

and practice? Why should not the adage, "Let the buyer beware," apply to relations between doctor and patient, the same as it does to merchant and customer. Many answers might be given to this. I shall content myself with the following. In case of sickness the patient and his friends are not, as a rule, capable of exercising that judgment and deliberation which usually attend the ordinary transactions of life. They are, for the time, in a state of panic, the degree of which varies greatly in different individuals. Moreover, even if they were able to use their usual judgment and deliberation these would not in themselves, without previous experience, enable them to judge the value of medical service to the same degree that the ordinary man can judge of the value of what he purchases in the store or factory. Again, many cases of illness concern not only the patient and his friends, but the community at large. It may or may not be a matter of interest to the community how much an eruption on the skin of a certain individual may itch, but it decidedly is a matter of concern for the community at large to feel confident that the man who is treating that eruption is able to determine with a reasonable amount of assurance whether or not it is contagious.

These are some of the reasons why we think it to be the duty of the state to insist that the ordinary citizen should, when he calls upon a licensed practitioner, have reason to feel that he will be treated by someone of at least average intelligence and possessing a reasonable amount of special training in the diagnosis and treatment of ordinary diseases and injuries. It follows, however, as a natural sequence that the state cannot secure such a specially trained body of men without granting to them certain privileges. The question for statesmen to decide is—"Are the privileges approximately proportionate to the special responsibilities and requirements?"

I have not had time nor opportunity to trace medical legislation to its sources and learn how much of it has been prompted by those desirous of securing special privileges and how much by personally disinterested statesmen desirous only of the welfare of the people. Whatever the origin, however, the present condition is that practically all civilized nations have restrictions and regulations of some sort, and the philosophical anarchist is probably the only class of thinker who would advocate that anyone who wished be permitted to practice medicine, surgery and obstetrics for compensation.

We, of course, are particularly interested in legislation as it affects our own province. I do not think it necessary to make