

any escaped. There continued for considerable time a purulent discharge. The absorbent pads were changed as soon as any moisture appeared (about every six hours at first). The urine passed per urethra contained blood and pus, showing that the ureter and pelvis were free.

The patient is now quite well, and since the operation has had no attack of the characteristic pain.

Correspondence.

Editor of THE CANADIAN PRACTITIONER :

Again I must beg of you to assist me in refuting statements made by Dr. Benson regarding my views on diphtheria (*CANADIAN PRACTITIONER*, Feb. 1st and May 2nd, 1892). In my first answer, printed in your esteemed journal March 16th, 1892, I plainly showed that the above mentioned gentleman had attacked "the disciples of the local-origin theory of diphtheria" for statements they never made, but which originated in the mind of Dr. Benson. Instead of taking warning through this reply, which was only intended to correct wrong statements regarding my views, and not for entering into a discussion which we then and there termed useless, Dr. Benson again tells your readers and myself that "Dr. Seibert's theory is that there is first an inflammation and secondly an exudation, so that the disease actually existed before the exudation appears by which the disease is recognized."

(1) Dr. Seibert never said this, no more than he would say that a wood fire could first burn without smoke, while in reality we have both fire and smoke within the same second.

(2) Dr. Seibert never had the audacity to advance any theory of his own regarding the pathology of diphtheria, but freely confesses that no amount of ink-wasting could induce him to think Dr. Benson, in Chatham, correct, and Klebs, Loeffler, Oertel, and Heubner all wrong.

(3) Dr. Seibert does not want to answer questions which can only be answered by a careful study of the wonderful work of the above-mentioned scientists; he simply asks not to be cited in the misleading and erroneous manner that Dr. Benson made use of.

(4) Dr. Seibert does not expect any one to

try his submembranous local treatment of pharyngeal diphtheria with the chlorine water syringe devised for that purpose who is not even acquainted with the rudimental portions of modern diphtheria pathology, for this treatment is based upon these facts, but he does deem it unscientific and unfair to attempt criticism without a fair trial.

G. SEIBERT, M.D.

New York, May 14th, 1892.

Editor of THE CANADIAN PRACTITIONER.

There having appeared in the *Templar* of March 31st last, a paper published in Hamilton, and the organ of the Royal Templars in Canada, a portrait and laudatory notice of myself, containing statements that are a gross violation of good taste and professional ethics, I am required by the Council of the Toronto Medical Society to repudiate, through the medical journals of Toronto, all connection with the parts of the article which deal with me in a professional capacity.

Having been one of the organizers of the order in this country, and having held office continuously for seven years, the editor of the paper had often asked permission to publish my portrait, accompanied by a short biographical sketch. This permission I had refused until a few months ago, when the editor urged it, reminding me that a similar course had been taken with nearly all the officers of the society. I unadvisedly consented, and did not take the precaution to see the biographical sketch before it was published. Having worked with and been known to the editor during those years, he was quite conversant with my history, and penned the exaggerated statement on his own responsibility.

In reply to a note from me complaining of the statements made, he sent me the following:

HAMILTON, April 28th, 1892.

DR. B. E. MCKENZIE, Toronto, Ont. :

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—Replying to yours of the 26th April, I desire to express my sincere sorrow if any blunder or mistake of mine has placed you in an unfavorable position before the profession. I am very sorry now that I did not consult you with regard to the brief sketch before it was published. Newspaper men easily fall into a hurried, reckless way of slashing off matter of this kind without any thought of the technical etiquette of any society or profession.