

*To the Editor:*—As a member of the Association, I have carefully read and compared the various reasons assigned for the removal of THE JOURNAL, or for continuing its publication in Chicago, wishing, in casting my vote, to do so only after mature consideration.

It would occupy too great space to review the pros and cons—the arguments offered on both sides of the question—those of Dr. Solis-Cohen's removal article, so ably replied to by Harold N. Moyer, M.D., and Harvey Reed, M.D.; the spicy and patriotic non-removal vote of E. Chenery, M.D.; besides various other articles appearing in THE JOURNAL, under the heading: "Shall THE JOURNAL, be Removed to Washington?"

Permit me, on so appropriate an occasion, to offer the tribute of my sincere esteem to Dr. E. Chenery, for the display of such unbiased and patriotic sentiments as expressed in his letter to THE JOURNAL of January 27. Certainly, if Pope was a contemporary with Dr. Chenery, he would have found an exception to the doubt expressed in the lines:

"Where is the man who counsel can bestow,  
Unbiased or by favor or by spite."

Please record my vote *against* removing THE JOURNAL from Chicago, and *especially* against removal to Washington.

"Come, your reason, Jack, your reason."

While my reasons may not be "as plenty as blackberries," there being no compulsion, as in Sir John's case, I will simply urge the objection to Washington, on strictly sanitary and hygienic reasons.

I respectfully call the attention of the Trustees of the Association to page 867, "Da Costa's Medical Diagnosis," seventh (last) edition, line 17 to line 39.

Under article "Fever," calling attention to the effects of malaria in simulating acute meningitis, Prof. Da Costa states that the patient had spent part of his summer vacation in the *marshy* neighborhood of Washington—the cerebral symptoms arising in which case so simulated acute meningitis, that it was only through the use of the quinine treatment that a differential diagnosis could be arrived at.

In this connection, one of the most prominent scientific members of the medical profession in the United States, in an address before the British Medical Association, not many years ago, in speaking of the deleterious effects of malaria upon the human system, declared that malaria was antagonistic to high mental culture, or words to that effect.

I think that for the successful publication of THE JOURNAL, it should be kept as far as possible from all marshy or malarial centres, that the intellectual faculties of the editor, publisher and type-setters, *et hoc genus omne*, connected with it, may enjoy the full scope to be attained only in a pure atmosphere, uncontaminated by antagonistic intellectual influences. "*Stare decisis, et non quietam movere*," is a law maxim it would be well to bear in mind, in considering the question of the *locus in quo* for THE JOURNAL.

C. D. OWENS, M.D.,  
Pres. Louisiana State Medical Society.

Eola, La., February 16, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—As a member of the American Medical Association I wish to record my name "with the crowd" and say: Let the place of publication remain where it is. I think, with Dr. John M. Batten, that it should remain in its *native habitat*.

H. C. FAIRBANK, M.D.  
Flint, Mich., Feb. 20, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—If the home of THE JOURNAL must be removed from Chicago, let it come to Galena, Ill. It was the home of Grant, Washburn, Rawlins and other great men. It is far more central than Washington and has eight physicians, equally inexperienced in editorial work with their brethren of the Capital City, and equally full of enthusiasm for the good work.

We of Galena are far from the maddening and demoralizing influence of political parties and their intrigues, and when we come home from our muddy country rides and hang up our splashed overcoats, we can give to our editorial work the full power of our massive intellects.

I think Chicago the proper place for the home of THE JOURNAL, but as I said before, if it must be removed let it come to the central city of Galena, and not to the outer edge of the territory at Washington.

HENRY T. GODFREY, M.D.

Galena, Ill.

*To the Editor:*—If THE JOURNAL should be moved to Washington City I am fearful much of its life and vigor would be lost. Business activity is contagious, and in Chicago we have the benefit of the stimulus of this kind of an epidemic all the time.

J. T. MCSHANE, M.D.

Carmel, Ind., Feb. 23, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—Keep THE JOURNAL in the great city of the enterprising West. Chicago is the only city that presents so many advantages for the publication of THE JOURNAL.

J. J. GARVER, M.D.

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 23, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—Permit me, as a member of the American Medical Association since 1877, to interpose my decided opposition to the removal of THE JOURNAL to Washington or anywhere East. From my standpoint I cannot see any good reasons for the change, while to the contrary, many sufficient reasons have already been suggested, by many members from different points of the compass, why it *should not* be removed to Washington, but should remain in the great central interior city of Chicago, where it first saw the light, and where it has served us so well.

J. H. DAVISSON, M.D.

Los Angeles, Cal., Feb. 19, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—To some men the arguments in favor of Chicago are too obvious and too numerous to require enunciation. Insane or insincere men I have neither time nor inclination to labor with. Yours for Chicago, ten thousand times Chicago!

DONALD MACLEAN, M.D.

Detroit, Mich., Feb. 23, 1891.

## MISCELLANY.

*Official List of Changes in the Stations and Duties of Officers Serving in the Medical Department, U. S. Army, from February 14, 1891, to February 20, 1891.*

Lieut. Col. Charles C. Byrne, Surgeon, is relieved from duty at Ft. Sam Houston, Tex., and will report in person to the commanding General, Dept. of the Columbia, for duty as Medical Director of that Dept., relieving Col. Bernard J. D. Irwin, Surgeon. Col. Irwin, on being relieved by Lieut. Col. Byrne, will proceed, via San Francisco, Cal., to St. Louis, Mo., and report in person to the commanding General, Dept. of the Missouri, for duty as Medical Director of that Dept., relieving Col. Charles Page, Asst. Surgeon General. Col. Page, on being relieved by Lieut. Col. Irwin, will report in person to the commanding General, Div. of the Atlantic, for duty as Medical Director of that Division. By direction of the Secretary of War. Par. 6, S. O. 36, A. G. O., Washington, February 13, 1891.

Capt. Louis M. Maus, Asst. Surgeon, is relieved from duty at Ft. Stanton, N. M., and will report in person to the commanding officer, Whipple Bks., Ariz., for duty at that station, relieving Capt. Richard W. Johnson, Asst. Surgeon. Capt. Johnson, on being relieved by Capt. Maus, will report in person to the commanding officer, San Carlos, Ariz. Terr., for duty at that station. By direction of the Secretary of War. Par. 7, S. O. 35, A. G. O., Washington, February 1, 1891.

### CORRIGENDUM.

In THE JOURNAL of February 21, page 286, next to the last line in third paragraph, for "*bladder*" read "*blades*."