

The remarks, which we now intend to make, have chiefly reference to the signatures to the protest, and in these we intend to be as brief as possible. 1st, With reference to the signature of Dr. Robitaille, we ask Dr. Coderre why, even admitting the conversation to which he alludes to have taken place, and which we certainly did not hear—we ask, why was not the Christian name added? What was the object to be gained by the omission of the Christian name in this, as well as other instances in the protest. Was it that the name of one known to the profession should be mistaken for one unknown to it? We pause, in this case, for a reply. The authority which dictated the use of the surname, most surely also dictated the use of the Christian name, and why was that Christian name omitted in the protest? Let Dr. Coderre answer this.

2. With reference to Dr. Badeau: Dr. Coderre's reason for having entered this gentleman's name in the protest, is no reason at all. Dr. Badeau sought amendments in the act, which every member of the corporation is seeking, but not a repeal. Dr. Coderre admits having used Dr. Badeau's name without authority, and attempts a most lame excuse, without even an apology for his fault.

3. As to the name of Dr. Dubé, Dr. Coderre admits his error.

4. As to the name of Dr. Tassé. In this case, the publication of a letter under his signature, compels us to place him in a singular position. We mentioned his name on authority. The same authority now permits us to use their names—and that authority is Drs. Arnoldi and Sutherland, to whom Dr. Tassé distinctly stated, that he had given *no* permission to Dr. Coderre to use his name in the protest. We thus adduce two witnesses of the fact of his having done so.—Dr. Tassé's subsequent denial, by no means disproves the fact. Misconception might arise in the case of one witness—"Unus testis, nullus testis"—but "in the mouth of two witnesses shall the truth be established."

There is a point, however, in Dr. Coderre's remarks concerning Dr. Badeau, which we intend to notice in a special manner, as it demonstrates to a nicety the petty devices to which the party stoops for the purpose of kindling and maintaining an enmity against the Institution. We proclaim it to be utterly unworthy of every right-minded member of the Profession; and as we are perfectly persuaded that not one-half of the Canadian country practitioners have seen the Bill to read it and study it for themselves, the attempt at the perversion of its spirit and obvious import, is the more

to be condemned. We will now translate the passage:—"Since the operation of the Act itself, there is no longer protection for those who are not members of the Corporation; and more than *two-thirds* of the practitioners of the Province are in this situation, and none of them can become members of this Corporation except after *four years' probation*; that is to say, four years after having made application to become a member." Where, we ask Dr. Coderre, is his authority for this wanton statement. Is it to be found in the Act? Let us see. "And be it enacted, that the College of Physicians and Surgeons shall have power . . . 4thly. To fix the *period of probation* which persons must undergo before being eligible for election as members of the College, which *period shall not be less than four years*," &c., &c. And again: "Be it enacted, that all persons obtaining the certificate for license to practice from the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Lower Canada, shall be styled Licentiates of the said College, and be, *consequently* in due course of time*, eligible to be elected members of the same." Any person reading these extracts, cannot fail to notice an explanatory connexion between them. What is the "*due course of time*"—the probational "*period of not less than four years*?" When does this probational period commence? From the date of the "*certificate for license*!" And in the first instance, this rule is made to apply to all who were licensed before the passing of the Act; and in the second, to those licensed subsequently; and we must here deliberately state this as our conviction, that a mind, only, imbued with an overweening desire of making its possessor notorious, and unscrupulous as to the means by which it may effect its object, can put any other construction upon these extracts.

Based upon this fair and legitimate construction of the act was the conduct of the members of the corporation at its last meeting in Quebec; and the bye-law framed in accordance with it. Every member of the profession, who had been a licentiate of four years standing, was at once admitted a member of the corporation upon merely signifying his desire to either of the District Secretaries, any time before the October meeting of the Board. Thus, and at the first oppor-

* Words are sometimes, in argument, unfortunate things, and prove stumbling blocks to those who cannot appreciate their value. Were this adverb omitted, Dr. Coderre's argument would even then not be worth the trouble of refuting, for the act would declare, that any subsequent member would have to renew his license, or obtain a "*certificate of license from the College*." This would then be the strict legal and logical interpretation of the act. The use of the adverb, coupled with the words which follow, "*in due course of time*," so clearly indicates the meaning of the words, "*period of probation*," and its commencement, as to render any further remark a work of supererogation.