




UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



FOUNDED 1836

---

WASHINGTON, D.C.





# REPLY TO A PAMPHLET

PURPORTING TO BE AN

ANSWER TO A LETTER

ADDRESSED


TO A REPUBLICAN MEMBER


OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON THE SUBJECT OF A PETITION FOR A NEW INCORPORATION,  
TO BE ENTITLED A COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

BOSTON, FEBRUARY, 1812.





## REPLY, &c.

---

*To the three principal Advocates of the petition for a College of Physicians, authors of the said Answer.*

SIRS,

THROUGH the great care you employed to keep your pamphlet secret from all those capable of contradicting the numerous falsehoods it contains, this ingenious publication has but lately fallen into my hands. On the first perusal of it I was so much disgusted with its vulgarity and so well convinced of the notoriety of its misrepresentations, that, in common with the physicians of this vicinity, I judged it unnecessary to raise it from the contempt it merits. Within a day or two however I have been informed that the statement of pretended facts has had influence on the minds of some individuals, and that it would be proper to set them right. I must in the outset assure you that I shall not descend to your level. I shall not follow you through the aspersions and the abuse which you have heaped up in your defence. A good cause requires nothing but a plain representation of facts, and such you shall now see laid before those you have attempted to deceive.

Your letter is attempted to be imposed on the public as an answer from a republican member of the house of representatives. No such answer was ever written. The original letter was addressed to the Hon. Joseph Story. He carefully read it in manuscript, and recommended its publication. A printed copy was afterwards sent him, which he read, together with some additions. Judge Story then wrote a brief answer, which has been published in the newspapers; and which contains sufficient evidence that he did not confound the institution or Medical School, established

in Boston, with the Medical Society. He first read the letter at a moment, when his mind was not peculiarly engaged in business; and possessing a judgment unusually penetrating and discriminating, it is to the last degree absurd to suppose, that he could make such a ridiculous confusion. You have however most decidedly asserted in the newspapers that he did not distinguish the Medical School for lectures and the Massachusetts Medical Society from each other; and that his favorable remarks were applied to one of those institutions only; this untruth you have not only asserted, but propagated with the most studious industry.

It is quite curious to remark with what singular address you have varied the objects of your attack. One of you insinuated at a meeting of the Medical Society, that the Medical School alone was to be affected by your plans; and that he never would have signed the petition, had he thought it would infringe the privileges of the Medical Society. In a very few days after, as well as before, you published newspaper pieces, in which you totally denied the existence of a wish to injure the Medical School. It was the domineering society, whose concerns were so much mismanaged, that you would bring on its knees.

So much for the introduction of your pamphlet. I shall make no reply to the scandalous insinuations thrown out against the President of the Medical Society, to whom you deny at once discretion, consciousness of integrity, and desire to promote the public good. That gentleman's character is too well known to be affected by your malignity, desperate as it is. If there be in the community a person whose labours deserve well of the public, it is that man. Deserting a lucrative business, he engaged in the service of his country at the first moment of the revolution, and he only quitted it when a glorious peace relieved him from any further duties. Since that time he has been occupied with professional labours, whose severity has scarcely been paralleled by those of any other individual; and as the result has acquired a fortune, which none but you think immoderate, and a reputation, which none but you are capable of aspersing.

The assertions of a *rancorous* and *hostile* disposition on the part of this gentleman against the Medical Society, at any period, are absolutely false. They could only originate in the breast of one of your triumvirate, who himself has always felt those dispositions towards the Society from not being elected to any office in that body. While, on the other hand, the person you accuse of rancor toward the Medical Society, has

been annually chosen by the fellows of that Society into its various offices during the whole period you refer to ; a measure that would hardly have been pursued, if there had been reason to believe him a malcontent.

Now, Sirs, it is with great regret I take hold of that part of your pamphlet, which is loaded with fulsome panegyrics on your own deeds. You know that during a period of ten or eleven months past you have been constantly occupied in the production of a series of false and scandalous publications in the newspapers, reflecting personal abuse on the officers of the Medical Society, particularly its President, and on the officers of the Medical School. You know that those publications have never drawn forth a reply except in one single instance ; and as that reply has by you been employed as a sanction to the most disgraceful scurrility, I will refresh your minds by inserting it below. You and the public will then better judge how far it has justified your abuse.\*

\* MESSRS. EDITORS,

In answer to the singular remarks in your last paper, respecting a proposed College of Physicians, it is only necessary to state two or three facts.

1st. This College, so far as its projects are known, contemplates nothing beyond what is performed by institutions already existing in the most active and flourishing state, and amply competent to all medical purposes.

2d. The memorialists for this College, it is said, are distinguished by their age and rank in their profession. Some of them are so ; but this respectable portion of the memorialists have arrived at that period, when men usually retire from associations of this nature. These gentlemen have, accordingly, done so ; and, it is well known, will take no active part in this new business. The active part of the memorialists are in no way remarkable for their age, or rank in their profession.

3d. As to the "hatreds," existing between "the young and ardent candidates for fame and practice," none have been known, before the projection of this College exposed them to public view. On the contrary the medical profession in this state has been distinguished, by their distant brethren, for their harmony and mutual exertions for the promotion of public objects. If the demon of discord is to be let loose, he will spring from the foundations of this extraordinary new school.

4th. It seems that the public are to be taught by this College, that medicine is not a "mere money getting trade ;" which is as much as to assert, that it is so considered by the medical profession at present. The physicians of this state will, no doubt, feel obliged to those gentlemen for making the discovery ; and the public will duly appreciate it, when they consider the labours of the faculty during the yellow fever, whenever it has appeared ; during the spotted fever ; and the exertions they have made and the risques they have incurred in investigating these diseases, in every way practicable ; their gratuitous attendance on Dispensaries and other public charities ; their attempt to diffuse the Cow Pock among the poor in 1803 and 1811 ; and their various publications made for the promotion of medical science, and the public good. All these things will be still more justly estimated when contrasted with the deeds of *agents* for the new College, such as a *liberal dispensation of Cow Pock matter—for a small fee ; generous inoculation of seamen,—when paid for by a merchant ; and the disinterested offer to vaccinate a hundred individuals in two rich parishes—*at the expense of a benevolent unknown.

April 26th, 1811.

N. Eng. Palladium.

You also know that in the *letter* you pretend to answer, the greatest care has been taken to avoid all personal reflections. Notwithstanding this forbearance, which I think must be acknowledged to have been far extended, you now come forward with one of the most abusive pamphlets that has been seen. You seem at last to have supposed that those you have been so long attempting to injure and destroy, are paralyzed by a fear of your acuteness and severity; for you must be perfectly aware that the public mind contains a treasury of facts which if arranged against you would overwhelm you with irrecoverable confusion. But though you have cut away the scabbard, the sword shall not seek you. Your ambitious jealousy has so blinded you, that you are hardly accountable for your present misdeeds. Your attacks shall be repelled, but you shall not be pursued.

You commence the blazon of your own importance with a description of the powers of the most respectable physician of those whose names you have obtained. The powers of that gentleman I shall not dispute; and as to his reputation I have no desire to lessen it: But when you insinuate that he is deeply interested in your petition, or any of your concerns, you misrepresent the truth. You heard one of the committee of the Society state, that this gentleman avowed to him that he felt no personal interest in the success of your petition. He declared that he would not step *over the threshold of his door* to attain it. He declared moreover, that were the incorporation granted, he should not attend the meetings. In addition to this, let me now inform you, that since the meeting of the committee, the gentleman who made the statement has called on him and requested to know, whether he had correctly reported his sentiments, to which he was answered entirely in the affirmative; and also that he was not acquainted with your proceedings; that he disapproved of them, and especially of the attempt to effect your object under the cover of its being a party affair.

Let me ask why you have passed over the gentleman whose name is at the head of your petition? Is it because he has lately disproved you proceedings, and regretted that his name had ever been placed to your petition?

Of the gentleman whom you rank in the second place, I shall make no remarks except this, that you have endeavoured to excite the animosity of that gentleman against the President of the Medical Society, by misrepresentation. It is certain that the latter did give a toast at a meeting of the Medical Society, something like what you have

published, "the suppression of quackery." But it is also certain that he had not the most distant idea of alluding to Dr. S. With this gentleman he had always been on the best terms, and had no inducement nor disposition to injure his character or feelings. Besides, that Dr. S. was long a member, and has been a censor of the Society, and the term *quack*, could not be applied to him by any but yourselves, for your own purposes. The accidental coincidence of a story told by some person with the giving the toast in question, is however a better foundation than you generally obtain for your representations. The President of the Medical Society, and some other of the subjects of your abuse, have often represented this gentleman as a man of talents and experience. His operation on the thorax, while it has been naturally opposed by some, has been held by others of them, as an ingenious effort to do something for the cure of a disease, which is usually hopeless.

What you state of a third gentleman whose name you have on your petition, is *absolutely* and *wholly* false. You know it to be so, and he knows it. I could exhibit a letter to one of those persons you represent as persecuting him, written no long time since, in which Dr. J. employs the most ardent professions of friendship: and I defy you to bring forward an instance of an attempt to lessen the respect of the public towards him, separated from your petition. If any such expression as "crush the wretch," was ever applied to him, it was not by those you have impudently attempted to fix it on, but by a republican gentleman, now high in office, who together with another gentleman of the same politics, highly respected, but now reposed in the grave, was averse to your fellow petitioner. The ground of their opposition was a supposed ill-treatment of the American prisoners in Halifax during the revolution. A supposition, which probably was founded in misinformation.

What you say of a fourth gentleman needs no reply, as your remarks refer to the Boylston Committee, a body entirely distinct from the Medical Society and Institution. I will state, however, that this Physician has received as many marks of attention from the Medical Society, as he had any right to expect. One paper he communicated was published. The only additional one I know of, is now on that file, which comes next in order for publication. He is a Counsellor, and was elected to deliver the annual discourse for 1811, provided another gentleman failed. The Counsellors did not reelect him, probably because they discovered his name was on a petition, whose object was to undermine the

Society. This neglect you have very cunningly imputed to his being a republican, because you wish to rouse a party spirit in your favour.

Your fifth character you ought in conscience to have placed first; because he is your prime mover, and because he no doubt principally inspired your pamphlet. He is represented as a good anatomist, which may be true. Where did he get the rudiments of his anatomical knowledge? Of the man whom he abuses and would destroy. He is bolstered up, as a great Surgeon; if you mean the public should think so, leave his merits to speak for themselves. His great operations on the saphena vein and tic douleureux, may be performed with ease by every student of anatomy. THE operation of strangulated hernia has been done by gentlemen in different parts of the country *with success*. Particularly by Dr. Bryant of Cummington, and Dr. Thaxter of Dorchester. It has been three times done with success by one of the persons whose reputation you are striving to destroy; one operation of inguinal hernia like your hero's; two of crural hernia, a more difficult and delicate operation than the other. The story of the *stiff* elbow joint is perfectly ridiculous; as is well known to the junior practitioners of Boston. The consequent persecution never existed except in your imagination. In proof of this, you are to know that a year or two after, when a vacancy occurred in the counsellors of the Medical Society, he was supported as being the senior candidate by the very person you represent as trying to injure him; and supported in opposition to the sentiment of many members, and especially of one, who now pretends to be his friend. At the last annual meeting he was dropped on account of his enmity to the Society.

Would you really represent this man as persecuted? Who is it that has, at different times, disgusted nearly every practitioner in Boston by his conduct in practice? Who is it that dragged a respectable and amiable physician before the Boston association; and at a subsequent period opposed his return into that body with peculiar virulence? Who is it that thrust himself into a meeting of the Censors of the Medical Society to oppose and persecute a young man for the most trifling offence?

In the midst of your commendation of yourselves, there is one sentiment perpetually predominant; this is a desire of insinuating that one or two gentlemen have persecuted every man who had pretensions to a knowledge of anatomy and surgery. How does this accord with the facts, that one

was the only teacher of anatomy and surgery for many years ; that the other was the first person to establish the firm foundations of anatomy and surgery in Boston, by which you had an opportunity of benefitting ; that both have employed every occasion to advance the general knowledge of these branches, by allowing others and even you to attend their operations whenever circumstances admitted, and to attend their lectures, where your agents have appeared within three days of the time I write, no doubt with a view to glean for your advantage.

The sixth of your petitioners mentioned, has certainly merit for his industry, if he has put the work on Diseases of the heart as you mention into the English language ; but as the publick have not yet seen this translation, they cannot judge of its execution. You should at least not put a translated book on the same footing with the publications of the Medical Society, which, consisting principally of new cases, have some claims to originality. You try to insinuate, that a communication on the diseases of the heart is founded on the one your colleague has translated. That is, that a communication composed of a number of cases occurring in Boston before the eyes of all the physicians there, is founded on a work composed in France. The credit that the author of the communication gives to the lectures of Corvisart, a part of which he attended, for the first hints on the subject, ought to have prevented such insinuations. Such a constant effort to depreciate the labours of others would injure a better cause than yours. Let me ask you a question on this subject. If you believed the work of Corvisart to be the foundation of the said communication, why did you so studiously conceal the copy you had obtained from the author, and enjoin on one of your friends, particularly to avoid letting it fall into *his* hands.

Your *remarks* now require to be briefly *remarked* on.

Remark 1. In asserting that the President of the Medical Society and another member attempted to influence and intimidate the editors of two republican newspapers to stop the discussion of your petition in their papers, you entirely violate the truth, as these editors and you well know. These gentlemen called on the said editors to inquire the author of some scurrilous production which appeared the summer before ; and for no other purpose.

Remark 2. The petition for the College of Physicians

was called up, on the suggestion of a gentleman, perfectly acquainted with parliamentary usages.

Remark 3. Too contemptible and notoriously untrue to require reply.

Remark 4. In the first years of the Medical Society, the country was poor and authorship was rare. Lately that society have made as many publications as their funds would admit. We shall see, when the works of your College come out, whether they will be greatly superior. As to the Pharmacœpeia, it is indeed a *translation*; but with important variations, founded on experiments, some of which required much labour. You probably will present the publick with an *original* pharmacœpeia, an original Materia Medica, and a new set of diseases. The report on vaccination comprises important information regarding the cow pock, drawn from European sources, which was what the society required. It contains more good and useful matter than all the pompous productions of your great writer.

Remark 5. The assertion that the Medical Society did not encourage vaccination is completely counteracted by the report subjoined, which was drawn up by the honourable gentleman who is now Secretary at War, in whose hand writing it is on the files of the society.\* It was the same gentleman, who moved that a smoked letter, generally thought to be formed for the purpose, should be returned to its author.

The publications in the Centinel, which are alluded to in this remark, were drawn forth, one after the other, by the most abusive assertions on the part of Dr. Waterhouse; and were entirely defensive of the society and of Dr. Rand, to whom every vile and unjust epithet had been applied by this

\* THE counsellors of the *Massachusetts Medical Society*, to whom was referred a certain publication in the *Columbian Centinel* of the 19th April, 1806, signed BENJAMIN WATERHOUSE, have, in conformity to the direction of the Society, proceeded to an examination of said publication, and

First, They find that Dr. Waterhouse therein complains, that in prosecuting the vaccine inoculation, he did not receive the countenance and assistance of other physicians; and more particularly, that "*an illiberal construction was put on his application to the Medical Society;*" and asserts, that he sent to the Society vaccine virus, which had been transmitted to him from England, and that "he offered to put himself under the advice and controul of the Society, as he wished to push the inoculation, as a *public benefit* and not for *personal profit* or *rebutation*"

Second, That a committee of the Society appointed to repair to Marblehead, to inquire into facts relating to the vaccine disease, and to the small pox, "after making every arrangement with *apparent exactness and sincerity*, never appeared on the ground, but left him to encounter for ought they knew the resentment of an enraged populace."

person, equally without scruple, and without truth. The physicians never were desirous of impeding this man in the business of vaccination; on the contrary, some of the junior part of them had conceived a plan for making vaccination a separate business, and they would probably have succeeded in persuading the more elevated part of the profession to agree to such a plan, as the conduct of vaccination has in general been considered onerous by them. Dr. Waterhouse would undoubtedly have had the offer of taking the management of this business, had he not, at the very time the idea was originated, been guilty of a violation of all the decencies that belong to a man and a physician.

“This gentleman” you say “was the constant theme of their abuse and object of their persecution.” Afterwards you say, “your treatment of the *only republican professor* in your medical school for several years is of itself sufficient proof,” &c.

In answer to the first charge or complaint, the counsellors beg leave to remark, that they find in the records of the society no evidence, either that matter was sent by Dr. W. or that he offered to put himself under the controul of the society. That he may have furnished individual members of the society with vaccine matter after a certain period, is probable: that he has also been supplied by them is unquestionably true. If Dr. W. did propose to any members to place himself under the direction of the society, which however does not appear, the society have taken no measure or order thereon, and cannot therefore be charged with want of liberality.

The assertion of Dr. W. that he was pursuing vaccination as a public benefit, and not for personal profit, does not accord with a notorious fact, viz. that until the virus had been received from *Europe* through other channels, he kept the matter in his own hands, excepting that it was imparted to those, who were ready to give him bonds for a pecuniary remuneration, proportionable to the profits of the business. When Dr. W. intimates that other physicians doubted the success of the inoculation, ought he not in candour to state, at the same time, his own embarrassments, arising from many spurious cases among his own patients? That the Society was not indifferent as to the diffusion of vaccination, appears by their sending to *England*, in January, 1801, for vaccine matter, which was received, and *did not fail*, as Dr. W. insinuates, for he himself saw a case produced by it. Nor is there better foundation for his attempt to propagate the opinion, that physicians here were averse to the introduction of the vaccine disease; for no where has it been better received by medical men.

With respect to the second article, it appears from the records that the counsellors did appoint a respectable committee, of which Dr. W. was a member, to repair to *Marblehead*. A time was appointed for making the visit. Two of the gentlemen, residing in *Boston*, were prevented from going by calls in their profession, which were imperious and irresistible; and Dr. W. had information of the reasons which detained them, as soon as was practicable. As he was possessed of this information long before he made the publication in question, the counsellors are at a loss to conceive what motives could suggest, and what excuse can palliate, the intimation of insincerity on the part of the committee.

*Ordered*, That the above report be printed in the newspaper in which the publication alluded to appeared.

Now in proof of his *republicanism*, let me give you a little extract of a letter he wrote while physician to the Marine Hospital, to which he was appointed by Mr. Jefferson, "Every thing I should have said on this subject would have been construed as referring to the rash and wicked conduct of one or the other of these men; and the Democrats would probably have quoted my sentiments in the Chronicle to serve their vile, party purposes." The whole letter is at your service. I can also assure you, that within a few weeks he has expressed nearly the same sentiments to a federal gentleman; and added some remarks on Mr. Austin, the *imprudence* of which would surprize you.

He has so long and so often repeated the cry of persecution and with such excellent effect, that I cannot avoid bestowing a little attention on it. The first time that we hear of his being persecuted was in the year 1789, when an anonymous letter was written to Dr. Lettsom of London to induce him to fix a donation, he was supposed to be about making the university, on the professor of theory and practice of physic, who was represented to Dr. Lettsom to be *persecuted* by the physicians of Boston, partly from the preference given to him as a professor, and partly because he was a QUAKER! Dr. Lettsom being himself a Quaker, it was supposed this insinuation would influence him in favour of his *persecuted* brother. Next to this *religious persecution*, we find *that* of the late Dr. Howard, who dared to vaccinate a number of persons at Dorchester without his permission. A torrent of abuse was poured upon Dr. Howard through the newspapers, and was hardly suspended by his death. Next, the doctor was *persecuted* by Dr. Rand, because the latter did not find it convenient to go to Marblehead with him. What was said to him is recent in the recollection of every one. Then followed the *persecution* of the Medical Society; lately the *persecution* of the President of said society, and the *persecution* of his colleague professors. This poor man has been forever *persecuted*, and yet forever deluging the public with abuse in every possible form.

Remark 6. "Why is not a word said of the labours of the professor of the theory and practice of physic," &c.? Nobody can answer this question better than you yourselves. You know perfectly well that the one of you who has most pretension to talent, and who has attended his lectures of late years, always spoke of them in the most contemptuous man-

ner, till you became joint petitioners for the College of Physicians. You know that one of you has said within a fortnight, that you were embarrassed as to the method of trusting him after you had served yourselves through his agency, or words to that effect. You know that one of the most respectable of you unguardedly spoke of him some time since, in the most contemptuous manner, but agreed that it was necessary to coalesce with him at present. In short, Sirs, you know that you will consider him a burden to your institution, the moment you have effected its establishment; and should you succeed, we shall indubitably see you engaged in plans to get rid of him, with as much zeal as you now court his assistance.\*

Remark 7. The reply to this is contained on page 5; where "that *scandalous* and *abusive* communication" is inserted, which is the only one that a series of 20, 30, or perhaps 40 of your publications have drawn forth.

Remark 8. You deny the accuracy of the statement of disputes in Philadelphia; and have artfully imputed them to an animosity between Dr. Rush and Cobbet. Although your assertion is made with unblushing effrontery you adduce no facts in support of it. Had you been cautious of your reputation you would not have passed over the notes in the letter you were answering; and there you would have found, that the disputes in Philadelphia took place prior to the year 1791, that is, prior to the time when Cobbet appeared in Philadelphia. Dr. Rush is the very worst authority you could have quoted for your purpose; for in the first page of his recent publication, you will find that he is congratulating his students on the annihilation of an antagonist institution, or rather their union in one.

Remark 9. This is equally barefaced. I defy you in the face of the world to controvert a sentence of what is put down in the letter relative to the disturbances in New-York. The whole of what is said in the letter is supported by authentic documents now in Boston; the principal facts are *supported* by the *notes* to the letter.

Remark 10. Abusive declamation against the Medical Society.

Remark 11. "*Childish*," "*dishonest*," "*stupidly ignorant*," are terms becoming your mouths and your cause

\* This professor gets 500 dollars salary from Harvard College.

alone. I will not retort them on you; but plainly remark, that the Royal College of Physicians in London, and the London Medical Society are institutions totally different in their character, as one of you well knows. The College of Physicians is the body which governs the profession in London. The London (not Royal) Medical Society is an association for literary improvement. It has no more to do with the admission of candidates to practice, or the regulation of the profession, than you have. If you will venture to come forward in any way, and appoint proper persons to be the judges, I will at a public hearing adduce the evidence of this, and the other facts of a similar nature, and confute your assertions so plainly as to cover you with shame.

Remarks 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, are not worth noticing. They contain no appearance of facts.

Remark 17. You adduce the opinion of Governor Gerry in your favour. You best know by what presentations he was induced to favour you. It is fair to state that his opinion was promulgated before he had any opportunity of hearing the arguments on the other side. Besides this, his opinion goes no further than to show, that two literary institutions for self improvement have a good effect on each other. This may be true; but that two institutions for regulating the same body of men can have a good effect on each other is not said by his Excellency, nor is it true.

Your loose remarks contain little which is worthy of notice. If you can by them convince the republican party that the persons concerned in opposing your unjust and unreasonable demands, have attempted to influence any of them by other means than good, sound arguments, you may convince them that their senses betray them. Who has ever conferred with Governor Gerry or any member of the Council on this subject? I have heard of nobody. One or two members of the Senate were addressed, when it was understood that they were willing or wished to hear both sides, and two or three members of the House of Representatives. While you know that there is not a boarding-house in town where any member of the dominant party live, which you have not visited repeatedly. You know too, that some ridiculous instances have occurred of your unfolding your budget of scandal and misrepresentation in these places in the presence of individuals, whom you afterwards could have wished elsewhere.

You pretend to claim the influence of republicanism to help you to your wishes. One of you has made himself an excellent republican for this very purpose, and would probably be as strong a federalist tomorrow, to answer his object. But what right have you to the aid of any man who pretends to be a republican. Where were you in the revolutionary war? Where were the officers of the Medical Society at that time? They were engaged in the service of their country. They have grown old in the pursuit of honorable employments, and are they now to be insulted by the worthless and unprincipled? Do you consider the state of society here so debased, that you can at freedom let out the most unfounded slanders, the most loose and profligate reports against men, whom the public esteem, without exciting a reaction in their favour? Do you imagine that the Medical Society, which contains nearly all the regular practitioners in the state, will always see the men they respect covered with abuse by you, and not feel any indignation? It is impossible.

One word more, Sirs, before we part. You have said something and insinuated more about "deficiency of integrity," and other matters, which are intended as reflections on the morality of the individuals you envy and would destroy. Beware of ever more touching the private character of those you abuse. Remember the Marine Hospital, remember there are other affairs of a deep dye, which you must tremble to think of answering before the world.

Let me assure you that I have no expectation of gaining one of your friends by these observations. I have no object in view but to re-establish the truth among those you have deceived.

I am, with that degree of respect you merit, Sirs, your  
humble servant.

P. S. YOU say that "the representation in page 6 is a misrepresentation." Why do you not prove it so? I defy you to controvert a syllable of it. You threaten the public with a statement of facts. The public are accustomed to such threats; for they have been long threatened with a statement respecting vaccination, respecting the Marine Hospital, and various other statements which never have been made. I should rejoice to see such statements; for as you have at last goaded us out of silence, we will amuse ourselves with examining them.

At the moment of concluding this reply, I learn that two of the most respectable of your petitioners have in writing expressed their unqualified disapprobation of your proceedings in this business, and vindicated the character of the President of the Medical Society from your aspersions; and others have done the same verbally. It must now appear evident that your whole transactions arise from a desire to make a little bustle and raise yourselves out of the obscurity, from which you cannot be rescued by your own merits. You have succeeded in some measure by putting on a cloak of *republicanism*. Will the predominating party then suffer themselves to be *gulled* by such green *republicans*?





Med. Hist.

WZ

270

W291r

1812

c. 1

