

ditional pages; that it is a most complete and scientific treatise; and lastly, that Messrs. Blanchard & Lea deserve great praise for their labours. All this we are told in twelve lines, and not half so well as we have done it in six!

Having been informed that it is a "most complete and scientific treatise," its completeness and scientific accuracy are in the next twenty-seven lines unwittingly demolished, and a personal and professional attack is made upon myself for having ventured to express the opinion to Dr. Gross that calculous complaints were rare in this district, without having duly acknowledged the services of Dr. Robert Nelson, uncle to Dr. Horace, "who has operated close on to, if not more than, one hundred times in less than twenty years," (we admire the grammatical construction of this sentence,) and "with a success almost equal to that of the distinguished lithotomist of Kentucky, Dudley!" I am, furthermore, accused of prejudice in ignoring Dr. Robert Nelson's services as a lithotomist, although what I had to do with him, or with any one else, while expressing to Dr. Gross *my opinion* of the prevalence of calculous complaints, surpasses my comprehension; and, finally, my ignorance of surgical matters in this district, in which I have practised about twenty-one years, is severely denounced, and this, too, by a young man, whose term of professional duty scarcely exceeds the half of that period. The whole criticism, if indeed it deserves the name, is a lamentable proof that an editorial chair does not always inspire wisdom, far less is it apt to imbue its occupant with modesty, and of these two facts I will shortly furnish abundant proof.

So far as regards myself personally, the animus which pervades the editor's critique, and the tone in which he has indulged, would have precluded all reply; and I must say, that during seven years of editorial life, I have rarely met with an attack so grossly and offensively personal, or more unsolicited; and assuredly had I been alone concerned, I would have treated it with silent contempt. But unfortunately, through me, it is attempted to impugn the accuracy of Prof. Gross' work, and as, therefore, a question of scientific interest is involved, I cannot avoid a reply, both in justice to Prof. Gross and myself. It is not a little singular that the opinion expressed by myself should have been sustained by "a number of the most respectable practitioners" of Quebec, and by Dr. Bethune of Toronto; and yet, while the rarity of the disease has been acknowledged both in the Eastern and Western sections of the Province, I am singled out for attack for expressing a like opinion in regard to this district, which may almost be deemed central. Did Dr. Horace Nelson, editor of the *Northern Lancet*, think that I could be made a convenient peg on which to hang a eulogy of his uncle, or that I would constitute