

a man of promise. Dr. Keagey was enjoying his ordinary health up to within about six weeks of his death. He complained at first of a slight bronchial affection and then a slight pain in the side. He did not ask any one to examine his chest, nor did he betray any anxiety about himself. This lasted for about a fortnight, when he was called out in the night to see a patient in the country. It was a very cold, stormy night, and he appears to have taken a fresh cold, for he did not feel able to return to the city, but drove on to the residence of his brother near by, he remained quite ill, without being seen by any Physician, for nearly a week, when violent Hæmoptysis set in, and occurred at short intervals, in spite of every means to check it, and he sank rapidly, expiring on the fifth of the present month, lamented by all who knew him.

The Medical Society met as usual this month, but adjourned immediately as a mark of respect to their late member, Dr. Keagey.

Yours, etc,
FORCES.

Hamilton, April 16th, 1870.

DR. RICHARDSON'S LETTER.

To the Editors of the Dominion Medical Journal.

GENTLEMEN,—In your number for March you refer to the proposed change in the attendance of the Medical Officers of the Toronto General Hospital, in the following terms :

“We are glad to learn that the Trustees of the Toronto General Hospital are just now trying to effect some change in the system of attendance at that institution, whereby its clinical advantages can be more fully utilized than at present.” “In our simplicity we supposed that those who accepted hospital appointments (especially if connected with medical schools) would be willing, in view of the honor of the position, to make some sacrifice of personal ease and convenience, in order that the advantages of the institution, as a school of observation and discipline, might be developed to the utmost degree, but forsooth, we are told, (we hope incorrectly) that all these objects are subordinate to the convenience of the medical officers.” “All honor to the trustees who have the moral courage to approach the matter.” “We hope they will carry out their patriotic design, without fear, favor, or affection.”

The facts are these. The trustees addressed a circular to the medical officers, requesting their opinion as to the advisability of changing the mode of attendance, so as “to place the entire charge of the patients in the care of a certain small number

of 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6 medical men (according to the number of patients) in rotation, for a certain period of from 2 to 4 months, permitting the retiring medical men to retain one or two patients, whose cases may be of a peculiar or interesting nature, to deal with to the end.”

The staff accordingly took the proposition into consideration at a meeting called for the purpose, and adopted a reply condemnatory of the scheme, which reply was signed by Drs. Beaumont, Rolph, Hodder, and Bovell, of the consulting staff, and by Drs. Berryman, Rowell, Richardson, Thorburn, Geikie, Canniff, and Cassidy, of the ordinary staff in fact, by all the medical officers, with one exception, ten of the eleven being teachers in the two medical schools of this city, and therefore directly interested in making the Hospital as attractive and useful as possible to students. Most of these gentlemen have for many years “sacrificed” considerable “personal ease and convenience,” and have had long experience in hospital attendance and in teaching; and, besides, the four gentlemen who compose the consulting staff can have no personal convenience to serve in this matter, as the proposed change would not in any way affect their attendance.

It is, then, an unwarrantable and offensive assertion which you make, that these medical gentlemen “have made the higher objects of the institution subordinate to their personal convenience.”

Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the plan, common courtesy would have accorded by the medical officers, in their consideration of it, so much credit for intelligence and desire for the advancement of the schools, the students, and the hospital, as well as for as much patriotism and selflessness as the editors of THE DOMINION MEDICAL JOURNAL, or others, can claim for themselves.

You endeavor to convey the impression that antagonism exists between the Trustees and the medical officers; that the former are attempting to carry out a change for the benefit of the Hospital, but are thwarted by the selfishness of the latter. To this I give an emphatic denial. A perfectly good understanding exists between these gentlemen. The medical staff were requested by the Board of Trustees to express their opinion upon a certain plan, “in order that the Trustees may be enabled to arrive at a definite understanding on the matter,” and with one exception the whole staff expressed a strong opinion, and gave strong reasons, against the proposed scheme.

Under these circumstances, I have no doubt but that the “moral courage” which you so generously