

by attribute to the Trustees will enable them to decide upon the matter without the "fear, favor, of affection" of even the editors of THE DOMINION MEDICAL JOURNAL.

I am yours, &c., JAMES RICHARDSON.

[We are exceedingly sorry to find our remarks on hospital management thus construed, as we took a great deal of pains when writing, to avoid everything that might give personal offence, and if we did not succeed, we suppose it must have been, as our Montreal *confère* would say, owing to our "youth and inexperience;" but we think the Doctor is more sensitive than the case would warrant, and we know that our only object was, to get some system inaugurated, by which the clinical material which the Toronto General Hospital *now possesses* might be more fully utilized. We do not think that object would be promoted by personalities, and we do not intend, *willingly* to indulge in anything of the kind, but we certainly think the following resolution, passed by the Hospital Staff, will bear the construction we gave it.

"Resolved,—That we are of opinion that the plan proposed, of transferring the patients from one medical officer to another, would be objectionable to both of these gentlemen, and injurious to the welfare of the patients, and would tend to remove all responsibility as to their treatment; that the daily duty which would necessarily result, would be so prolonged and constant, as to *interfere seriously with the private practice* of the medical officers, and could not be discharged faithfully without entailing upon them *great loss and inconvenience* and.

That, therefore, we do not approve of the changes proposed by the trustees of the Hospital, as to the attendance of the Hospital Staff."—ED. DOM. MED. JOUR.]

To the Editors of the Dominion Medical Journal, Toronto.

GENTLEMEN:—I wish to correct an error which appeared in the last number of your journal: the communication signed "a subscriber," was not written by any medical man of this place, the article was written by me, and I beg to enclose my card. I wish at the same time to apologize for an error which occurred in signing said article, which should have been signed a *Reader*, instead of "a subscriber." The error was caused by the young man who made a copy of the communication, hoping you will accept this apology for the error.

I remain, yours truly,

A READER.

April 7th, 1870.

Reviews and Notices of Books.

MODERN THERAPEUTICS, BY NAPHEYS. S. W. BUTLER, M.D. Philadelphia.

We felt some disappointment on taking up the little book with the above captivating title, to find that it was nothing more than a collection of formulae and "specific therapeutical directions," compiled from recent periodicals, monographs, and systematic treatises. As such, it displays a good deal of industry on the part of the author, and will probably save much time for the older and more busy practitioners when they wish, in a hurry, to refer to the therapeutics of a disease.

To men of mature judgment, it will prove useful, as it gives, in connection with each disease treated of, the prescriptions of a large number of medical writers, with, in some instances, a short account of the principles which should guide in the treatment; but to young men just from the schools, a work giving so many different prescriptions in connection with each disease, it will not afford much help in those puzzling cases which never occurred to anybody before. What the beginner wants is not only the treatment advised by the best men, but a decided expression of opinion, on the part of the author, in favor of some one of them; hence we would rather put into their hands a good standard author, who gives something of the pathology of disease; as, in this way, we foster the habit of thought and reflection, instead of a blind routine which we generally see in the man who practices medicine according to the old prescription book of his father.

On the whole, however, we like the book as a curiosity, showing how these doctors differ, and it really contains many useful hints and formulae, but we fear it is likely to prove more embarrassing than assuring to our young men who most need an instructor.

The chapter on enlarged tonsil is deserving of more especial notice. In it Dr. Ruppner advises the use of the London paste, instead of the knife, and reports one hundred and twenty-three cases treated thus; the minimum number of applications of the paste, in any case, was six; the maximum, fourteen. He says this new escharotic supersedes the knife for the removal of enlarged tonsils.

A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE DISEASES OF THE EYE: THEIR MEDICAL AND SURGICAL TREATMENT. By HENRY-W. WILLIAMS, A.M., M.D. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869.

A number of good books, great and small, bearing upon the subject of ophthalmology in its modern