

## REPLY.

Independently of the foregoing, and by way, we presume, of giving as much currency as possible to his lucubrations, Mr. Linton has seen fit to *advertise* his letter in the Montreal Pilot, an evening newspaper of note in this city, with some prefatory remarks based upon an extract from our own leading article in our April number, and to the effect, "that the attention of the *Attorney General West* had been called to this question, who stated that "there was some room for doubt, and that the question is one to be decided by the Courts of Law, and that preceding such decision any person practising in Upper Canada, on a License from the Licensing Board of Lower Canada alone must do so on his own responsibility." We will now exhibit the peculiarity of Mr. Linton's *honesty* in quoting. Any one would suppose that this was the tenor of our article on the subject. But far different is the fact. On the next page of our journal and in continuation will be found the following: "on this subject *we are authorized* to state that these officers do not consider themselves in duty bound either to prosecute for, or give opinions on the construction of the Law to Corporate bodies, but that they think it the better course to leave corporations or individuals to prosecute their own cases, and that if *this is done in reference to the disputed point, the Courts of Law must decide in favour of the value of the college licenses WITH costs.*" Mr. Linton's honesty in quoting just so much of an editorial as suits his purpose is thus shewn. In controversy we can recognise no more reprehensible, we were going to say contemptible, practise than this.

Mr. Linton accuses us of "defaming" him. This we deny in toto; and we opine it will be difficult for him to show it. If proving that a Law officer is ignorant of the Law is defamation, then we certainly plead guilty, and to this we adhere. Nor do we think that Mr. Linton has afforded us any grounds for altering that opinion.

Either the act which enables a Licentiate of one Province to practice in the other is of some effect or of none. If the latter, then the sooner it is expunged from the statute book the better, and to this complexion would it come if a Licentiate were compelled to take out another license in that Province in which he proposes to dwell. But the licenses are in both cases *bona fide* and good, and the act alluded to expressly declares, and this in terms so plain that he who runs may read it, that "any person who is or shall be duly licensed or authorized "to practice as a Physician or Surgeon, or both, either in that part of the Province called Upper Canada or in that part of the Province called Lower Canada, under the laws in force in the said portions of this Province respectively, "shall be, and is hereby authorized to practice in any part of the Province." But now come the Pons Asini.—The act further declares "but subject to the "laws to which other practitioners are or shall be subject in the portion of the "province in which he shall practice." If according to Mr. Linton this means that the already licensed individual must take out another license before he can practice, it is perfectly plain that this last clause would then negative the obvious intention of the whole Bill, which was the very opposite; and well might we have exclaimed at such a piece of legislative absurdity. No: it implies in few words, that the licentiate shall conform to all those regulations or laws which the