

Correspondence

The Editors are not responsible for any views expressed by correspondents.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN MEDICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—With respect to the alleged animus of our attack and bitterness of our letters, allow me to say that our critics, perhaps, wilfully or otherwise, mistake mere vigor and earnestness for violence and rancor. Personally, I am not conscious of having, throughout the controversy, penned anything in a spirit of bitterness or with malicious intent, and I am quite sure the same can be said of my associates. Once it became patent that an attack on the late Council was inevitable, it necessarily had to be made a strong attack. Determined men do not attempt to remove a mountain by blowing thistle-down at it, or to break up a long-established system of legalized injustice, by being mealy-mouthed, or carefully young-ladyish, in the choice of the language they employ in its exposure. Whether we should have made our strychnine more palatable, or increased its tonicity, by administering it in syrup is open to question. We can look back with great satisfaction on the fact that our modes of warfare, if ungentle, were in no case dishonorable. If there was hard hitting, on the part of the Defence Association, it was, at all events, hitting straight from the shoulder. There was, on our part, at least, no striking below the belt, no stabbing beneath the fifth rib, no descent into the regions of epistolary black-guardism, no resort to the coward's chosen methods of innuendo, anonymity, moral attenuations, and personal vilification. We neither invoked nor accepted the assistance of professional outcasts. We, in no case, forgot the amenities of public debate, or violated the decencies of reputable journalism, or subjected any newspaper or periodical that published our letters, to the stinging suggestion that, before being issued, it ought to be thoroughly disinfected and deodorized by the Board of Health, or, failing this, should be carefully lifted with a pair of tongs out of the post-office into the stove. We severely left to our opponents a rigid monopoly of these and all kindred methods of being *strong*. We confined our criticism to the public acts of public men, carefully avoided misrepresentation and vituperation, and kept to established facts and hard-fisted arguments. That our articles were vigorous and forceful, we are glad to believe, especially in view of the fact that those of our adversaries were strong only in the sense already referred to. When, as now and then chanced, we found an official editor or an ex-president flaunting his nakedness in our face and, shamelessly,