

eighty members, whose positions are at least as good as that of the Editor of the *Medical Record*, and it was only after having studied the subject for a very long time, and after having taken the advice and opinion of one of the most distinguished advocates, that the Society presented the Bill before the Quebec House. Since, Mr. the Editor continues to say, that the Bill should have been choked in its first reading, and that it was allowed to drop after its second reading—a second untruth. The Bill has not been dropped, Mr. the Editor of the *Medical Record*, and do not be vexatious (*i. e.* troublesome) it will come up next session. If its adoption has not been pressed this year, it is because we did not wish to take the profession by surprise, and that we did not wish to attempt hasty legislation, on a subject of such importance. We desire to have a free and upright discussion, between now and the opening of the next session. I hope that we may get it.

Further, Mr. the Editor of the *Medical Record* complains that the Bill is too complicated, and he assumes that a man of ordinary ability should read it a dozen times to understand it, and that, notwithstanding that the Bill was based (a transcript) on that of the advocates, and also on that of the notaries, each containing a greater number of clauses than the Medical Bill, it has not yet come to the mind of any advocate, or the mind of any notary, to complain that the bills concerning their professions were too complicated. Perhaps Messieurs the advocates and Messieurs the notaries have twelve times more intelligence than Mr. the Editor of the *Medical Record*.

As a last resource Mr. the Editor of the *Medical Record* takes advantage of a typographical error that he finds in the English copy of the Bill, I will not answer to this last piece of foolery, but only say, *en passant*, that he must have been very short of arguments, to have recourse to such means.

I stop here, Mr. the Editor, my answer to the article in the *Canada Medical Record*, reserving, with your kind permission, the right of replying, in a manner more becoming, in the *L'Union Medicale*, when I have to answer adversaries of more importance.

Signed, A. DAGENAIS, M.D.

We propose dealing with the principal points of this letter, seriatim. And first, we have to regret that Dr. Dagenais has committed to writing such a silly sentence as the very first one in his letter. "No

time to lose, therefore does not read the Record. Happy Dagenais, to be so fully occupied. We, however, fear that his judgment of the value of medical literature can hardly be a good one, influenced, as it is, not by the practical character of a journal's contents, but by the appearance of a political article which rubs him all the wrong way. Dr. Dagenais finds fault with us for saying that the Bill was the work of a half-dozen dreamers, and asserts that it was made by the Medical Society of Montreal, which numbers eighty members. We reply that our information was received from members of the very Society whose authority is invoked, and who still assure us that this Society, composed of our French Medical brethren, cannot be held liable for this Bill; and in proof of this we have names given us of prominent members not only of the Society, but of the French Medical profession, who were entirely ignorant of this so-called action of this Society. Surely our correspondent will admit the prominence in both the above respects, of our friend Dr. Rottot. Was he aware of the proposed Bill? On the contrary, was he not working on his own Bill, for presentation before the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and was he not constantly in communication with some of the leading spirits in this attempted movement—who, while they willingly supplied him with their views, never informed him that they were preparing a Bill themselves, with which they proposed suddenly to astonish the profession. The relative professional positions of the eighty members of this Society, as compared with that of the Editor of this journal, has nothing to do with the subject under discussion, and the introduction of such a remark is, in our opinion, in exceeding bad taste. We are glad, however, that Dr. Dagenais has at last boldly come forward and thrown down the gauntlet, which he does when he tells us that this Medical bill has not been dropped, but that it will come up next session. We now know with whom we have to deal, for we confess that, till very lately, it was impossible to find who were the originators and promoters of this Bill. The profession of this Province are not the mettle we take them for, if they quietly submit to have a body legislated out of existence, which has many faults we admit, but which, notwithstanding these, has done very much for the profession in Lower Canada. We do not see that Dr. Dagenais has satisfactorily answered our complaint as to the complicated character of the Bill. He seems to think that, because it is a copy or transcript of that for the advocates and notaries, only less voluminous, it must