

In the same number of the *Chronicle* we gave our opinion upon the position of the College towards unlicensed practitioners, and of the duty which its members expected her to do, now we need no more than renew it. Of three letters we have selected one for publication—that from Dr. Chamberlin of Fredrichsburg,—from the others we excerpt their answers to the charges, which are their only portions relevant to the subject under discussion. We shall, however, retain them, and if desired, print them *in extenso*. We have been called upon to furnish the true name and address of “a Veritable M.D.” In reply we have to say that he desires us not to divulge them for the present.

Dr. C.’s letter will be found under the heading of Correspondence. It will be observed he stigmatizes the charge of encouraging quackery as “a falsehood and a slander,” and in reply to the second accusation enters upon certain explanations of an interesting kind.

The second of the three gentlemen is Dr. Stephen Sewell Foster of Knowlton, Brome. He says:—“As relates to my having an unlicensed medical man in my employ, I have not, nor never had. I have had students only.”

The third is Dr. Brigham of Philipsburg; he answers, referring to his calumniator:—“I also wish him to give my assistant’s name, for those who know me, know the affording my countenance to quacks and quackery, is about the last charge to which I am really obnoxious.”

To the charge of not putting down quackery, both Drs. F. and B. retort upon us the disgraceful example which Montreal, with all her vaunted superiority, is setting other parts of Canada over which, in medicine, she usurps pre-eminence. We admit the force of the observation, but with qualification; Montreal is at present, from her imbecility in the Tumblety affair, an object of pity, or scorn as you please; but who makes her so? It is not the individual members of the profession,—they have nothing to do with taking out actions against unlicensed practitioners, they have neither the ability nor the business to do so; these lay entirely with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, C.E.; for these she was mainly incorporated, and in these she is sustained by the Legislative powers with which she is vested. She can prosecute, and with prospect of her suit not only being entertained, but becoming successful if her officers, who are the proper parties to interfere, choose to bestir themselves and appeal in her behalf, as her representatives. The comparison, then, is not just, for the parallelism cannot be carried out; you in Bedford are officers of this body,—we who write are not. And here again, for further elucidation of this point, we refer to the editorial before quoted, the expressions in which we reiterate.