

labours, and which on one or two occasions already we have had occasion to repress or turn aside by gentle words. Our efforts, it would seem, have been unavailing. The tocsin of controversy has been sounded, with, it is true, a somewhat bombastic blast, yet neither loud or fearful enough to prevent our answering the challenge.

The accusation of speciousness in our remarks is as unworthy the pen that makes it, as it is undeserved. Every one who reads the article referred to without the bias of personal dislike will, we are confident, acquit us of the charge; and we have the gratification of knowing that, although written without the "counsel of a friend," our sentiments have met with a warm approval from those who are competent to judge of the whole merits of the case. Nor is this judgment, we may remark, confined to the profession, whose organ we certainly profess to be, although we cannot claim the privilege of "*pledging that body ex cathedra*" to any particular views we may editorially express. With the consciousness of this approbation, we can well afford to pass over without further comment this ungenerous expression of our bellicose contemporary.

With our contemporary's reflections on Dr. Scott we have nothing whatever to do; that gentleman is perfectly capable of defending himself, and we have no doubt he will successfully reply to the strictures contained in this celebrated manifesto, if he should deem them worthy his special attention. We never contemplated being regarded either as the champion or advocate of Dr. Scott. We saw that the public feeling had been outraged, by officious meddling on one hand, and incautious proceedings on the other; and our desire was to set both parties right. If in the remarks we did make on the subject, there is a sentence which may be construed into exculpatory pleading, it was written because we thought Dr. Scott unjustly assailed; and he would have received the same consideration from us if he had been a perfect stranger.

The affected purity of our contemporary's motives, in thus dealing with the subject, is truly amusing. He has no party ties! he is exempt from the influence of private cliques or political partizanship; he has no cause to serve; he is, in fact, in his own estimation, *IMMACULATE*! It is no breach of professional courtesy in him to charge us with subserviency. It is no want of Christian charity in him to assume and insinuate that we are governed by less worthy motives and to impeach our morality. Oh, no! he is infallible! We might, possibly, by carefully unravelling the records of the past, shew on what foundation this self-assumed censorian character has been raised. But we repudiate such recrimination, and leave our irate friend to batten on the fruits of his own injustice, which must, sooner or later, come to perfection.