

duct to each other, the same medical pensioners are on the roll? Why should this continue?

If we, as individuals, cut off the diseased limbs, why should this not apply to bodies corporate? Is it not time to call a halt, have a new deal, a complete change, and would it not be well for the profession to understand the position fairly, and at the next election see that a little rest is secured those so long in their service, and that change may be made as will the better satisfy the profession at large. I wish to state that I am prepared to advocate economy and retrenchment in the Council, always having due regard to efficiency, and if an economic policy were adopted in the financial affairs of the Council, I for one cannot see why steps should not be taken to do away altogether with the annual assessment. Thanking you for the space taken by this letter.

I am, dear sir, yours truly,

P. PALMER BURROWS.

Lindsay, Sept. 20, 1893.

DR. SANGSTER'S LETTER.

To the Editor of ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,—I have to thank you for the insertion of my first letter, and for your excellent and judicious comments thereon. You profess to have limited your editorial retouches to the correction of my faulty orthography. In publishing this, and all future communications of mine, will you kindly leave my spelling just as you find it. Without any wish to disparage your superior erudition, I may be permitted to say that there are reasons—possibly not altogether within your personal knowledge and beneath your comprehension—which appear to me to warrant the omission of the *u* in such words as “honor” and “honorable,” and, further, that I am quite content to let both my orthography and my arguments rest on their merits. Perhaps, too, you will oblige me by avoiding, in future, the occasional elimination and substitution of words in my correspondence. I have no doubt you made these little improvements with the very best intentions—that you were moved thereto by an amiable desire to embellish or to strengthen my style, or to make my meaning clear, but, as a reasonable effort, on the part of my professional confrères, will enable them to comprehend what I am trying to say, I may be

pardoned, perhaps, for preferring my own language. Though my sentences may be uncouth and sadly involved, I would rather express myself thus imperfectly, and painfully, and, with an ungainly limp which is exclusively my own, than progress with ease and rapidity on the most polished crutches your editorial armamentarium can supply. I may add that, as I take the precaution to keep a carefully compared and certified copy of each letter I send to your journal, your very laudable zeal—though possibly untempered with discretion and certainly stimulated by the \$600 annual subsidy—is not likely to find profitable scope for its employment in this direction.

In quite another line of usefulness, however,—that of a literary acrobat—you not only achieve success, but must be nearly or altogether unapproachable. Why descend to the use of vulgar facts, or of hard-fisted arguments, when you can so gracefully demolish an opponent with a few bewildering gyrations on the editorial trapeze? It is no common feat to make a troublesome correspondent say, or, which comes to the same thing, seem to say, the very reverse of what he is trying to say, and, stupidly, thinks he does say. Yet, in a short paragraph or two, you several times accomplish this most difficult and perilous act of literary high-tumbling, apparently with perfect ease and unconcern! Allow me to congratulate you. No one but a really brave man—conscious of his superiority to the restrictions which hamper ordinary mortals in public discussion—would have ventured, while addressing a constituency so severely critical and discriminating as the medical men of this province, to openly pervert, on pages 1 and 2 of his journal, the printed statements contained on pages 13 and 14 of the same issue. Really, Sir, in the presence of such amazing intrepidity and matchless skill, I am lost in admiration and devoured by envy, and, in humble imitation of Alexander of old, can only exclaim “Were I not myself, I would like to be the editor of the ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL.” That courage and freedom from vulgar restraints, which are so indispensable to the important position you fill, you evidently possess in an eminent degree, and I fervently hope that, in your future editorial comments on my letters, you will continue to thus freely challenge the wonder and appreciation of your readers.