

Lastly, that they were "very questionable remarks with reference to the Medical Faculty," we utterly deny, and appeal to the article itself, in which, as plainly as language can speak, we spoke in the highest terms of the ability of the Professors, and complained only that they were not as fairly advertised as they ought to have been. That the Professor himself who holds the chair of Hygiene did not think we were using "very questionable remarks," is evident from the fact that the first time we met after the publication of the article, he thanked us for the manner in which the subject had been treated. And here we should drop the matter, but Dr. Scott volunteers a statement which so truly comes under the category of "very questionable," that we are bound to notice it. After bidding us reflect on the ill-advised course adopted in endeavoring to injure our Alma Mater—to which we boldly say "Not Guilty," and call for a verdict of acquittal from every *honest* man—he adds that "our Alma Mater" "most certainly has not been ungenerous to your family." We really do not understand where the generosity of the McGill Medical School has been displayed more to us than to any other students, for in the education of our family, the same fees paid by all students to all Professors were paid by ourselves, and we are therefore at a loss to conceive where the generosity has been exhibited. But enough; the name is removed from the list of subscribers, and we can only add that if an *honest*, friendly article, like the one in question, is a righteous cause to desert our effort for the public good, then the sooner we hand over the publication to a more *time-serving* and *obsequious* editor the better.—(ED. PUBLIC HEALTH MAGAZINE.)

————:o:————

COMMUNICATION received from N. E. B.—"Muffs *versus* Mitts."