

effectively discharged by a single person as by their division among many laborers. Upon this principle universities and licensing boards have founded a stringent rule which expressly declares that *no ticket will be recognized which emanates from a teacher who lectures upon two dissimilar branches*. The regulations of the Royal College of Surgeons, England, say, "certificates will not be received on more than one branch of science from one and the same lecturer." The same law is enforced by the Royal Colleges of Surgeons, Ireland, of Edinburgh, &c., by the Army and Navy Medical Boards, &c. &c. It is equally binding in Canada, at least in the eastern section. The only exceptions ever made are in favor of anatomy and physiology and practical anatomy, which *two* branches may be taught by one person, and in favor of clinical medicine and practice of medicine—of clinical surgery and surgery. Apply these laws to the classes of Queen's College, and of what value is her tickets. In Kingston, of course, they all pass current, but unfortunately she is no rule of authority, and she does not follow the observances of at least older if not of wiser heads, so that elsewhere than at home her clinical medicine and surgery will destroy each other because taught by one individual. Her midwifery and forensic medicine equally useless for the same party is engaged in teaching the two. Her Chemistry, also worthless, because taught in connection with mechanical philosophy, and with natural philosophy.

And now our rejoinder is ended. We have vindicated our veracity which was impeached and endeavored to serve the cause of truth. The editorial calling out the 'reply,' preceded its appearance by four months. It is not easy to understand why there should have been so long an interregnum of peace. While evidently the 'Reply' ought not to have required such protracted elaboration, it is equally palpable that it has been brought out at a time when students are making up their minds as to what schools they shall attend during the forthcoming session. While the ostensible reason of its publication is to contravert our statements, yet undoubtedly its writer would not be much disappointed if two other ends were subserved. 1st, The acquisition of public notoriety for himself and school. 2nd, securing public sympathy for an avowed persecution, for these are the stereotyped motives which actuate men under similar circumstances. To the readers of the 'Reply' it may appear our answer should not stop here, for there are many vulnerable parts in the production besides those considered, through which our lance might readily enter, and despoil the writer. But we care not for more than justifying our original position. Our adversary has prevented further