

said that there were at that time but two resident medical officers in the hospital, and eight or ten untrained nurses. The patients numbered eighty or ninety. The work was done remarkably well, considering the circumstances, and the death rate but little greater than at present, though of course such a variety of cases was not seen in the wards. He mentioned the cholera epidemic in 1854, when hundreds of patients died in the hospital, and all the nurses and orderlies deserted. The two house men, Dr. Ault and himself, had to do all the work from the time they carried the patient in, till the time they carried his body out, for death was not an unusual termination. Such care, however, was taken in the treatment of the disease that not a single patient or servant went down with cholera during the epidemic which lasted from June to October.

Dr. Patch, acting Superintendent, reported 803 patients treated to a conclusion; 55 deaths of which 28 occurred within three days of admission. Making the general mortality rate 3.34. The aggregate number of hospital days was 20,674; average per patient 25.6. In the outdoor department there were 10,850 consultations, and the ambulance responded to 434 calls.

During the quarter eight nurses passed examinations, receiving their diplomas and medals.

The medical board, which now controls the outdoor department, has appointed the following for the staff visiting of this department: Physicians, Drs. Gordon, Gillies, C. P. Howard; Surgeons, Drs. Von Eberts, Bazin, Pennoyer, and Peters. With the death of Dr. Buller, Montreal loses her most eminent specialist, and Canada the man of all those resident among us whose name has been most familiar to European physicians.

Dr. Buller has long been recognised as the last court of appeal in Canada for disease of the eye—if he could do nothing nothing could be done. We have eminent specialists in the profession, but few who impress one with such capacity in emergencies as did Dr. Buller. He was never at a loss, and, when most hardly pressed, shone most brilliantly. His manner was brusque, as a rule; but the students gathered many a lesson of gentleness when he handled a little child in his outdoor clinic, and his house man at the hospital saw through the rough mask long before the term was completed.

He was a well of knowledge, and he could teach a combination as useful as it is rare. He could not impart his experience, his touch, nor his genius, but he could show a student how to look, and how to see what he was looking at; further, he could, in a few words, convey great lessons, and in a short series of lectures emphasize what a general practitioner should know of ophthalmology; what he should do; and,