

its present size, especially in view of the crippled state of the endowment. Eight attending and four consulting medical officers, all privileged to receive and attend patients, in an hospital only able to support fifty free beds, (yes, for several months only able to support twenty-five,) does appear to us an absurdity.

If it were not presumption in us to express an opinion, we would suggest classifying and dividing the men differently. We would make three classes: consulting, attending, and assistant physicians and surgeons. We would limit the consulting men to what the term implies—the giving advice at consultations. The consulting staff we would compose of all men from the active staff who had arrived at a certain age, or who had served a certain number of years. The attending physicians and surgeons we would limit in the present state of the institution, to two of each, or four without distinction, and we would make provision for the filling of vacancies in this staff, from among the assistants.

We would limit their duties to the attendance upon interné patients, and make it compulsory on them to give a certain number of clinical lectures every month during their period of attendance. They should have the privilege of admitting or refusing any patient sent up to them (by the assistant physicians and surgeons) during their period of service; and we would extend the period of consecutive attendance for each, to one, two, or three months; one physician and one surgeon, if thus classified, being compelled to attend at the same time, the one to receive surgical, and the other, medical cases; and we would make them be at their post of duty, every day at a certain hour during their period of attendance. Then students would not go to the hospital day after day, register their names, and go home again without seeing the face of a medical officer, as we believe they often do now.

Then we would elect ("by concours") a number of assistant physicians and surgeons, whose duty it should be to attend (in a certain rotation) to the externé patients, and send up for admission those requiring such aid, thus saving much time to the attending staff; and we think it would be a vast convenience to the sick poor, to medical students, and to the assistant staff, if this out door relief could be afforded at some central point within the city, easily reached by the feeble and infirm. We would only allow the attending staff to be filled from the assistant staff, and then only by election, according to fitness. The men might be appointed to the assistant staff, for three or five years, but eligible for re-election if found competent.

We would thus have a modification of the French system of appointing, which we consider to be one of the most equitable and efficient for all purposes in the world, and under which no man is admitted to examination, for appointment on the assistant staff, or "Bureau Central" as it is called, under twenty seven years of age, while a surgeon must have attained the age of thirty years, and a physician thirty-five, before he is eligible to the office of attending surgeon or physician.

If some such system were adopted we would escape the absurdity which now exists, of appointing men on account of their national, sectarian, or political affinities or influence, without any reference to, or test of, their professional ability.

WHAT WE MAY EXPECT FROM THE PUBLIC.

The *Toronto Leader*, of February 2nd, 1870, has the following paragraph in its Police reports:—

"*Procuring Abortion.*—The abortive charge preferred against Dr. R. S. Andrews, of this city, by Dr. Clements, of Bradford, proved abortive indeed. Dr. Andrews was honourably acquitted. The particulars of this case have already appeared in the *Leader*, and it is needless now to repeat them. It was expressed in court that it was a pity such a feeling of animosity should exist between doctors who had studied their profession in different schools of medicine, and it is to be hoped this will be the last scene of the kind."

The truth, as far as we could learn is, that the case was dismissed, because the principal witness, the woman herself, was not forthcoming. We know the difficulty of obtaining evidence in cases of this sort, and presume every effort was made to sift the matter to the bottom. Upon this head we have nothing to say, and "R. S. Andrews, L.L.D.," is fully entitled to the honorable acquittal accorded to him, for anything we know to the contrary.

But when we read the feeling expressed in court, which the *Leader* quotes in a way which certainly implies approval, we despair of the general public ever appreciating efforts to distinguish between legal and illegal practitioners. Surely the present law is broad enough, (too broad, many of us say,) and allows a man to practice any *ism* whatever, at present invented, provided he has a proper medical education. But a Dispensary for private diseases, and for the sale of Pills which will restore Menstruation, with special instructions when they are not to be used, is a school of medicine existing only in the fertile brains of the *Leader*.

We have no wish to say anything personally offensive to Dr. Andrews, we have said nothing of him now that he does not say of himself in his advertisement. The whole matter would be entirely un-