

in harmony with fact. The Council, however, accomplished its purpose, and by retroactive, the most offensive of all kinds of legislation, succeeded in robbing the members of the profession of a vested right which cost them years of study and thousands of dollars to obtain. Is it to be wondered, Mr. Editor, that there have been twenty years of irritation, if not of rebellion against an Act so arbitrary and unjust? The members of our profession are as sensitive of their honor as any class of men in the world, and are prepared cheerfully to meet all their just and lawful obligations, but they felt in honour bound to resist the annual tax, and this resistance is almost universal. No fewer than 4,227 letters during a decade of years have been sent out to the members of the College, by the Solicitor of the Council, demanding payment on penalty of process of law. Several hundred medical men have been dragged into the Division Courts and subjected to the costs and annoyances of law suits. But all these methods of treatment, though heroic in their character, most signally failed to bring the profession into line. Something more radical was necessary, and then came the Dernier ressort. As already pointed out in a previous letter, the Council with the lights turned down, in order to keep the profession in profound ignorance of its purpose, secured the now notorious legislation of 1891, with its far-reaching powers, by which the Council could erase the names from the register of all who still refuse to pay up its demands, and if any dare to sell a pill or push a lance, after erasure, the Council had in store for him a fine of \$100 with costs, and a cell in a common gaol. Well, sir, with the terrors of this terrific law hanging over their heads what was the result? No doubt many paid from sheer fear of extinction as practitioners, but notwithstanding all the terrors of the law and the firm and systematic methods adopted by the

Council for its enforcement, there were at the close of 1892, 1,295 who refused to bow the knee to Baal and pay the tribute. I venture the assertion that there are not from Sarnia to Cornwall three hundred medical men who willingly or cheerfully pay the annual tax. What is the reason for this resistance, which no methods, even the most crucial, can tame or conquer? Is it, as the Council asserts, dishonesty? Not even our worst enemies, excepting always the Council, will believe this. We must look elsewhere for the solution of a resistance so determined, so persistent, so irrepressible, so universal, and it is this: the imposition of a tax infringes upon a vested right, if life duration which every practitioner secured for himself prior to 1874, and it violates the fundamental principles which underlie all taxation, viz., that the men who demand and spend the tax shall be subject every one of them to the votes of those taxed. Upon this principle the whole profession takes its stand in its resistance of the Council's arbitrary invasion of its rights. I believe I voice the views of my fellow practitioners when I say that I am willing to pay \$2, \$10 or \$20 per annum for the maintenance of the Council upon two conditions:—*First*, that every man who imposes and spends any money shall be amenable to the votes of the profession; and *second*, that after the application of the most rigid economy in the management of Council affairs it becomes evident that an annual tax is necessary. But so long as the present reckless era of speculation and extravagance prevails; so long as members of the Council sup their porridge at their own fire side, dine in their own banqueting halls, slumber and dream complacently on their own couches, and then demand and take out of our treasury for these valuable services to the profession \$3.50 per day, under the deceitful misnomer of hotel expenses; so