

senter au bureau sans imposture ces aspirants.

Si le Dr. Hall prend connaissance de ceci et veut me faire l'honneur d'une traduction pour l'insérer dans son journal, il aura atteint le but qu'il avait sans doute le dessein de toucher en provoquant une telle explication.

En insérant ce que dessus dans votre intéressant journal, vous obligerez, M. l'éditeur,

Votre très-obéissant serviteur,

M. P. DE SALES LATERRIERE, M.P.P.  
Toronto, le 7 Juillet, 1851.

The above communication from Dr. Laterriere, purporting to be an answer to the questions proposed to him, succinctly enough, in our last number, has appeared in the *Quebec Canadien*, and *Montreal Minerve*; and we have (since the copy in French received directly from Dr. L. himself, which we handed to the printer and was immediately set up,) seen it translated in the *Toronto Globe*. We assure Dr. L. that we tried our best to get it translated before sending it to the printer but partaking as it did so much of the style of Marivaux, Rabelais, or Brantome, whom he appeared desirous of imitating, we at last were compelled to follow the original, as best exhibiting the originality of the author, from which, we assure him, we are not desirous of detracting in the least.

In our last number, we proposed to Dr. L. four distinct questions, to which we requested replies, seriatim. Our space forbids us re-publishing them; yet, on reference to them, we submit it as a question of common sense to any man who is not devoid of it, to say whether he has answered one. It may be convenient for Dr. Laterriere to say, "that the committee has no account to render to Dr. Hall for its motives." Dr. Hall never questioned the motives of the committee; Dr. Hall did judge the motives of those who moved the Bill, based upon the provisions of the Bill;

and if words can express an intention, and if from an intention it be possible to deduce a motive, then were we clearly justified. To understand or divine the motives which influence or guide a committee of the House, is, we apprehend, about as difficult a matter as to determine for any succeeding day, which way a modern Thersites would wear his jacket—whether inside out or outside in.\*

While Dr. Laterriere has, however, found it unsuited to both his tastes and objects to furnish categorical answers to the queries proposed to him, he has furnished us a few hares to hunt—a chase in which we feel bound to follow him.

Dr. L. says, "the committee composed of the Hon. Mr. Badgley, Drs. Bouthillier, Fortier, Taché, and your servant, (Dr. L.) to which were referred the petitions of the Physicians of Quebec and of Montreal, made their reports in recommending unanimously the passing into law of the Bill in question." From this it would be inferred, and justly too, that the "unanimous recommendation" was founded upon the representations in the two petitions adverted to. But how stand the facts of the case? The petition of the Quebec Physicians, which we give on another page, exempts graduates from the *United Kingdom* from undergoing examination by the Provincial Board, while the Bill (which thus appears to be Dr. L.'s especial bantling,) goes farther and exempts *none*. The petition from the district of Montreal, is signed by fifty-one medical men, and

\* In 1847, Dr. Laterriere supported the Bill as it now stands, awarding full honors to British degrees and diplomas. In 1849, he was still of the same opinion, as we have been informed. In 1850, he desired to degrade the honors of the Canadian Universities, only. In Jan. 1851, he was of the same opinion. He was still of the same opinion in May 1851. In one month afterwards, he proposes to demolish all honors, whencesoever derived, at one swoop.