling of annoyance among some that they shall annually pay the sum of \$2 towards the maintenance of the Council, which has become so obnoxious to them, and for the defraying of such necessary expenses for the conducting of examinations, registrar's salary, etc. Surely the amount is not too great for a man to pay yearly, for the support of body upon the integrity and business capacity of which, the very existence of his profession depends. If the members of the Council, individually or collectively have been either incapable, or guilty of dereliction of duty, then let the fiery cross be sent round, and let them, individually or collectively, be returned to their homes and other good men and true sent to fill their places, but do not let us in the present age complain that the impost is too much. How much does it cost a man per annum to belong to the Masonic order? Just about three times as much as to belong to the medical brotherhood by which he earns his living, and which *must*—if we do not wish to be overrun by quacks and charlatans, and if we wish our rising generation of medical men to be properly educated, and take their place in the ranks of the educated men of the world—which *must* be supported. No medical man will attempt to compare the importance to the medical profession of one or other of these institutions being maintained, and yet how many doctors—they are nearly all enthusiastic Masons, and all the better for it—pay without a murmur the amount considered necessary for the proper running of the honorable and respected Masonic machine, from the Grand Lodge down.

The Masonic body has been instanced, but the annual dues of many other secret organizations might be given to show that \$2 per year is a sum, small indeed to pay for the maintenance of the honor and dignity of the grand and noble profession. The druggists pay \$4 for their protection, which it must be admitted is not nearly so complete or certain in its working as ours. The lawyers pay about \$18, and we do not hear any revolutionary murmur in the camp. They either pay or quit the game.

The majority of the aggrieved ones, however, and it may be said to the honor of that majority, resent, not the amount to be paid, but the threat by which the "dun" is accompanied; viz., that the names of all who do not pay shall be expunged

from the register, rendering them legally unqualified to practice in Ontario, though they received their degrees and licences to practice for life many years ago. They regard the punishment as altogether out of keeping with the delinquency—that of failing to pay a trifling sum annually.

They enquire—Is not a power like this, given, in equity, if not in law *ultra vires*? Could the collection of the dues not have been secured in a fairer and less irritating manner?

The answer to the above, appears to us, who have taken some pains to get at the true inwardness of the doings of the Council as regards its financial operations, more especially as to the collection of dues, seems plain. When the annual due was \$1, many men, we fully believe from forgetfulness and the habit of procrastination, did not pay. It was not that they wished to evade the law, or get out of paying their just dues; they would have been indignant, and rightly so, if any one had seriously imputed to them the desire to sneak out of paying what they owed to the profession, \$1 per year, and yet *they did not pay*. This same habit of procrastination in the payment of small debts is not singular to those owed to the Council; would it were so.

So, many of the registered members *did not pay*. How could they be made to pay? By ordinary suit in the Division Court of the district where the delinquent lived. This proceeding was found to cost nearly as much as it came to, so that it was a sadly losing game for the Council. (See President Williams' address, CANADA LANCET, July, '92.

So far as irritation and annoyance is concerned, it cannot surely annoy a man who intends to pay his dues, to have certain penalties attached to his non-payment of them. It is not fair that some should pay, and some go scot free. Yet this was exactly what was happening under the old régime, in spite of the powers vested in the Council, for it did not pay to collect by an ordinary suit at law the dues owing the Council, and necessary for its proper maintenance. If any due is necessary, and if \$2 in a year is not too much, both of which propositions seem clear, what difference can it make to an honest man who intends to pay, what penalty is attached to his non-payment, even were that penalty—death by hanging!