

flicted on any person who should have practised Physic or Surgery, without being duly *licensed* to do so; the information charges the defendant with having practised Physic and Surgery, without being *qualified* to do so. Now these words have a widely different signification; besides, if I convict the defendant, I must convict her of the charge laid in the information, which must be in accordance with the Statute; for the conviction, information, and Statute must agree,—in this case they do not agree.—The information, therefore, having charged the defendant with the commission of an offence not specified in the Statute, I dismiss it, with costs against the College.—*Gazette.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the British American Journal.

Toronto, May 28th, 1850.

DEAR SIR,—It is but a few days ago that the May number of your excellent Journal fell into my hands. While according to it the high praise which this number, even more than many others, deserves, I was startled at finding, under the head of Correspondence, a most extraordinary effusion signed "A Country Practitioner." If this displayed *only* ignorance, it might excite pity, but its gross ignorance is surpassed by its malevolence and malignant misrepresentations. With rather an extensive acquaintance among the Practitioners of the Home District and City of Toronto, I am happy to say I do not know of one whom I can suspect of this atrocious slander. But I proceed to particulars illustrative of the ignorance and falsity of this production.

The account of the proceedings of Convocation are garbled and falsified. Passing over the statement of the "trickish subtlety" of "some of the legal members," the assertion of "the artful manœuvring of the medical aspirants to the vacant chair of Practical Anatomy" is a foul falsehood. In the first place, to this day it is not known that there is in Convocation more than one *supposed* "aspirant" to this Chair, viz., James H. Richardson, M.B.; and whether or not, it would puzzle "A Country Practitioner" to shew how these aspirants could be affected by any proceedings in Convocation.

The expression—"the shameful inconsistency of the High Church party"—betrays the *doven foot*, and is quite consistent with the *devil's* tendency of the letter in

question:—the old gentleman with the tail and horns being, on what even Dissenters allow to be good authority, the father of lies. The "Country Practitioner" informs you that the gentleman who was elected Pro-Vice-Chancellor is "a beardless youth"—one of those who "exhibited a total absence of all discipline, dignity, and reverence for their seniors and superiors"!!! Now, without pretending to recollect whether it be twelve, fourteen or fifteen years since Mr. W. L. Smith obtained the manly appendage of a beard, or to know how often he has shaved during the three or four years of his married life, a very slight glance at his muzzle would at once stamp your correspondent as belonging to the progeny above alluded to.

Again:—His complaints and observations in regard to the "Members and Dignitaries" of the University belonging to the Medical Profession, are on a par with the foregoing. *It is not true* that "the University has proved a stumbling-block to us." (Us, indeed!!—the country practitioners have not much to boast of in their *self-selected* representative!) *It is not true* that "its functionaries, except Doctors King and Nicol, have openly arrayed themselves against us (us!) in all our endeavours to obtain an Act of Incorporation." *It is not true* that the magniloquent "hero of the lancet" "*cannot* be a candidate for, nor Professor of, any office in the new College" because—mark Sir, BECAUSE!—he is not "a member of King's College," but more probably because his *acquirements* are on a par with his *veracity*! *It is not true* that "they" (the Convocation) "have the power to enforce" the above imaginary grievance; *nor can it be true by any possibility* that "undoubtedly they will do so." The statement that the Convocation have any voice whatever in the choice of any Professor is *utterly untrue.*

The classical "way" of settling these difficulties may, however, be applicable to the final choice of the Professor of Practical Anatomy; but it can be applied only in the Senate or by the Executive. It is supposed that the candidates are—Doctor Rolph, of political notoriety, Dr. Richardson, Dr. Deazley, Mr. Norman Bethune, and perhaps two more. To which of these does the "Country Practitioner" refer?—which "*three*" of the above are "members of the College"?

The paragraph in which our amiable friend alludes to the merits of these "*three* members of the College" can excite nothing