

Correspondence.

The Editors do not hold themselves in any way responsible for the views expressed by correspondents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MEDICAL FACULTY OF UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

To the Editor of the ONTARIO MEDICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,—In the year 1887, the Toronto School of Medicine suspended active teaching, and became the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Toronto. Owing to the zeal and hard work of the members of the teaching staff of the said school of medicine, it had, at the time of confederation, become one of the foremost medical colleges in Canada. The attendance then was about 250 students, and the income about \$16,000 per session.

Thus each one of the staff of the Toronto School of Medicine had a vested interest and right in it as a going institution, yielding a large income as the results of the efforts individually and collectively of the said staff.

When the Toronto School of Medicine entered the University confederation and became its teaching Faculty, it was fully believed that the vested rights of all who had laboured so long and faithfully to build up the Toronto School of Medicine, would be fully respected and honourably rewarded.

After five years of the new arrangements, the term came round for an adjustment or reorganization of the Faculty. At this reorganization some members of the Faculty were dismissed with retiring allowances; some were dismissed with a status, but without a retiring allowance; one was dismissed without either status or retiring allowance; some were degraded in pay; some were promoted in pay and status; some were underpaid compared with others; and some of the ablest members of the staff received less pay than some of the youngest members. For these reasons it is to be hoped the senate will soon reconsider the action of the committee and senate of last spring, and do justice where justice was not done then.

1. In the case of Dr. W. W. Ogden, it is evident that injustice was done by breaking up his

department into two lectureships. By the report of the committee, Dr. Ogden was retired with the status of professor emeritus, but without any retiring allowance being granted. Now, it is clear, that these two actions of the committee and the senate were grossly unjust, viz., the dismissal without good cause or complaint: and second, that no retiring allowance has been granted. It ought to be remembered that Dr. Ogden has a financial interest in the original Toronto School of Medicine buildings.

2. Dr. M. H. Aikins, who, like Dr. W. W. Ogden, laboured efficiently on the Toronto School of Medicine staff for upwards of twelve years, and has also a financial interest in the said school, was by the same committee retired from the staff of the Medical Faculty, and the position he held given to another. Still further he has been relieved of his professorship without retiring allowance.

3. The case of Dr. J. Ferguson is specially aggravating. The injustice that has been done to him is pronounced and patent. He served in the Toronto School of Medicine for six years, and during that period gave an enormous amount of time, both winter and summer, to the advancement of the college. He has also served for five years on the staff of the University Medical Faculty. During these five years he has ever been diligent in seeking the good and welfare of the Faculty, and has always given a large amount of time, and that to a difficult part of the work. But he has been dismissed from the Faculty without either status or retiring allowance. His position has been given to another.

4. The question of a retiring allowance is specially important, as two, viz., Drs. H. H. Wright and James Thorburn have been granted such an allowance, whereas in the cases of Drs. W. W. Ogden, M. H. Aikins and J. Ferguson, who served for five years, no such allowance was granted. This is an unfair discrimination, that it is hoped every member of the senate will hasten to remedy, and wipe from the records a proceeding so glaringly partial to two, and unjust to three, of the staff.

5. The position of Dr. J. E. Graham is one of peculiar interest. It shows how unfairly the committee balanced their account of what had been done in the past, and how unfairly they estimated value for the future. Dr. J. E. Graham has