scientious change of opinion on any given subject was dishonorable, and is a heinous offence in your eyes, if the conversion does not accord with your views. You express great astonishment at my "sudden conversion," and add: "no one was more, bitterly opposed to the Bill at Toronto," &c. Why did you not say, "on the first day," which would have been strictly true. As I said in my paper, "it was not until the second day's proceedings of the Association, when this matter had been discussed and agitated by h in and out of the meeting, that I, and I may salely add we, began to understand the Act." If I have not sufficiently explained my reasons for my conversion in my "analysis," I will not now tire your readers, nor take up your valuable space, by an attempt to do so, as it would only be a repetition of what I then said, and still think, and which any one may read that is interested.

Now, gentlemen, although I have been guilty of the great crime of differing in opinion with you on this subject generally, it is a satisfaction to see that you admit with me, "that the Act so far as relates to the penal clauses is a good measure."

The undignified taunt about seeking to amend "our own Act based on the Ontario Medical Act of 1869," applies, with a singularly bad grace, to one who has devoted his whole professional life, without regard to time or money, to obtaining useful Medical legislation, and who has been greatly instrumental in securing what little we have that is worth having.

An experience of about forty years of Medical practice and Medical legislation has convinced me of the fact, that there is no branch of art or science which is so little understood or cared for, or so badly manipulated by legislators, as physic; and, the little good that has been attained by legislation is more due to accidental circumstances, coupled with vigilence and perseverance on the part of certain members of the Medical Profession, than to the sympathy or good will of the legislators, with whom politics, and not physic, is ever the motive principle. This, however, is not surprising when we consider the difficulties and impediments that have constantly beset Medical legislation in Great Britain and Ircland, as well as elsewhere.

You are aware, gentlemen, that, bad as this Act is in your estimation (and still defective as it is in mine,) an attempt has lately been made to amend the Ontario Medical Act of 1869, by a bill introduced on the 3rd inst. by the Hon. Mr. McMurrich.

By whom were these amendments sought? By the regular Profession! Certainly not; but by the Homcepaths and Eclectics. Does not this clearly demonstrate the fact that if the regular members of the Medical Profession are not satistied with the Act, the irregulars arc still less so? These latter used every possible means to ensure success, and were only defeated in committee (on the 7th inst.) by the exertions of the regulars. If they were so universally dissatisfied with the Act Quebec, Dec. 27th, 1869.

as you gentlemen suppose, and they saw even the shadow of a chance of amending it, why did they not go into its whole merits in committee? cause they well knew the state of parties (medical as well as political) both in and out of the Legislature, and were certain that any change that might take place would "amend" for the worse; and "the Act being the best that could be obtained at the time," they determined to protect it witil they saw a chance of getting a better.

Your last number contains an article headed, "Quebec Medical Society," to which you gave insertion "with pleasure, and are glad to find that at all events the members of the Quebec Medical Society do not endorse the statements of Dr. Marsden with regard to the Ontario Medical Bill."

Had Dr. J. B. Elanchet, furnished you the names of the members present at that numerous and influential meeting, you would have seen that besides the concoctor of the resolutions so ununimously adopted, there were only four junior members of the Profession present, including the Secretary. I entirely absolve the respected President, who occupied the Chair on this memorable occasion, from any complicity or sympathy with this fragment of the Quebec Medical Seciety, which presumes so authoritatively to contradict my statement, and speak for the Society. I have conversed on the subject with a larger number of the members of the Quebec Medical Society than composed that meeting, (and am prepared to furnish their names if required) who entirely "endorse my sentiments, with regard to the Ontario Medical Act, and some of them who, like myself, were originally of a different opinion. I have found none, however, that are ashained to acknowledge their conversion.

As the meeting referred to is stated to have been held "at the Medical Faculty of Laval University," (sic) you may suppose that allusion is made to persons and not to a place; and that so distinguished a body as the Medical Faculty of Laval University had anything at all to do with the meeting. Beyond permitting it to meet in their rooms, they had no more to do with it than any of the Medical Faculty of McGill College; no, not even as members.

Finally, gentlemen, although you do not entirely concur in my sentiments or opinion of the Ontario Medical Act—for it is only a matter of opinion after all—it is satisfactory to me to be able to inform you that I am receiving letters from members of the Medical Profession of Ontario, as well as from members of the "Medical Council," heartily approving of my analysis. Until you change your opinions (which I have every reason to believe you will when sufficient time has been given to test the working of the Act), let me assure you that I shall be as ready in the future, as I have ever been in the past, to use my best exertions and influence to elevate and maintain the character of the Medical Profession, and promote its unity, with singleness of purpose, not only in the Province of Quebec, but throughout the Dominion; making our motto, 'Charitas-Veritas-Unitas.'

Yours, &c.,
W. Marsper, M.A., M.D.,
Place d'Armes. I am, Gentlemen,