

*To the Editor:*—I am of the opinion that there is no good reason for moving THE JOURNAL office. I think Chicago is the most suitable place for it. I vote for it to remain in Chicago, for that to be its permanent home.

H. H. DARR, M.D.

Caldwell, Texas, Jan. 30, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—I prefer to see THE JOURNAL continue its publication in Chicago. Besides the superior facilities of communication with all parts of the country, the ambition to excel all competing cities in laudable enterprises that give prosperity to a city, which prevails there, may sharpen editorial energy to make it the best medical journal in the world.

WM. LOMAX, M.D.

Marion, Ind., Feb. 2, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—I prefer Chicago as the location and home of our journal for one good reason, in addition to the many others already stated by numerous correspondents. I believe the Eastern members of our profession are tainted with heretical opinions as to the propriety and practicability of our "Code of Medical Ethics" as a guide to the highest honor and truest success of the profession. Witness the heterodoxy through which we have only recently passed and fresh in the minds of all.

This reflection is not meant to impugn the characters of Eastern members generally—simply as a statement of a deplorable fact, as to a few in high places.

GUSTAVUS S. FRANKLIN, A.M., M.D.

Chillicothe, O., Feb. 3, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—Though living in the East and wishing it to prosper; yet I wish to be understood as advocating Chicago as the place for THE JOURNAL. 1. Because of its central location. 2. Because it is a great medical centre. 3. Because the next decade will witness it the largest city in America. 4. Because THE JOURNAL is ably edited in Chicago and is prosperous, not political nor prejudicial to sections.

C. G. CANNADAY, M.D.

23 Salem ave., Roanoke, Va., Feb. 3, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—I do not think the time has come, or in fact, ever will come, when our journal should be removed from Chicago. This child of our creation was born under trying circumstances, and I hope it has passed all the straits of its birth, and now at an age well on its feet, walking alone. Chicago, I believe, should be its home.

THOMAS H. BRIGGS, M.D.

Battle Creek, Mich., Feb. 5, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—In the absence of any sufficient reason for changing the publication office of THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION from Chicago to Washington, I wish to record my vote in favor of its present location.

J. W. FERGUSON, M.D.

Canaan, O., Feb. 7, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—I am greatly surprised at the letter of Dr. Solis-Cohen in THE JOURNAL of January 31. I admit that THE JOURNAL has not reached the standard of excellence which the profession have a right to expect. I am, however, satisfied that "sectional prejudice" and personal ambition in Philadelphia, New York and Washington, have had not a little to do with this lowering of the standard. Dr. Solis-Cohen makes the assertion that the removal to Washington would overcome all the present difficulties.

Washington is not, and cannot be a centre for this country. Even the political conventions are not held there, and the only thing that preserves it as the National Capital is the amount of money expended in permanent government improvements.

Perhaps THE JOURNAL would not in Washington be debased to a "local" organ, but what assurance would we have that it would not be practically debased to the uses of some one service of the government. For example: With the official organ of the profession under control how easily might a Marine-Hospital surgeon annihilate a National Board of Health. For one I prefer a "local" medical journal to the tool of a political ring.

I am opposed to removal of THE JOURNAL:

1. Because such removal of plant would be expensive.
2. Because such removal would result in loss of advertising patronage.
3. Because there is not the slightest assurance that such removal would improve the personnel of the editorial board.
4. Because such removal would not increase facilities for good work.
5. Because such removal would cause loss of subscribers.
6. Because such removal would make THE JOURNAL a local journal, out of sympathy with the profession of the country.

The East has three good medical weeklies, the *Medical News*, the *New York Medical Journal*, and the *Medical Record*. The West has none. The removal of THE JOURNAL to Washington would immediately result in the establishment of a high grade Chicago weekly, which would largely decrease the advertising and subscription patronage of THE JOURNAL.

Permit me to suggest that THE JOURNAL would be more improved by having an editor for each Section of the Association, than by its removal. These sectional editors should take turn in getting out successive numbers of THE JOURNAL, under the supervision of the Editor-in-Chief, until the work of the meeting is finished, and thereafter these sectional editors should have supervision of papers in their special departments. If, for example, at a sectional meeting there are five papers read on peritonitis, publish them together, followed by discussion, as is done in the *British Medical Journal*.

HENRY B. HEMENWAY, M.D.

Evanston, Ill., Feb. 9, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—I am profoundly opposed to the removal of THE JOURNAL. Chicago is central and has talent to edit the same as well as Washington, Boston or New York.

A. G. PORTER, M.D.

Lebanon, Ind., Feb. 9, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—As a member of the A. M. A. I am decidedly opposed to the removal of THE JOURNAL to Washington, or to any other point at present. I am also opposed to locating our annual meeting at any one point. By all means let the Association remain National in character, and let it itinerate, gathering new members from all parts of our country. To permanently locate the annual meeting somewhere in the East or South, would be practically inviting our brethren on the Pacific slope to withdraw, which they would probably do.

I vote to let THE JOURNAL remain in Chicago until after the Columbian exposition at least, and let special inducements be offered all visiting physicians in good standing to visit the editor and subscribe for THE JOURNAL.

I have no fault to find with the present, or past, management of THE JOURNAL.

C. N. UDELL, M.D.

Blakesburg, Iowa, Feb. 9, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—The fact that Washington City, with all her macroscopic advantages, has never produced a medical journal "National" either in character or reputation, is the very reason why she is just the place which can do it. Every process attending the production of a journal, composing, printing, sewing, etc., is directly