

Practitioners who happen to be teachers in medical schools are, in common with other members of the profession, assessed, and, possibly, they pay their tax, but they do it in their individual, not in their corporate capacity. As institutions, the universities and schools do not in this, or in any other way, directly or indirectly, pay anything towards the maintenance of the Council. Harnessed with the profession in an unequal team, they have been content to appropriate most of the fodder, and to shift their share of the load upon their less self-assertive and more patient yoke-mate. They have grown plump, and are yearly waxing fatter, if not at the expense of the profession, certainly to its great detriment. It is not even a fact that the schools send the men to the Council for examination. The very reverse is the case—it is the Council that sends the men to the schools for preparation. In their favour, it has practically closed the Province of Ontario against the world, in the matter of medical education. One of our medical school deans, in a document lately addressed to the Government, claims that under the system of provincial policy so rigidly enforced by the Medical Council, his particular medical factory alone has three hundred inchoate doctors on the way to completion. Three hundred medical students at \$100 each for the session, give that one school an annual income of \$30,000. Doubtless each of the three other universities will admit that it has as large an attendance and as many dollars. Surely, wealthy institutions, whose magnificent emoluments would so largely vanish but for the fostering care of the Council, can each afford, if necessary, to pay \$300 or \$400 annually towards the support of this beneficent outcome of their own creative ingenuity. They are quick in the assertion of their rights real or fictitious—why so tardy in the recognition of their obvious duties? In the persons of their respective presidents and provosts, they interposed themselves between the profession and the legislature, last spring, in a strenuous though vain effort to assist the Council to frustrate the wishes of the electorate. I submit to President Loudon and to Rev. Provost Boddy, and to the several university senates, whether, when it is looked into, there does not appear to be something pitifully small in the action, as well as in the want of action, of their respective establish-

ments, in this matter. To zealously claim the privileges pertaining to a position, while ignoring its moral obligations, and systematically evading the pecuniary duties attached to it, is, perhaps, no more than might have been expected from petty money making corporations such as mere medical schools; but when our great universities which are almost national in character are found stooping to the same level, one is surprised indeed.

A body constituted, as the Medical Council is, with dual relations, clearly may not impose a tax, or even seek power to impose a tax, as if it were homogeneous and purely elective, like the executives of other professions. If it seeks power to assess both constituencies, such power can only be righteously conferred on it, conditional to the assessment being equitably adjusted between the two, and if only to levy an impost on one, legal authorization can only be properly given or sought for with the explicit and unanimous consent of that electoral element. I am prepared to show, and in due time I will show, that neither the universal nor general consent of the profession was ever obtained or honestly sought after. I attempted at the time to voice the feeling of hundreds of my fellow practitioners by exclaiming against the injustice which had been perpetrated, and by declaring, both privately and publicly, that I never would, except on compulsion, and under protest, pay the so-called annual fee. Now, Sir, I hope to completely enlighten you before I finish this discussion, but probably you can already dimly perceive one reason why to answer your question "the tax is not paid." Unless it be levied with the universal concurrence of the electorate, such an impost is justified, and becomes a debt of conscience to the individual members of the profession, only when it is assessed impartially. However strictly an assessment, which violates this fundamental principle, may have the sanction of law, the higher and holier sanction of equity warrants its repudiation by all concerned. A man may not palter with his conscience and self-respect by paying an unjust tax, because the amount of money demanded is insignificant, or because it is easier to submit and pay, than to stiffen the spine and refuse. If the only alternative presented be, to conform to an iniquitous statutory enactment, or, by its determined resistance,