

5th. That when an argument is submitted to the umpires, after it has been reviewed, it is not again to be discussed or re-cited.

6th. That either party shall have the privilege of closing the discussion by giving notice to that effect, the opposite party having permission to write one article after said notice shall have been given.

7th. A synopsis of the arguments to be written out by both parties, after the close of the discussion, and published in the same number of the *Unfettered Canadian*.

Signed,

ROBERT DICK.
N. B. WOLFE.

I will proceed in my next letter to review the article in No. V. of your publication, and I hope sir to be able to show you that your position is weak and untenable; and your readers as integrals of the community, that there best interests are consulted by perpetuating the restrictive laws "which now protect the medical profession."—I would ask for a suspension of judgment until both parties shall have been heard, and I trust that no feeling of prejudice or rancour will be permitted to do injustice to an impartial investigation of the subject at issue.

With considerations of high regard

I am respectfully

Your's &c.,

N. B. WOLFE.

Prince Albert, Reach, }
Sept. 1st, 1849. }

REPLY.

Our friend errs, in supposing that we intended, or wished, to submit all his articles to a board of inquisitors: indeed we never expected to have the *least occasion* to submit even one of them to such a board; feeling confident that nothing could proceed from his pen, which we could hesitate one moment to publish—what we said was designed wholly for his benefit—that he might be assured, that no cowardly advantage would be taken of the power which we hold as editor of the "U. C.", in closing its columns against his communications, when they became, to us, unanswerable. But surely no one will blame us for refusing to publish

that, which three respectable men cannot be found to sanction. To satisfy Dr. Wolfe, however, that we intended no monopoly—that we ask no advantage—we cheerfully agree, to publish nothing in this discussion, which we cannot find three respectable men to sanction.

Our friend's conception, or interpretation of our claiming the right to throw him on the affirmative after a certain time, is positively so ludicrous, as to put all gravity at defiance. We have labored hard to shun the conclusion, that the Dr. *really fancies*, that we actually expected him to turn round, and annihilate his own positions! To take the affirmative of the identical question, the negative of which, he had labored through six articles to establish as sound and true!!! This, he calls cool as the demand of Santa Anna at Buena Vista—Cool! we can assure our friend, that we feel it to be humiliating, and mortifying in the extreme, to have such consummate folly attributed to us.

Dr. Wolfe will doubtless admit that he ought to take our positions as we state them—that he should not find fault with what he has not read—for certainly a single glance at the *passage* will convince him, that he has committed a gross and ludicrous blunder; as it is utterly impossible to force from it, the meaning which roused his indignation. Here it is—"I shall claim the right, however, of calling upon you to sustain the affirmative, after the publication of your sixth communication for an equal number of articles; THE QUESTION TO BE—*Are the restrictive laws which now protect the medical profession, beneficial to society at large?* Why did our friend not discover that we had inverted the sides of his question? why did he not perceive that the negative in *his* question is the affirmative in ours? and that if *both* questions are discussed, he who takes the negative of the first, *must* take the affirmative of the second, unless he abandons his own position and adopts that of his antagonist? all this our friend would have readily perceived, had he read our note with the least degree of attention—and that we had not the most distant intention of asking him to relinquish his opinions, or to "surrender without a contest"—that we only asked him to bear the "*burden of proof*"