

other than postage. In connection with this same provision, the Act was made retroactive ; this is said to be an unprecedented thing. What does this retroactive feature mean ? It simply means this : That men who have been taking advantage of their fellow-practitioners for years, shall now be compelled to pay their fair share. It means, that they shall not be allowed to plead the Statute of Limitations, but at this late day, they shall pay as others have done. Could justice demand less ?

It has been urged very strongly that the taking out of an annual certificate is derogatory to the profession—that it is humiliating—that it is placing you on a par with the hackman who requires to take out an annual license. The members of the profession are supposed to be so very dignified in their make-up, that they should not be asked to pay their just debts, and get a receipt, under the more genteel title of a certificate. Yet, some of these gentlemen, but yesterday so pachydermatous in their make-up, that they could be pierced only in the Division Court, now so sensitive, cannot stand this provision !

Are we children ? Are we hypercritical wise-acres ? Or are we men ?

Gentlemen, we are not the only incorporated body, the members of which are required to pay promptly an annual fee. The druggists have a provision by which every man who keeps a drug store must pay \$4 per annum for his license. To pay this he is allowed till the first of May, otherwise he loses his license. Then, there is the legal profession. We have never found members of the legal profession backward in looking after their rights. We have never found them backward in standing up for liberty. The annual fees in their profession amount to about \$18, and they are allowed to the last day in Michaelmas term to make payment and obtain the annual certificate. If after that time the amount is not paid, the right to practise is lost and they are subject to fine. We hear no outcry about their being humiliated or their liberties curtailed. Now, gentlemen, surely members of the medical profession are not so much more sensitive than those I have mentioned, that they should object to being asked to contribute their professional fee after being given twelve months in which to pay it, and two months' notice being required before any action can be taken.

The annual certificate is objected to because they say we had a right under our diplomas to practise without a fee during good behaviour. Unfortunately, diplomas do not undertake to cover everything. Previous to 1865 as now, each of the universities granted diplomas. These diplomas did not entitle to practise medicine, but they were received by the Government as proof that the person had the required professional knowledge, and upon the production of other testimonials "required by law in that behalf," the Government granted a license. The licentiates of the Medical Boards obtained licenses to