

have not the skill to use them? Where do these very public bodies, which would thus break down all distinctions between the educated and the ignorant in our profession, where do they look in times of danger for counsel, and upon whom do they call for advice and aid in their public institutions for the relief of the sick? Not to the ignorant pretender; not to those who use roots and herbs without fee or reward, whose claims for confidence they have sanctioned by their short-sighted legislation, but upon those whom they know to be qualified, both by education and experience, for the important trusts which they wish to commit to them. Let us then rather pity than blame this delusion, which leads those who are constituted our legislators to act thus blindly, and rob their constituents of the only protection they have against the ignorance and rapacity of pretenders; and let us, by increasing the facilities for education, as well as by a more diligent use of those with which we are already favoured, prove ourselves above the necessity of legal protection; and by our devotion to our cherished pursuits and our deep sense of the obligations imposed upon us by a higher than human law, show our fellow-citizens the true bearing of the question, and by this best of all influences, lead them to honor and protect the profession, as the best and surest way of honoring themselves and protecting the lives and pockets of those for whom they are called to legislate. Yours most respectfully,

A. M. ROSEBRUGH, M. D.

Preston, Waterloo County, April 9th, 1861.

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL QUARTER SESSION FOR THE COUNTY OF WATERLOO.
14TH MARCH, 1861.

The Queen vs. Frederick Hessel.

Practising physic for hire, gain, or hope of reward, without license or authority.
Consolidated Statutes for U. C. cap. 40.

VERDICT—NOT GUILTY.

The defendant having been committed for trial in February last, on the affidavit of several witnesses, for having practised physic, and for having demanded and received payment for the same, was subsequently bailed and released from his imprisonment, and upon arraignment in Court, pleaded "Not guilty."

The County Attorney as prosecutor for the Queen.

J. W. Hancock for the defendant.

Upon examination of four witnesses it was proved:—

By 1st witness. That defendant had undertaken to cure her, and was to be paid for it in washing; defendant had given medicines, and witness had paid him in washing, but was not cured. By 2nd witness. The first testimony was corroborated by the second witness, the husband of the former witness, who further stated, that soon after the medicine had been used by his wife, she (being enceinte) had lost a foetus of about two months old, and that defendant upon being asked by said husband whether the medicine given by defendant would not operate injuriously upon witness' wife, on account of her pregnancy, had replied that the medicine *would not* injure her. By 3rd witness. That defendant had engaged to cure him, had given him medicine, *had demanded payment, had received four dollars* in part payment, *had demanded more money*, had been refused further payment because he had not effected a cure. By 4th witness. That witness was afflicted with the asthma, that defendant had undertaken to cure witness, that if defendant did not cure him he would have no pay. That defendant had asked witness for some money, that witness gave him twenty dollars, that defendant promised to return the money, that he had returned one dollar, that defendant had hired witness' horse and conveyance at different times, that defendant had not paid witness any money for such hire.

For the defendant it was proved by one of defendant's sureties, that defendant had attended witness' wife for several months, and had not received anything for it.