

that there is a spirit goes with the oral expression. It is not simply the words. It will be for the doctor's readers to judge whether or not he prostitutes words to the Billingsgate spirit. I quite understand that the doctor has studied "a Standard Dictionary," not "the Standard," as he would make you believe, until he knows well the use of language, and that had Disraeli lived to the present decade, he would have found one more man "intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity."

I regret not being in a position to accept the honors and compliments your correspondent heaps upon me, as being the "discoverer of microbic exogenesis." Unfortunately "Canada is" not "to be congratulated on having produced a truly great scientist." "God's injunction that each created existence shall bring forth after its kind," is still in force. The doctor was led into this error by a little faulty diagnosis on his part. He knew the outbreak in December was from the organisms in the dishwater of June. As the December product could claim his parentage, he did not suspect it was strictly homo-genetic. It is well known that a parent is rarely a good judge of his own progeny. What he supposed to be an indication that the December outbreak was "pungently racy," was acrimony, the result of decomposition, brought about by putrefactive changes. He hints that his integument was not likely to be pierced by microbes with little penetrating power. If, as he says, it was the "Pachydermatous Dr. Sangster," this may be true.

In the February number, I say "his (Dr. Sangster's) first letter is introduced with a series of italicized head-lines that would be creditable to the business energy of a peripatetic medicine vendor. No doubt they are introduced to so satisfy the reader that he will not peruse the context and learn that the arguments (?) do not establish the assertions made." From these two sentences, this masterly logician finds that I am "moved to bitter reproach at the iniquity of italicized head-lines." "Characterize them as dishonest and in every way reprehensible," "and condemn their employment unequivocally, rather offensively, and without any reservation whatever," and "insist that (he) shall be classed with quacks and rogues, and thieves and murderers, *et hoc genus omne*." Who would have suspected those two little sentences so pregnant with meaning? Just think of it, compliment a man for his business ability, and you are actually insisting that (he) shall be classed with quacks and rogues, thieves and murderers, *et hoc genus omne!!* My, my, what logic does for a man. Where could such brilliancy have been acquired? Surely not from Whately. The doctor owes it to the world to acquaint them at what Gamaliel's feet he studied.