of Examiners? What special right have they to determine whether my articles should be published or not? Their approbation! What right have you to exact such a compliance to a monopoly, which, if established, not only fetters the hands, but enslaves the noblest aspirations of emancipated mind! You affect a contempt for hoary-headed usages, and yet are the very first to offer an oblation at her shrine. I do not appear before your readers as the special pleader for the members of the Medical Profession. I do not address myself to them exclusively, knowing that but very few of the Faculty have had time to become acquainted with the existence of such a periodical as the Unfetterd Canadian. I do not assume the position of the apologist for any flagrancies that physicians may perpetrate, either in a professional or civil capacity; nor do I write, AS A PHYSICIAN, in the pending conroversy.

But why "sustaining an honourable position in society?" Mr. Dick does little credit to his discrimination by noticing, in the manner he has, a man whose moral character and position in society is not a sufficient guarantee to publish any thing he may write, to which he may attach his name.

"A gentleman will not insult me, and no other can."

Then, sir, as an Unfettered Canadian, I cannot acquiesce to this requirement. What assurance have you given me that an inquisitorial committee will not be as necessary to approve your articles as mine. Why react this fortification if you are to meet me in single combat! Why place the quill in my hand and the sword in yours! No, sir! we cannot subscribe to, or tolerate, so far as our personal influence extends, any monopoly, be it political, moral, physical or medical, and with the statesman of his age, I declare, "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

But, secondly, "You claim the right of calling upon me for an equal number of articles, sustaining the affirmative of the question, after the publication of my sixth negative article."

Your claim is unjust (a) because I will not grant that special right, and (b) without my assent no such right exists; (e) to assume such special right conflicts with my natural rights, ergo (f) the claim is usurped and must be unjust. For the philosophy of this reasoning, see Unfettered Cunadian, No. v. p. 116, col. 2 ph. 3.

In controversies, custom has established the principle, that the parties engaged must have a mutual understanding of what they are to discuss, and how they are to discuss. I have taken the negative of the question; and to ask me to change my position, is about as "cool" as Santa Anna's request to Gen. Taylor, asking him to surrender the field of Buens Vista, or that "ocean of polar icebergs" which you have invited us to navigate. I promise, however, to conform to your request when it is found to be to my advantage to do so; but, let this be understood, that "I never surrender without a contest."

You now perceive, sir, that I object to your two requirements. 1st. Submitting my articles to a committee of physicians for approval; and secondly, taking the affirmative of the discussion for an equal number of articles that I may have written on the negative of the question. I would submit the following "Rules" to govern in the discussion of the question at issue,—in lieu of your require requirements; to which, if you approve of amend so as to make no material alteration of sense or import, attach your name, as I will attach mine.

1st. The question to be, "If the restrictive laws which now protect the medical professions were removed, would society at large be benefitted?"

2nd. No reflection is to be cast upon corpse editorial, or, upon the members of the medical professions for any thing advanced by either of us as argument.

3rd. That whatever is written, shall be published, the writer alone being responsible for every thing which he may advance or quali-

4th. The readers of the Unfettered Canadian, to be the umpires, with whom the merits of the discussion is to rest.