

cribed had not been given. She said there was wine." Yet this independent lady of superior quality seems not to have been checked, but to have been allowed to run her course undisturbed. Of course, as was to be expected, the students met with frequent annoyances from her, and it is asserted that "*she* often refused to allow them to examine patients."

Another count in the indictment is moral pollution, but we have not been able to obtain any particulars, and sincerely hope it does not extend beyond the impurities comprised in the foregoing implications.

So far the accusations rest with the inferiors, now we enter upon those levelled against the medical staff, and here we deplore that they should ever have been countenanced by the infirmities of our brethren. Some of the Physicians are represented as having been very irregular in their attendance, one in particular, Dr. Beaumont, except during his week for admission came to the Hospital at no appointed hour, so that it was altogether impossible for the *eleves* to follow his practice or participate in the benefits which they anticipated in selecting this institution for the study of disease. The pupils of one school, Trinity College, were more favored than those of others, and received notifications of operations which was withheld from their rivals. But the remaining charges are of a still more serious nature, and imply an actual breach of professional courtesy in the mutual treatment of individual Physicians. Instead of consultations being general they were restricted to a chosen few, and in one or two instances the exclusions were not merely markedly invidious, but sedulously designed. Of those who were thus withheld from obtaining the privileges which legitimately pertained to their position was Dr. Aitken, whom we look upon as the victim of petty jealousy and shameful oppression. In giving his testimony he says, "some of the *patients* in the Hospital have observed to me that some of the medical officers disliked me, and gave these patients as a reason that I was a young man, and that the other medical men did not like to see me succeed in an operation." Our readers will judge from this at how low an ebb medical ethics must be when the very patients are aware of the likings and distastes of their attendants. And in the propriety of making them confidants in matters of so delicate a nature few right minded persons will be found to acquiesce. Dr. A. had patients actually taken from under his treatment and discharged just on the eve, as it were, when he intended subjecting them to operation: a case of stricture of the urethra is adduced in point. The cause of malignity would seem to proceed from his unfortunately being connected with Rolph's school, for his associate teachers were equally dispised. Mr. Lennon says, "a nurse considered, and every person connected with the institution was of the same opinion, that every one connected with Rolph's school was