

**23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503**

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

© 1983

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

- ☐ Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restoration may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- ☐ Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- ☐ Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- ☐ Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- ☐ Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- ☒ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- ☐ Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- ☒ Showthrough/
Transparence
- ☐ Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- ☐ Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- ☐ Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- ☐ Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata
slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to
ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement
obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure,
etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à
obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



Library of the Public
Archives of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol ➡ (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ▼ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:


La bibliothèque des Archives
publiques du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole ➡ signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ▼ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.



REPORT
OF
AN INVESTIGATION
BY
THE TRUSTEES
OF THE
TORONTO GENERAL HOSPITAL,
INTO CERTAIN CHARGES AGAINST THE MANAGEMENT OF
THAT INSTITUTION.

TORONTO:
PRINTED AT THE GLOBE BOOK AND JOB OFFICE, 22, KING STREET WEST.

1855.

1855
(15)

INTRODUCTION.

In consequence of certain grave charges having been preferred in regard to the management and general appearance of the Toronto General Hospital, in a letter published in the *Colonist* of the 24th of March, 1855, and signed "A Medical Student," the Trustees of that Institution resolved at a meeting held on the 27th of the same month, "that in order to give the party assailing the management of the Hospital, an opportunity of establishing his allegations, they would hold a meeting on the 29th of March, at 12 o'clock noon." To this meeting the attending Physicians of the Institution, as well as members of the profession throughout the city were invited. The paper in which the announcement was made, contained a letter from the trustees, signed by Mr. Brent, the Secretary of the Board, expressing the great indignation with which they had read the false and calumnious statement of the management of the Institution, over the signature of "A Medical Student"; and also a letter signed VERITAS, and endorsed by nineteen Students whose names were given in full; characterizing the letter of "Medical Student" as a tissue of untruths.

On the morning of the 29th, the Board room of the Hospital was crowded, chiefly by students and professional

iv.

gentlemen, and the trustees commenced an investigation, which lasted during that and the two following days. The trustees present were Hon. Dr. Widmer, James Beaty, Esq., and J. G. Bowes, Esq., M. P. P. The following report of the three days' examination which ensued, appeared substantially in the columns of the *Globe* and the *Colonist* at the time. The third day's proceedings were somewhat condensed, but enough was then given to present the case fully before the public and more than is usually given in a newspaper re-port of such an enquiry. In revising that report, however, for publication in another form, I have given *in extenso* certain portions of the proceedings, which I, at that time, considered unnecessary to a correct understanding of the question, and have supplied in full, the letters which were then merely referred to. As a chronicler simply, of the statements publicly made before the trustees, it would be altogether unprofessional to offer one single remark here, either in regard to the manner in which that enquiry was proceeded with, or to the amount of evidence adduced to substantiate the charges made against the Institution. These matters the public will, by a perusal of this more ample report, determine for themselves, if they have not already done so. I therefore submit it with all respect, as a faithful record of that memorable three days' investigation.

G. P. URE.

REPORT.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, 29TH *March*, 1855.

A public meeting was held this day in the Board room of the Toronto General Hospital, to consider and examine into certain charges against the trustees, resident surgeon, and domestics of that Institution, made in a letter published in the *Colonist* of the 24th March inst., and signed "a Medical Student." Hon. Dr. Widmer, James Beaty, Esq., and J. G. Bowes, Esq., three of the trustees, were present. At a previous meeting the trustees had instructed their Secretary, J. W. Brent, Esq., to reply to the letter of "a Medical Student," and to express their great indignation at the false and calumnious statements therein contained. They also resolved that, in order to give the party assailing the management of the Hospital an opportunity of establishing his allegations, they would hold a meeting in the Hospital at noon on the 29th March, to which meeting the attending physicians of the Institution, as well as the members of the profession throughout the city, were invited. The Board room was consequently crowded, principally by students and professional gentlemen.

Some general remarks having been made amongst the trustees as to the propriety of Mr. Sheriff Jarvis taking the chair,

Mr. Sheriff JARVIS said he did not intend to take any part in the proceedings, as he thought when complaints were made, such as those now preferred against the Hospital, it was the duty of the trustees to enquire into them, and if there were good grounds for the complaints, let the proper course be taken to have them remedied. But if, on the other hand, the complaints were found to be frivolous and vexatious, let the trustees tell the public so. However, he did not feel justified in taking any part in the investigation. He did not think the public, or he, as an individual, had any right to interfere in the proceedings. It was clear that they had not the power to take evidence on oath; but if any voluntary statements could be made to the trustees, it would be as well that they should be taken.

Mr. Bowes said he had intended to move that Mr. Sheriff Jarvis should take the chair, but the objections that he had made were valid, and therefore he would not press that duty upon him. The trustees were desirous to have everything sifted to the bottom, and if any change could be made to promote the interests of the Institution, the trustees would very cheerfully do it. If a "Medical Student" is correct in the charges he has made, he (Mr. Bowes) was sure the trustees would be the very first parties to come forward and remedy the evils. The trustees had never themselves observed anything of the kind so strongly stated by the writer of the letter alluded to, though they had examined pretty regularly; but, of course, it was expected that the "Medical Student" who had written the letter, had information in regard to existing abuses which the trustees had not. If he had, he (Mr. Bowes) hoped he would have the honesty and boldness to come forward and state everything that he knew. No matter who was the delinquent, they wanted to find him out. Mr. Bowes concluded by moving that Dr. Widmer take the chair.

Dr. WIDMER said he did not think it right that he or any of the trustees should take the chair. The trustees were implicated, as well as other parties connected with the Institution, and they could not conduct this investigation without sitting as judges in their own case.

The honorable gentleman's scruples were not considered valid, however, and he consented to preside, and Mr. Brent acted as secretary.

Mr. BOWES suggested that the questions of enquiry should be put and answered in writing. He then moved that the letters be read, commencing with the letter of the 24th.

Mr. BRENT read the following letter:—

(To the Editor of the Colonist.)

"SIR,—Will you permit me through the columns of your paper to call the attention of the public to an evil which has grown grey in sin, and has reached a climax demanding speedy adjustment: I mean the manner in which "The Toronto General Hospital" is now managed. I have wondered repeatedly, with many others, at the remissness of the trustees; and why it is, they do not correct the loose and flagrant mismanagement which I am sure they are aware exists, since the matter has been repeatedly pressed upon their attention. It is only a few weeks ago that a man by the name of Burns, whose duty it is to wait upon the patients, and in their turn present them to the attending physicians, was brought before the Police Magistrate for brutally ill-using a colored man. It was shown by Mr. Lennon (a Medical Student) that this Burns had, without any provocation, grossly and wantonly maltreated this poor fellow; and that in the act, he could be prompted by no motive, but the *cruelty and relentless heartlessness* which he saw him so frequently manifest towards the suffering and afflicted, upon many other occasions. The Police Magistrate very properly fined him 20s. and costs, with a severe and

withering rebuke to his inhumanity; and expressed a hope that he would be dismissed from the Institution. This is not a solitary or isolated instance of this man's conduct; his cruelty and ruthlessness are proverbial among students. If it were necessary I could cite many other instances in support of these allegations. And with all these glaring verities staring us in the face, which in loud and piercing accents call for his dismissal, he is still retained in the Hospital to continue to perpetrate outrages upon the persons of the patients; and yet, forsooth, in justification of his demeanour he states the physician will give him a character. What kind of a character he deserves, from the above facts, let your readers judge. It is self-evident that the resident physician endorses his conduct, not only by retaining him in the Hospital, but also from his refusal, since this occurrence, to permit the poor to have their teeth extracted. Now, Mr. Editor, let me ask, who will perform these surgical operations, and where, if not in the Hospital? The resident surgeon says, they must go to the dentist; but, few of them have 2s. 6d. to pay for his professional services; and if they have not, what then? I presume it is a matter of indifference to him; he would sleep none the less sound for it. Is this fact to go abroad, that in "The Toronto General Hospital" a poor man cannot have a tooth extracted; it would be a disgrace to our city. Again, one of the women who has charge of the male patients, betrays a disposition similar to that of Burns, and exhibits a heart as *callous and impervious* to the appeals of common humanity. Her coarseness, inselence and rude treatment are too notorious to every observer to need comment. It is a short time ago that this woman solemnly asseverated in the hearing of the students, that if the then attending physician admitted a patient against whom she had some personal pique, "she would be the death of him." Whether or not she has carried this threat into execution I have not learned, but from my knowledge of her, I have reason to fear. It is no use to order any particular regimen for the sick, for it seems to rest wholly with this woman, whether it shall be given or not; it seems, I say, to rest upon the volition of her will; and she takes care, so far as I know, rigorously to enforce and interpose her authority. It would be impossible, in one letter, to give even a faint exposition of the corruption which exists and stalks forth in open day in this house of sin. I do not believe there is another similar institution in all America, where greater wrongs are perpetrated, or more distortion of kindness exists. It is so filthy, that it is best known among those who walk the wards by the appellation of the "L—y Hospital;" and it is only mentioned to sneer and ridicule it as a fountain of moral pollution. The time spent by the student is considered worse than squandered; no remuneration is received to compensate for the loss of the £2, much less their time; and were it not that our Colleges demand a twelve months' hospital attendance, few, if any students would visit it, but to learn how much misery and disease are augmented within its walls. I am in possession of a great many incidents to which I may draw the attention of the public again, if these wrongs be not speedily re

dressed. I hope this will have the effect of awakening the attention of the public, and causing a spirit of enquiry to be aroused, that will reach every extremity of the evil, and that a medicine, potent enough to reach the foundation of the disorder, may be applied, that death to the parts may be arrested.

Yours, &c.,

A MEDICAL STUDENT."

The letter having been read, James Dixon, a medical student came forward and said he was the writer of that letter. Some of the charges he was himself cognizant of, others of them he had been informed of by students attending the Hospital, whose names he was not at present at liberty to give, but who, he had no doubt, would come forward to substantiate what they knew of the charges. He was as willing to come forward and state what he knew publicly, as he was to make the charges in the letter. It was a recognised principle in philosophy, that a man's actions were neither good nor bad, aside from the motive which prompted him to perform those actions. He was sure that he was not prompted to write that letter by bad motives, and, therefore, had no hesitation in coming forward, not only to acknowledge having done so, but to substantiate the statements therein made.

Mr. BOWES.—How long have you been studying your profession? My reason for putting that question is to ascertain what means you have had of acquiring that knowledge in reference to this Institution, which other students attending the Hospital have not. I wish to see whether other medical students will coincide in the statements you have made.

Mr. DIXON.—I have been studying medicine about eight months.

Question.—How long have you been attending this Hospital?

Answer.—I have no ticket out, but have come here occasionally.

Q.—Have you a ticket taken out for the Hospital?

A.—I have not a ticket taken out for this session.

Q.—Have you the information, put forth in regard to the management of the Hospital, from your own observation, or from information derived from others?

A.—I have it from both sources. Some portions of it I have witnessed myself, and other portions I have from others.

Q.—What is the name of the nurse who is alluded to in your letter?

A.—As that is a fact I was not myself cognizant of, I do not choose to answer to the name.

Mr. Sheriff JARVIS said if it was the desire of the trustees to elicit all the particulars in connexion with this matter, he would humbly submit that they were beginning at the wrong end. It struck him that it would be much better

to pursue the course taken in a Court of Justice, and allow the gentleman to make his statements without interruption; and then let him be cross-questioned upon that statement. The questions would naturally grow out of the accusations. It would then be for the trustees to say whether these accusations had been verified. Some of these charges, he says, are made upon his own knowledge, others of them are given on hearsay evidence. If he cannot substantiate from his own observations and that of witnesses, the charges he has made, then the whole of his statements will go for nothing. Let him, however, make his statement and let it be taken down and signed, and then, on the part of the trustees, let any question be put to him which may be suggested by that testimony. This appeared the more correct mode of procedure.

Mr. BOWES said he would rather some other party should conduct the investigation. As a trustee he was rather there to hear the accusations brought forward. He had no doubt that the trustees were prepared to take any course that would most fully elicit the truth.

Mr. DIXON said, the spirit that prompted me to come forward was not a bad one. I have nothing against any of the persons connected with the institution personally, they have never done me any wrong, I am sure. I have already stated distinctly that some of the facts I was personally cognizant of. I expect the parties from whom I got the information will come forward, and answer to their part of the charge. I think, therefore, it would be better to permit me to make the statements I have to make, and then any question may be put to me that may be thought necessary.

Mr. BEATY said the only object the trustees had in view was to elicit all the facts in the case. They had Mr. Dixon's statement already before them in that letter. If he had anything further to say, they were willing to hear it; then they would proceed to the examination; their object was to arrive at the truth, and nothing but the truth.

Mr. DIXON said with regard to the first statement in the letter, that, in reference to Burns, I can not state exactly the day of the month, but it was in the month of January. I came up here to see Dr. Paget examined at the Board. I went into the Surgery, and there were quite a number of students inside; I cannot be sure, but I think that Dr. Bovell was there. Dr. Clarke was there, and either Dr. Bovell or some other Dr. authorized one of the students to bleed a patient; I went out to see the operation. The student bled the patient, and when he had done so, the patient fainted away; the student held him up in his arms on a chair; Dr. Clarke came forward and directed the patient to be laid upon his back on the floor. I then went away and returned in a short time. When I came back to see how the patient was doing, one of the students was applying a bottle of ammonia to the patient's nostrils. I felt the patient's hands; his extremities were cold, and the tips of his fingers were blue. I put my hand on the region of his heart, and the action had ap-

parently ceased, and there was a cold clammy sweat upon his face; there seemed to be a cold spasmodic shuddering running through his whole frame. Just as I was looking at him, Burns came forward with a pail of water in his hand, and threw a part of it upon the patient, and it was dashed all over his clothes. He was in the act of throwing the remainder of it, when a nurse came forward and prevented him from throwing it. Burns then took the patient up in his arms by the shoulders and pushed him outside the door. I went away and came back in a little while, and the patient was still lying outside in the cold, shuddering.

Dr. CLARKE.—Was the patient not brought out to the verandah to get the fresh air?

Mr. DIXON.—I do not think he was brought out for any purpose of that kind.

Dr. CLARKE.—I say the man *was* brought out to get the fresh air, a circumstance that frequently occurs.

Dr. BOVELL said he rose at this stage of the examination, to say that the young gentleman should take very good care what he said, because he (Dr. Bovell) could say distinctly that he was not in the surgery at the time alluded to.

Mr. BEATY hoped the witness would be allowed to proceed, and when the evidence was taken down, any gentleman present would have an opportunity of correcting the errors into which the witness may have fallen.

Mr. BOWES here said he should like to know, from any of the faculty present, what course was generally pursued in such cases.

Dr. COTTER said they all knew very well that he had a large practice in the city, and he could say that it was an invariable custom if he bled a patient to bring him out to the fresh air, and if it was a heavy person he must be dragged out the best way possible.

Mr. DIXON resumed. Upon another occasion I was here, I cannot exactly say when, but I think it was in the month of October. I came out of the surgery and went towards the door. A poor man whom I considered to be a patient, came in, when Burns came forward and lifted his hand and knocked off his hat. He struck it with such force that it went against the wall on the other side. It was knocked off with violence. Upon another occasion, I was up stairs, where there was a considerable number of students, I think from 30 to 40, and while there, one of the nurses came up and announced that a medical student was at the door wishing to know where the students from Victoria College were. She ushered him in among the students, and in doing so, made some taunting remarks to him, and put her hand up towards his face in such a manner as made the impression upon my mind that she was drunk.—I thought it very unbecoming in her to act so. I thought from the way she put the question that the student had asked where the students from Victoria College were.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—Do you believe that the woman was drunk?

Mr. DIXON.—The impression made upon my mind was that the woman was drunk.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—I only asked the question because I consider it too grave a matter that the character of a woman should be destroyed at one blow.

Mr. BENTLEY.—Do you know that one of the students made the remark at the time, that the woman had acted very imprudently, and that had she done so in Montreal Hospital, she would have been dismissed.

Mr. DIXON.—I am satisfied that this remark was made at the time, but the name of the student who said so, I do not remember at the moment.

Mr. BENTLEY suggested that it would be quite sufficient for the purpose the trustees had in view, to take such notes as were necessary for their own guidance, and depend upon the report given by those parties who were here to represent the Press. It would save a great amount of trouble, and the evidence when taken in full would be more satisfactory.

Dr. O'BRIEN said that any person who had attended a magisterial investigation would understand that the magistrate would stop the individual giving evidence until he had taken down the sentence. In this way there was no difficulty in giving the evidence correct.

Mr. BOWES.—I wish you to say whether you are the author of the letter which appeared in the *Colonist*, signed "Medical Student?"

Mr. DIXON.—I am.

Mr. BEATY said he was desirous to arrive at the truth. Much as he admired the cadid way in which the young gentleman had come forward, it did not alter the fact that the charges in that letter were very serious. He was personally acquainted with a number of the parties in the Hospital, particularly with the matron, and the gentleman who superintends the building. If these charges were true, he would regret it exceedingly. As one of the trustees, he would like to know about the immorality that is practised in the Hospital. He considered it an act of kindness upon Mr. Dixon's part to come forward, but he wished now that he would give testimony to corroborate that part of the letter in relation to the immorality that is practised.

Mr DIXON.—I explained, in a subsequent letter to the *Colonist*, what I meant by moral pollution. I said there that I meant moral obliquity.

Dr. RICHARDSON said he did not know about these charges until he came to the meeting. He had not seen the letter in the *Colonist* until he saw it here, nor had he seen any other letter except that which appeared in the *Colonist* of yesterday. He, therefore, took it for granted that Mr. Dixon was prepared to substantiate these charges or to confess that they were false. It is said that this Institution is immoral, that it is dirty, and that it is a house of sin. He would like to hear these statements substantiated.

Mr. DIXON.—I stated at the commencement that all these charges did not come from me. They came from different sources, and I do not doubt that the persons who told me are prepared to substantiate them. I have already said that what I meant by moral pollution was moral obliquity.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—The second letter takes quite a different stand from the first. It says—"By the term 'moral pollution,' I mean no more than a 'deviation from a judicious and righteous course of government,' or in other words, 'moral obliquity.' I make no immoral impeachment of its government."

Dr. RICHARDSON.—That second letter does not cover one-tenth part of the charges. This Hospital is declared to be a house of sin, a lousy hospital, and a sink of corruption. How moral obliquity and a house of sin can be connected he could not understand.

Mr. DIXON.—These charges do not all lie with me. I made them all public, but other parties told me of some of them.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—A person who makes such charges should be able to substantiate them.

Mr. BOWES.—I wish distinctly to know what opportunity you had of judging of the management of this Institution?

Mr. DIXON.—I have already told you that some of the charges I made from my own observation, others from what friends have told me.

Mr. BOWES.—Then I trust that these parties will come boldly forward and substantiate them.

Dr. PHILBRICK here came in, and said he was but a very sick man, and had just risen from a very sick bed; but he had one or two remarks to make, and wished to know what would be the fittest time for the trustees to hear his statements. For the last three years he had been a visitor in this Hospital, and he had a standing *second* to no man in his profession on this continent, and therefore claimed for himself, the right to state his opinions in regard to this Hospital.

As the Dr. was evidently much debilitated, and under great mental excitement while making these remarks, he was interrupted by some of his friends and requested to retire.

The CHAIRMAN said the gentleman was evidently very ill, and it were better to appoint some time for him to give his evidence.

Dr. PHILBRICK, however, retired shortly after, without making any further statements at the time.

Mr. BOWES.—There is a charge made against the management of the Hospital, what do you say about that?

Mr. DIXON.—I got my impression of the management of the Hospital from what I saw myself, and wondered why it was these acts were tolerated.

Mr. BOWES objected to any reference being made to any other parties unless.

the names of the parties who made these statements were given. They would hold him to the letter.

Mr. DIXON.—I presume the parties are prepared to substantiate what is said in that letter. I do not, however, wish to give their names, believing that the parties themselves will come forward.

Dr. RICHARDSON declared that the letter was false and calumnious, and it was no use for Mr. Dixon to try to get out of it in that way. When a person made any statement in the public prints, it is given there upon his own authority, and not upon the authority of another.

Mr. BENTLEY considered it quite out of place for Dr. Richardson or any other gentleman to express his opinion upon the question while it was undergoing investigation. Parties, in giving evidence of this kind, had a perfect right to withhold the names of those from whom they received that information. There was also such a thing as common report, and statements were frequently made upon that, without any one party being able distinctly to say how that rumour originated.

Mr. BEATY differed entirely from the remarks of Mr. Bentley. The trustees wanted facts. Mr. Dixon had told them what he saw. He says, he had some of the facts from others. Why not give the names of those parties? He thought Mr. Dixon ought at once to tell who the parties were.

Mr. BENTLEY begged leave to differ with Mr. Beaty, and more especially as Mr. Dixon had asserted that these parties were coming forward themselves voluntarily to give evidence.

Mr. BEATY still considered that Mr. Dixon should give the names of the parties from whom he received his information.

Mr. BOWES.—On what grounds are you assured that the trustees were aware that flagrant mismanagement existed in this institution?

Mr. DIXON.—I had my information from parties who had repeatedly pressed it upon the attention of the trustees.

Mr. BOWES.—What we want is to get at the party who has misled you in this matter.

Mr. BEATY expressed his desire that Mr. Dixon would now do justice to the trustees. These charges were made and the party who had told him said he had pressed it upon the attention of the trustees frequently. Was it right to his own character as a man, to let these charges go forward against the trustees, and not tell them who it was that had pressed the matter upon them frequently.

Mr. Sheriff JARVIS said he did not think the witness was fairly dealt with. He had given information of what he saw himself. He says—the rest of his information he got from others. If the parties who told him of these fail to come forward, then the charges will fall to the ground. and upon Mr. Dixon

will rest the odium of having failed to prove the charges he had made, and the trustees and all the parties charged would be presented to the public as having been unjustly accused.

Mr. DIXON.—I expect the parties are here who gave me the information, and I have no doubt they will come forward. I did not report the ill treatment of Burns to the medical officer. I did not report any of the other cases, not being a regular student.

Mr. BOWES.—There is a charge of immorality mentioned in the letter.

Mr. DIXON.—I did not mean by immorality what is generally considered by immorality in the gross sense.

Mr. BOWES.—You have charged the trustees with knowing that the Hospital was a house of sin, and a sink of pollution. What are we to understand you to mean by these terms.

Mr. BENTLEY said, that might imply a deviation from a judicious and righteous course. The object of this Institution is to relieve the distress of the sick and the unfortunate, but if they are treated in such a way that their distress is not relieved but increased he would consider that a moral perversion of the objects of the Institution.

Mr. DIXON said—I mean by moral pollution as applied to this Institution a perversion of the objects of the Institution, I have not taken out a ticket this last session. I don't therefore walk the hospital regularly, although I have been occasionally. I have heard persons say they got lice upon them by coming into the hospital. I cannot speak from personal knowledge. I have heard students who are here to-day say that such is the fact. Mr. Bingham has told me he got lice upon his clothes. I have had conversations with others who have visited other hospitals, and they say that this one was in very bad order compared with them. I heard a medical man who attends here now say, that this Institution would bear no comparison with any other hospital that he had ever been in, either as regards management or cleanliness. I have heard them say that Montreal Hospital was well conducted, and that Boston Hospital was well conducted. I have not myself had an opportunity of judging of its cleanliness as compared with other institutions. I have heard the Hospital mentioned, frequently just to sneer at it.

Dr. COTTER Do you think from your own observations that this Hospital is a filthy Hospital.

Mr. DIXON.—It is no use putting such a question to me, because I have not had an opportunity of judging of its cleanliness, as compared with other Institutions of a similar kind.

Mr. BOWES.—You say the Hospital is mentioned, merely to sneer at it.

Mr. DIXON.—I have heard this repeatedly.

Mr. BOWES.—You say in your letter—"I am in possession of a great many incidents to which I may draw the attention of the public again, if these

wrongs be not speedily redressed." Now have you given us all you know personally about the institution?"

Mr. DIXON.—I presume that with regard to the other points, others that are here will sustain them.

Mr. BEATY said, he did not doubt that such might be the case but he would have been better pleased had Mr. Dixon himself given the names of the parties.

John LENNON.—A student of medicine said, they need not press Mr. Dixon so. They would get the whole of the evidence. He was prepared to come forward and substantiate the charge against the trustees. They need not therefore harrass Mr. Dixon any more.

Mr. BEATY said, the immorality has been defined, and it consisted in this, that patients coming to this Hospital, instead of getting proper treatment got the opposite. Was that deficiency on the part of the medical staff, or upon the governor of the Institution, or the servants. They wanted, as trustees, to know if any one of those who had been appointed to that Institution had not done their duty.

Mr. BENTLEY begged to say that the Sheriff had already complained of the way in which the witness had been treated, and he had good cause for such a complaint. The position in which he was placed was not a fair one as the trustees take the charges as applicable to themselves. Mr. Dixon had already explained what he meant by his statements. If he fails to make good his charges, the public would be able to judge for themselves. He had stated that he was unwilling to give the names of the parties who furnished the information, believing that these parties will come voluntarily forward and substantiate their charges. If they do not, then the blame will fall upon Mr. Dixon himself.

Here Dr. Widmer retired, and Mr. Beaty on taking the chair said, he thought it uncourteous of any gentleman in the city of Toronto to interfere with the trustees in their endeavour to get all the information they possibly could. If a gentleman who had charged them in the public prints comes here voluntarily and says that he is unwilling to give the names of the parties from whom he got his information, he was treating the trustees unhandsomely.

Mr. BOWES said they would have every gentleman connected with the Hospital brought forward, and would continue the investigation for a week or a month rather than not have the evidence complete.

Dr. HALLOWELL wished to call upon the learned gentleman, (Mr. Bentley) who seemed so able an advocate—he did not understand why he should be so, perhaps there were strong reasons for it—but he would simply ask that gentleman what those aspersions were that were cast upon the gentleman who had come forward to give information.

Mr. BENTLEY made no reply.

The CHAIRMAN asked if there was any other person prepared to give evidence, when—

JOHN LENNON came forward and said, I am a senior student, and have attended the Hospital about as regularly as any of the students who have attended the Hospital during the last six months. I wish to say that I come here voluntarily to make a statement of facts in connection with this affair. I knew nothing about the letter signed "A Medical Student" until it was in the hands of the publisher. I stated, when I saw it that I could not, subscribe to the latter part of it, that the expressions were not the best adapted to carry out the meaning the writer had in view, as they were liable to be misunderstood. In regard to the first part of it—that relating to the coloured man—I may say that I was summoned before the Magistrate, and gave evidence in regard to the coloured man. I stated that in coming out of the surgery in the Hospital, I met a coloured man, who asked if he could get his tooth drawn. Dr. Clarke gave me the instruments, and I drew the tooth. Just when I had done so, Burns came in, and took the coloured man by the shoulders and pushed him out of the door. After the evidence had all been given the Magistrate said that Burns's conduct was most unjustifiable—that it was extremely cruel—and that he was entirely unfitted for his situation, and should be dismissed from the hospital. Burns may be a good servant, and very capable of discharging his duty; but his conduct upon several occasions in this Hospital, has not been what an official in this Institution ought to be. In regard to another point in that letter, I am the person who bled the patient in the corridor. I came here to hear the examination of Mr. Paget, and some one came in and said there was a patient that needed to be bled. With all respect to Dr. Cotter and his large practice in this city, I must say that the water was not thrown upon the man in a Christian Spirit. He dashed the water into his face, in the middle of winter too, I did not take more than ten ounces of blood from him, and don't think he was bled to syncope. I did not see the man ejected from the Hospital. I say it was right to throw water upon the man's face. I would have done so myself; but I don't think it was right to throw it upon him as it was done. It is customary to throw water upon a patient after bleeding.

(Here the witness stated that he objected to any question being put to him by any person except the Chairman. He had come voluntarily forward to state all he knew about the affair, and if the Trustees were not capable of discharging their duty, he would cheerfully appear before any commission that might be appointed.)

Witness resumed—The next case in connexion with Burns that came under my observation was, one day when Dr. Bovell was prescribing for a patient in the room over the surgery, in the northeast corner. It was either Dr. Bovell's week as visiting physician, or he was discharging the duty of another medical officer, whom I have not seen there since I came. A poor woman came in-

side the room door, as if she was going to ask something, when Burns thrust her out immediately in a very rude manner. Dr. Clarke was present, and must have seen the circumstance.

Dr. CLARKE here stated that he did not see it done.

WITNESS.—If you did not see it you must have been wilfully blind, for I do not think you could help seeing it. I have no charge against you however, Dr. Clarke, because you have always treated me very kindly since I came to the Hospital. We come now to the case of the medical students from Victoria College. The students, I don't know the exact number, were all upstairs with Dr. Wright, who was the Medical gentleman for that week, when a nurse came and opened the door, and said here are the Medical students from Victoria College, and she then went on with a regular tirade that no person unless in liquor would have done. It appeared to me from her conduct that she was in liquor. She said to the young man that she would brickbat his mouth so that she would know him again. Dr. Wright said to her that there was no use in her going on in that way. The young lad would not trouble her again as he would find his way next time without her assistance. The name of the nurse I believe was Mrs. Donnelly. The next case we come to is that of the coloured man, Jackson. Mrs. Donnelly said to the medical officer (Dr. Wright) that if he took in that coloured man as a patient she would be the death of him. Upon another occasion there was some talk about this coloured man, when one of the patients came forward, and said that it was a shame, the manner in which this coloured man was treated, for he was as good a patient as was in the hospital. I heard that Dr. Clarke had refused to allow teeth to be drawn in the hospital, and said that they might go to the dentists. I immediately said to some of the students that they should write to some newspaper Editor on the subject, for I was under the impression that this had arisen through spite. Shortly after that, another patient came to get a tooth drawn while Dr. Aikins was admitting patients, and Dr. Clarke made the same remark to him that there were no more teeth to be drawn in the Hospital. Dr. Aikins said he would draw the tooth himself and not trouble any one. He then went in and got the instruments; but he found that it was only an abscess in the gum, and having opened it he told the man that that would give him relief. The last occasion on which I saw Burns manifest his cruelty was in the case of a poor man, called, "the doctor." The poor man came here with a fractured leg, and he jerked that man about in such a way as to be a disgrace to the Institution that such an officer should be about it. His conduct was such that the medical officer had to interfere. I wish to state that Dr. Clarke had refused the instruments to two students—Mr. Campbell and Mr. Carswell—before he refused them to Dr. Aikins. In regard to the bleeding of the patient I would state that Burns came forward a second time with the water to throw it, and was prevented doing so by a nurse, named Esther. There are certain charges that I am willing to give evidence upon, but I

think I would rather reserve to myself any further remarks at present as I do expect that there will be a commission from Government to investigate those charges.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think it is not likely. We are here to make an investigation. It is an onerous duty but we are prepared to discharge it. If you know anything of the wrong working of this Institution we will be happy to hear it.

Mr. LENNON—My reason for saying so is, from the fact that the Trustees have already prejudged the case in the letter which they published in the *Colonist* of the 28th.

Here follows the letter to which witness referred and part of which he read.

(To the Editor of the Daily Colonist.)

"SIR—The Trustees of the Toronto General Hospital have read with great indignation, a false and calumnious statement of the management of that institution, over the signature of "A Medical Student." Such a statement, if even remotely connected with truth, would cover with disgrace the character of five of your townsmen, in whom is vested the superintendence and direction of all matters connected with the internal economy of this public charity. The Trustees, as a public body, assert their claim upon the press for the exercise of a discriminating protection from the hasty publication of such atrocious libels as that of the "Medical Student," the publication of which appears to have been as readily effected as if it contained merely a discussion of some trifling points of discipline falling within the circle of a legitimate criticism. If the power of the Press, is thus extended on all occasions without due examination and investigation of the probability of truth in the charges, what public or private institutions may not be assailed with impunity by such unscrupulous scribblers? And although a subsequent enquiry may prove the falsehood of the attack, yet it may come too late, the poison has circulated throughout the country, and many will continue to believe in the truth of the statement. It is apparent, however to the Trustees, that this communication did not originate solely in the brain of a "Medical Student," its source is derived from parties who dare not come forward in their true position to substantiate their accusations; it is not the first of this description of slander that has emanated from the same source.

To bestow the necessary attention for refuting this tirade of falsehood, would be a waste of time. The Trustees believe that by inviting the intelligent and respectable inhabitants of the city, together with all the members of the profession therein, to visit the Hospital at all hours of the day, and to make enquiries of the patients and servants as to the treatment they receive from the resident medical officer, as well as from the whole medical staff of the institution; and to observe the degree of neatness, cleanliness, and regularity to be found, will be the surest made of confounding the writer under the name of "A Medical Student," and afford sufficient proof of the disregard he has evinced, by his publication, of common honesty and veracity.

J. W. BRENT.

Toronto General Hospital Office, March 27, 1855."

Secretary.

"It was resolved at a meeting of the Trustees, held this day, that in order to give to the party assailing the management of the Hospital, an opportunity of establishing his allegations, the Trustees will hold a meeting at the Hospital at 12 o'clock, noon, on Thursday next, the 29th instant.

The attending physicians of the Institution, as well as the members of the profession throughout the city, are hereby invited to attend.

J. W. BRENT,

Toronto General Hospital Office, March 27, 1855."

Secretary.

Mr. LENNON.—I can state as to the meddling interference with the patients.

Mr. BEATY.—If anything of that kind has come under your own observation, then it is your duty to make it known.

Mr. LENNON here related the case of a young lad, troubled with fistula, who was under Dr. Aikin's care and who had been advised by Mrs. Donnelly to get Dr. Hodder or Dr. Beaumont to operate upon him, and she had advised the parents of the lad to take him away or he would die in the Hospital if left under Dr. Aikin's care. Dr. Aikin had, however, succeeded in effecting a cure.

Mr. LENNON then said, as regards the charges against the Trustees, I have attended here regularly for the purpose of benefitting myself by seeing the practice of the able gentlemen who attend this Hospital. I am always happy to have the privilege of walking the Hospital with Dr. Hodder or with Dr. Bovell. But with regard to Dr. Telfer and Dr. Beaumont and Dr. Herrick, I have not had the privilege of walking the wards with them. I have paid for my ticket, and I expected to have the benefit of it. Dr. Telfer will come up at 11 o'clock and get through with his patients before the hour fixed for the students, and Dr. Beaumont will not come sometimes till three o'clock. It is not once in six weeks that I meet with them, and yet I must come up here and wait my hour from 12 to 1 o'clock, in order to get my ticket certified, or if I don't, I cannot graduate at College. I don't know why Dr. Herrick or Dr. Beaumont don't attend, I am under the impression and have always felt that as a student in the Toronto Institution, I was degraded, that there was some sort of stigma intended to be cast upon us, and upon all belonging to that college. If their object is to prevent us as much as possible seeing Hospital practice, they have accomplished their object pretty well. The students had attended regularly to receive their instruction, and I challenge any medical gentleman who comes to this Institution to name a student that has violated any of its rules. [Witness here referred to the following letter published in the *Colonist* of the 28th, with the names of the students of the Trinity College attached, and stated that one of these students told him that he never knew what was in that letter until it appeared in the newspaper with his name attached. He told him also that two of the students whose names were appended to it were out of town, and consequently had not seen the document at all.]

(To the Editor of the Colonist.)

"SIR,—In your issue of the 24th, there appeared a communication over the signature of "A Medical Student," couched in such language, and composed of such a tissue of untruths, as to demand an immediate answer, to counteract the impression which it would doubtless make upon the public mind. In answering this *pseudo-philanthropist*, I shall not stoop to use such language as characterized his production, which appears, like the spider's web, to have been spun from the venom of a brain, provided by nature for a higher and nobler purpose; but, alas! it proved degraded and debased. The animadversions of the writer are composed solely of strong assertions, without proof, declamation without argument, and violent censure, without truth or moderation, which in fact would not reach the standard of dignified contempt, were it not known that the "Student" known to you as the author of the letter in question, is but the *mouthpiece* and *tool of designing men*, who, too cowardly to speak themselves, thus endeavour to find shelter.

Your correspondent first makes an attack upon Mr. Burns who, he says, was fined some time since by the Police Magistrate, "for brutally using a coloured man," and continues that "it was shown by Mr. Lennon (a medical student) that this Burns had without any provocation grossly and wantonly maltreated the poor fellow, and that in the act he could be prompted by no motive, but the cruelty and relentless heartlessness, which he saw him so frequently manifest towards the suffering and afflicted upon many other occasions."

Now, Sir, without reflecting in the least upon the decision of the magistrate in that case, I fearlessly assert that a thorough examination into Burns's conduct, not only upon that occasion, but upon every other, would be productive of a result highly flattering to that official, and clearly prove that his great sin has been, that while in the performance of his duty, he has been forced to check the meddling presumption of some two or three notoriously impertinent students, and that instead of his cruelty and ruthlessness being proverbial among the students, the contrary is the truth. Next, the scribbler, with impertinence so truly characteristic, vents his spleen upon Dr. Clarke, the House Surgeon, by accusing him of encouraging and maintaining Burns in such disgraceful conduct and not permitting the poor to have their teeth extracted. The only answer to these accusations is, that they are wholly and utterly false. Dr. Clarke, as a gentleman and an able Surgeon, stands deservedly high in the estimation of the great majority of the Students attending the Toronto hospital, and the best evidence of this may be found in the fact, that he has demanded an immediate and strict enquiry into this whole matter, which enquiry will commence to-morrow, and will, without doubt, result in teaching "a Medical Student" and his prompters, that truth is the best policy, and probably lead the public to associate "moral pollution" with his name, giving the term a far different meaning from that given by him, in his attempted retraction, in your issue of this morning. The accusation against one of the nurses, while equally false, is truly

the most disgusting part of his production, and is completely unworthy of a reply. As to his appellation of L—y Hospital it is an invention of his own.

In conclusion, I feel confident that the large majority of the students attending the Toronto Hospital will readily testify to the utter falseness of his accusations, and leaving him to enjoy the unenviable notoriety he has gained.

I am yours,

VERITAS.

P. S. The investigation spoken of above, will be open to the public, and will commence at 12 o'clock, as Dr. Clarke is particularly anxious for the public to be present.

Toronto, March 26th, 1855.

We, the undersigned Medical Students, attending the Toronto General Hospital, having read the letter signed "Veritas," heartily concur in the sentiments it enunciates, and feel convinced that the accusations brought against that institution and its officers, by the person signing himself "A Medical Student," are utterly devoid of truth, and entirely unworthy the confidence of the public.

(Signed,)

Edwin Goodman,
Henry. Hall,
John F. McKenric,
Wm. S. Hewat,
Gordon I. Emery,
H. M. Wrong,

Wm. Chase,
D.E. Burdett,
Martin Morrison
Robert Johnson,
A. T. Augusta,
R. L. Ball,
Wm. Donnelly.

Isaac Ryall,
Arthur H. Paget,
Richard P. Lewis,
Thos. J. Phillips.
Michael Lowlor,
N. O. Walker.

Mr. Lennon resumed.—With regard to the treatment which the patients receive from the medical gentlemen, it is most humane. It is most kind. Last Saturday I attended here with Dr. Aikins, when Dr. Clarke brought under Dr. Aikins' notice the letter that had appeared in that morning's *Colonist*, and asked him if he had seen it; and he commented upon it in terms which I thought unjust. Dr. Clarke said, however as to the charges—"with regard to lice being in the Hospital, he did all he could to keep the place clean. He stated that the trustees would not do their duty. There was not a single bath in the Institution. If a medical man orders a bath for a patient, he cannot get it. They cannot get a bath unless they are moved down to the cellar, and there turn out the washerwomen, and take one of their tubs. These statements, in regard to Burns's treatment, and what I have here stated, I am willing to take my oath on in a Court of Justice. I don't think the term moral pollution in the letter is applicable. I think the other statements in the letter are true. In regard to the medical gentlemen in this Institution, some of them come at 11 o'clock, and get through before we come here, because our hour is 12 o'clock. Dr. Clarke has told the students attending this Hospital that they should go to the trustees and demand their fee to be returned, for they

had no right to it when the medical gentlemen did not come to give them instruction. I understand that this subject was brought under Dr. Widmer's notice, and that Dr. Beaumont said he would attend when he liked. There are several students who could corroborate what I have stated, but they have not the courage to do so, because they must appear before the Board for examination in another week. With regard to the cleanliness of the Hospital, it is perhaps as clean as it can be kept with the means placed at the disposal of the medical officer by the trustees. But at the same time I have seen vermin crawling upon the patients.

Mr. Bowes here put several questions from the letter, which were briefly answered.

Mr. LENNON.—With regard to Dr. Clarke, I can only say that his treatment of me has been that of a gentleman, and he has always expressed his desire to do any thing in his power to advance my knowledge. With regard to the officers of the Institution, I never heard the matron's name till to-day. With regard to female nurses, I think better nurses could not be obtained. I have not heard any one spoken of except Burns and Mrs. Donnelly. I don't think the man is incapable of discharging his duty; I think he could do it first rate if he was kept in subjection.

Dr. HODDER here said that he wished to make a remark or two. The young man had stated that he (Dr. Hodder) was present at the operation for fistula by Dr. Aikins. Part of that was true. It was true he merely recommended Dr. Aikins to cut a little deeper down and in all probability he would find the urethra. It was true that he took the probe in his left hand and tried to find out the passage, but Dr. Aikins did not feel as if inclined to cut deeper, and he (Dr. Hodder) took up his hat and walked off. He did not see the commencement of the operation. He only saw a small portion of it, and went off when he saw Dr. Aikins unwilling to take any advice from him. With respect to regularity of attendance, he believed he could boast of having attended the Hospital more regularly than any other medical gentleman. This winter, however, he had had an attack of sciatica of a very acute kind, and had been an invalid. But when he found that he was unable to attend the Hospital, being often unable to rise from the sofa, he had got Dr. Beaumont or Dr. Bovell to see his patients for him, and he was not aware that one single patient committed to his care had failed to get all the advantages which the Hospital affords. He wished the students to understand, however, that he was not here as a clinical instructor. He came here simply to attend to sick patients who were placed under his care, and did not come to give clinical instruction at all. He did so for the first year voluntarily, and he made no distinction between the students of one school and another. He told the students if they wished his instructions he would be happy to give them, but unfortunately a member of the medical profession then in Toronto, who was an editor of a journal, made some charges against the Hospital, and he [Dr.

Hodder] said if every little lapse was thus to be criticised, he, for one, would give no further clinical instructions, he was not appointed for that purpose by the trustees, and he did not intend to do so. He merely mentioned these things to prevent any further allusion to that part of the duty.

Dr. AIKINS wished to correct Dr. Hodder upon one point. Having made some remarks in regard to the case of fistula *in perineo*, he stated that the young lad was sent in from Lloydtown, by Dr. Bull, and that he (Dr. Aikins,) directed Dr. Clarke to call a consultation upon the case. At that consultation, Dr. Hodder, Dr. Bovell, and Dr. Telfer were present. Dr. Hodder did come in subsequently, when he was operating, and at Dr. Hodder's advice, he [Dr. Aikins] cut a little deeper than he intended. He denied the statement, that any want of respect was shown to Dr. Hodder, the reverse was the case. After considerable perseverance, he [Dr. Aikins] succeeded in the cure, and he was told by Dr. Clarke, that he was the first who had succeeded in curing that disease in the Hospital. [All this was a sort of interlude, while Mr. Lennon was still standing.]

Mr. BOWES.—Then your charge against the trustees is, first, that the medical officers appointed by them to attend to the Hospital, have not attended regularly.

Mr. LENNON.—Yes—and furthermore that the patients are not, by any means, so clean as they might be, if proper means were used.

Dr. CLARKE.—Have you ever known me, or do you think I would allow any person in a situation under me, commit a single act of cruelty to the poorest person in the Hospital, who had come in under my charge?

Mr. LENNON.—You have always acted as a gentleman towards me, and you have done the same to the other students. The case of tooth-drawing however, came under your notice, and the other case of harsh treatment by Burns, if you did not see it, it is strange to me.

Dr. CLARKE.—Did any person ever say they knew me to commit an act of cruelty to any patient in the Hospital?

Mr. LENNON.—I am satisfied you are incapable of committing an act of cruelty yourself.

Dr. CLARKE.—Had the thing been reported to me at the time, I immediately would have dismissed him. As regards the woman up stairs, I would only say, we are all liable to commit faults.

Mr. LENNON.—That man, Burns, when he knew that I was to give evidence against him, set himself up before me, and with a most contemptible leer looked me right in the face, and tried to get some of the other students to raise a laugh against me.

SAMUEL H. JACKSON, a coloured man.—I was a patient in the hospital. I was in three or four days without getting anything to eat. On the fourth

day after I was taken in, I asked Dr. Clarke the privilege of going out. I went out and got a loaf of bread. When I was returning, Dr. Aikins overlooked me and asked me why I was out. I told him that I was starving and had gone out to look for something to eat. Dr Aikins said it was very great carelessness on the part of the nurse. With that Mr. Burns and Mrs. Donnelly, the doctor's leader, went and told him [Dr Clarke] that I was going to break their heads. The doctor comes up and says: you are very rude, and make a good deal of disturbance; you cannot stop here; you have disobeyed the orders of the hospital. I told him that I was so hungry I could stop no longer without something to eat. So I was turned out. I did not think it right, but Mrs. Donnelly, the doctor's leader, stood there and prompted him. I went back again in about five weeks after, but the doctor was unwilling to let me in. I told him I was accused wrongly before, and by the persuasion of some of the doctors he allowed me to come in. While there the building got on fire because somebody had shut the stove damper and opened the door while the stove was full of wood. The nurse jumped on me and said this d——d nigger ought to have his head cut off. I had nothing to do with the fire, but they said this to raise the doctor against me. When I saw this I went up stairs, because I saw the doctor and Mrs. Donnelly were all one.

Mr. Bowes—Did you ever see Mrs. Donnelly drunk?

JACKSON—I have seen her in such a state that I thought she was drunk. I saw Mrs. Donnelly one day when three or four people came in and brought in a flask with them, and they sat down and divided the stuff that was in it among them. I did not tell Dr. Clarke, because I considered Dr. Clarke and Mrs. Donnelly were both my enemies.

SETH PHILLIPS, a coloured man.—I have been in the hospital for four or five months. I was under Mrs. Donnelly. I have nothing more to say than that I was never better treated than by Dr. Clarke. I was under Dr. Hodder; I know that Dr. Hodder did not neglect me.

[Phillips here related some transactions that had taken place between Jackson and himself, to shew that the evidence of Jackson was not to be credited. He then stated that he had never seen Mrs. Donnelly take a drop of liquor in his life, and he was at least three months under Mrs. Donnelly's care.]

The CHAIRMAN.—If there is any other person present who can give us any information in this matter, let him come forward.

ROBERT CAMPBELL.—I am a senior student of Medicine I have not taken out a ticket for the hospital for this year. I come here, however, occasionally. I only come forward at this time, voluntarily of course, to say that I have seen the transactions which Mr. Dixon has stated in the letter. In regard to the man that was bled, I saw Burns take the water and dash it upon him. He then took him forcibly by the shoulders and dragged him out of the door and laid him upon the verandah. The water was in such a large quantity that it deluged the man all over.

In reply to Dr. Cotter, who gave a practical illustration of how he would treat such a patient. Mr. Campbell said, that may be Dr. Cotter's system, but I wish to state that the man was handled very roughly, and the manner of lifting him was very harsh. I was present at the time when the students went into the room, when Mrs. Donnelly came up and talked to the young student. I think her conduct to that young man was rather rough and abusive. I would not have put up with it. I cannot substantiate the charges of moral pollution contained in Mr. Dixon's letter. I have seen nothing that I disapproved of unless these two incidents which I have mentioned.

G. W. BINGHAM—I am a senior student. I had a ticket out for the Hospital last winter, and I came into town in the fall with the intention of taking out a ticket for this winter. But when I went home after having walked through some of the wards I found lice upon my clothes. I was very much disappointed at this, but rather than subject myself to that annoyance, I deprived myself of the pleasure and the advantage of attending the Hospital, so I have not done so this winter. While I did attend the Hospital, I received the impression that the students of the Toronto School of Medicine were unjustly treated. I formed this impression from the general bearing of the professors. Others of the students have stated the same thing. I think there is great partiality shown both by the officers of the Institution and by the professors to the other students. I do not know that I could name any one student who told me of this. It seemed the general impression that there was great partiality shown to the students of Trinity College. I never saw anything objectionable in regard to Dr. Clarke. I never saw any thing immoral in regard to the Institution. I can, however, endorse the statement in regard to vermin. I think the way in which Mr. Dixon has written, is *comparatively*, but I cannot say what the general appearance of other Hospitals is, compared with this one. I have not attended the Hospital this winter, I have never heard complaints from patients themselves, but I have heard them from those students who visited the Hospital.

Dr. CLARKE here held up a ticket which had been made out at Mr. Bingham's request, but he had not called for it.

Mr. BINGHAM said, the Trustees would see his reason for taking out the ticket was, that he required a year's Hospital ticket at the school. He had not attended regularly and for the reasons he had stated.

JOHN G. Gray.—I am a senior student. It has been frequently stated to me by the students that they consider the Hospital very dirty. This was my conviction, from the first day I entered it. For the first two months, I attended regularly; that Dr. Clarke knows well. But I stated to him that it was not worth my while attending this Hospital, because it was only wasting my time. A friend of mine came to town, and he thought of stopping here; but I advised him to go on to Montreal, as I thought the facilities for students were much better there than in this institution. I was, for seven months at

tending Montreal Hospital, and I would certainly say that this Hospital, in comparison with the Montreal Hospital, is very dirty. I did not think it my duty to call Dr. Clarke's attention to the filthy state of the institution. I stated to Dr. Clarke that I did not think it was my duty to attend the Hospital at all, because the medical officers did not come here at the regular hour. I have come here at the regular hour every day for a week, and have not found any of the medical attendants present; and, therefore, I was deprived of the advantages of medical practice. I don't know how many physicians there are in this Hospital. Dr. Wright may be receiving physician for one week, and in that time he may receive a number of patients; but before his time of receiving comes round again, a great many may be admitted by the other medical gentlemen, and consequently we never see those patients at all when the physician under whose care they are placed is not present. My objection on this head, then, is—that the medical attendants do not come at a proper time, to meet the convenience of the students. In regard to the management of the hospital, I may state that, one week, when Dr. Wright was receiving-physician, a young woman came from Oakville, labouring under some syphilitic disease, as I thought. She asked for Dr. Aikins. I said that it was Dr. Wright's week to receive patients. I did not think it was any harm to speak to her, and I questioned her until I found out that I was correct in the opinion I had formed. While speaking to her, Dr. Clarke came up, and said, "Come here, you," pointing to the young woman. He brought her into this room, and locked the door—for what purpose I don't know. I had told her by this time that Dr. Wright was the receiving physician for that week, and that she would be put under his care. I did think at the time, that Dr. Clarke was rather out of place in the way he treated me. I found out after that the patient was put under Dr. Bovell.

Dr. CLARKE here stated that he remembered the case well, and that it was Dr. Bovell's week as receiving physician.

Witness.—I declare that Dr. Wright was the admitting physician for the week, and that Dr. Clarke had no right to put that patient under Dr. Bovell's charge, or that of any other but Dr. Wright.

Dr. CLARKE said if he got a note from any person to put a patient under the care of such and such a one he generally did so, and it was possible that this patient had a line.

Witness.—I consider that the patient could know nothing at all about Dr. Bovell, and could not have a line to him because she asked for Dr. Aikins. To show that Dr. Clarke did not think the Hospital worth attendance, he has frequently given the students a certified ticket for a year's attendance when they had not attended six months.

Dr. CLARKE.—I have already certified to students for this winter before the 1st of April, because I consider that five months' attendance out of six is good attendance.

Mr. BOWES. What have you to say about the immorality practised in the Institution.

Witness. If it is proved that the nurse was in the habit of cursing and swearing at patients, I think that is sufficient proof of immorality. I saw Burns one day give a patient a slap on the side of the head. I never saw any of them drunk. I have seen the clothes of the bed very dirty sometimes.

Mr. BOWES.—Was it uncleanness in the sheets, or general uncleanness.

Witness.—It arose from general uncleanness.

Dr. HALLOWELL begged leave, before they proceeded further, to call the attention of the trustees to one particular feature that had characterized the whole of the proceedings of the day. He would premise that he did not belong to the Hospital, and had no interest in it, either directly or indirectly except being connected with Trinity College, and having his colleagues *ex officio* connected with the Hospital, and therefore the remarks he was going to make might have perhaps some slight degree of weight. He would say that the first attack made upon the Hospital—whether borne out by facts or not, the evidence will eventually show—had been commenced at the instance of, and by one of the students of a certain school of medicine in this city. It appeared to him, and he had paid the greatest attention to the proceedings, that the whole of the evidence had been one sided. The accusations had come from a student of this school of medicine, and all the witnesses that had been brought forward to attempt to sustain these charges were from the same school. He did not stand there to impugn the testimony of any of these students. He was willing to allow that testimony its due weight. That given by Mr. Lennon, especially, had been that of a straight forward Englishman. [A Student,—Mr. Lennon is an Irishman.] What he wished to convey was that the evidence had been given in a regular John Bull style, and he believed that the Irishman was quite as straight forward. But it was a remarkable feature in the proceedings that not a single particle of testimony had been adduced by any single witness from any other school. Why was this? It appeared to him that there was a degree of jealousy at the bottom of it all. He would do the gentleman, (Mr. Dixon,) the justice to say, that his statements were equally straightforward with those of Mr. Lennon, but he believed that Mr. Dixon, had he been left to his own judgment would never have penned the letter which appeared in the public prints. (Cheers and hisses.) It was his firm conviction that Mr. Dixon, now regretted the false position in which he had placed himself, and that if he spoke the truth he would say that he had been brought forward by other people to make these charges. [Hisses and cheers.] There was an influence of that kind brought to bear upon him. That was his own opinion, and he believed it was shared by several gentlemen of the same profession present. [Hisses and cheers.]

Mr. GRAY.—Dr. Hallowell, from what he has said, would leave the audience to infer that all those who had spoken here to-day—except Mr. Lennon and Mr. Dixon—have not spoken the truth.

Dr. HALLOWELL rose to explain—when—

Mr. BOWES expressed his regret that Dr. Hallowell had made the remarks which had fallen from him. He regretted that any rivalry should exist between the different schools of medicine ; but he believed that Mr. Dixon regretted he had put forward so strong language when he has not been able to substantiate it by evidence. There was not a tittle of evidence to show that the Toronto Hospital is a "house of sin," or that the servants, or the matron are unworthy of being classed with honest women. The charges of delinquency are very sweeping and if not substantiated by evidence, Mr. Dixon will of course be bound to answer for them.

Dr. HALLOWELL said in his remarks he had alluded to the letter that appeared in the *Colonist*, signed a "Medical Student." He had said that Mr. Dixon regretted that that letter was written ; and he (Dr. Hallowell) believed firmly, and it was the belief of nine-tenths of the community, that Mr. Dixon was brought forward by others to make these charges.

Mr. BENTLEY.—Dr. Hallowell has here stated that Mr. Dixon was urged by either parties to write that letter, and he (Dr. Hallowell) lays the blame upon those connected with the Toronto school of Medicine.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—I have laid no blame, I have made no accusation ; but I have heard my colleagues spoken of in a very disparaging way and I have a right to stand up in their behalf.

Mr. BENTLEY.—It was necessary to suppose that so far as the witnesses could be brought forward, they must be from amongst the medical students ; and they could not expect them from the students of Trinity College.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—Why not ?

Mr. BENTLEY.—Simply because of that letter in the *Colonist* a day or two ago, which is endorsed by a number of the students of Trinity College, It has been said by Mr. Lennon that five, at least, of these names were put there without the consent of the students.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—That does not affect the question at all.

Mr. BENTLEY.—Does it not, when the names of the Students of a certain college are brought forward to take a certain side, without their consent or concurrence. If any individual from that college was willing to come forward to substantiate the truth of the charges made by Mr. Dixon, it is very easy to see that he could not come, for the influence of that school would be exerted to prevent him coming forward. He wished to say that he had, much against his wishes and contrary to his intentions, occupied some of the time of the meeting, but he was not aware that such statements were to be made.

The CHAIRMAN here stated that the trustees had nothing whatever to do with the jealousies that existed between the schools. He regretted that it should exist, but at the same time, the trustees were not to be blamed for

that. He was convinced that it would be borne out by the evidence that the trustees had no partiality in the matter there were three colleges he believed in the city; and they had selected two medical gentlemen from each of the schools as the way which seemed best fitted to give impartiality to all.

Mr. BENTLEY considered it of the utmost importance that the head of this institution should have the same spirit of impartiality. He had heard that Dr. Clarke had shown great partiality to the students of Trinity College and wished to ask Mr. Lennon this one question.—Have you ever heard Dr. Clarke declare that he used his influence in favour of any particular medical school.

Mr. LENNON.—A circumstance occurred to me while speaking, but I did not then mention it. But the impression upon my mind is that Dr. Clarke was overhauling Mr. Bovell about his non-attendance at Trinity College, and he said to Dr. Bovell, that he (Dr. Clarke) was doing all he could for Trinity College—that he had sent up students often to Trinity College, but that they never could see him (Dr. Bovell.) He would, however, continue to do all he could for Trinity College.

Dr. CLARKE.—I always will support Trinity College, because it was my *alma mater* in the old country, and more than that, it is a college founded on the religion I profess—the Established Church of England, and I am not ashamed to confess my partiality for that church.

Mr. BOWES.—I don't think that because Trinity College is founded upon the religion you profess, that therefore you should show any partiality in this Institution.

Dr. CLARKE, (warmly).—There is another thing Sir. I consider the Medical Staff of Trinity College the most efficient in Upper Canada. I consider it the most perfect staff in Upper Canada for this reason, every chair is filled by a professor who is admitted by the students of all the schools to be an able man.

Mr. BENTLEY.—That may be all very true, but I still hope that the Medical Superintendent of an Institution like this should be as free from bias as possible, and if he has any bias he should endeavour to keep it to himself.

The CHAIRMAN.—The thing is, has Dr. Clarke not done his duty, and have the servants of this Institution not done their duty?

Dr. HALLOWELL.—Before any further evidence is taken, he begged leave to ask one question, Mr. Gray had either stated broadly or insinuated whatever interpretation may be put upon it, that Dr. Clarke brought a patient into this room for purposes of which he was not cognizant but he was convinced that it was for the purpose of influencing that patient to put herself under the care of Dr. Bovell or Dr. Hodder, instead of under the professors of the Toronto School of Medicine. He begged to ask Mr. Gray if he (Dr. Hallowell) was correct in the impression he had formed.

Mr. GRAY.—You are perfectly correct I believe he did.]

Dr. HALLOWELL.—Then, Mr. Chairman, I beg to call upon Dr. Clarke, through you, to answer interested, as we all are in the welfare of this Institution, first, did Dr. Clarke thus influence this patient alluded to, and, second, if he ever influenced other patients to apply to other medical men than the legitimate admitting physician for the week? If he did so, then with all due deference to Dr. Clarke, unless he can give this meeting satisfactory reasons for recommending a patient or patients to go to one professional gentleman in preference to another he is not fitted for the situation he holds. He would therefore put these two questions to Dr. Clarke.

Dr. CLARKE said he could solemnly say that he had never influenced a patient admitted into this hospital, but had always left them to the medical officer for the week to do as they thought proper. If, however, a patient brought a note from any medical officer to be put under his charge, he did so, and patients had been sent in that way frequently.

Mr. GRAY.—Dr. Clarke has said he never influenced any patient. How did it happen that this patient to whom he had before alluded was not put under Dr. Wright's care. The patient, he could safely say had not heard of Dr. Bovell, she enquired for Dr. Aikins, and when told that Dr. Wright was the admitting physician for the week, she was contented to be put under Dr. Wright's care, yet after all she was put in Dr. Bovell's list. She had been recommended to Dr. Aikins, and, he would venture to say, knew nothing at all about Dr. Bovell, and it was Dr. Wright's week for receiving patients. How did it come that she was handed over to Dr. Bovell? He could not help saying that he believed Dr. Clarke did influence her.

Mr. LENNON said that he remembered very well the patient was put under Dr. Bovell's care, for he had visited her with Dr. Bovell.

Dr. CLARKE denied most positively that he had ever influenced any patient.

Dr. Bovell here disclaimed the idea of Dr. Clarke influencing any patient to be put under his care.

Mr. BENTLEY considered that the evidence was sufficient to establish the fact that influence had been used. This was clear. The woman came in, asked for Dr. Aikins, it was Dr. Wright's admitting week, and yet the patient is placed under Dr. Bovell. This to him was quite sufficient.

Dr. BOVELL presumed that the patient must have been sent in expressly for that purpose, for if a patient brought a letter to Dr. Aikins or Dr. Wright in his admitting week he generally handed them over.

Dr. CLARKE said that this was the first time he had been accused of showing partiality.

Mr. GRAY.—I heard that partiality was general here before the time that this woman came.

Mr. CASTLEMAN—I cannot say much about this affair. I know that Burns's manner was in general very rough, but I can give you no particular instances of it. He was always very rude in language, and harsh in manners. In regard to pulling teeth, I happened to be here upon one occasion, in Dr. Beaumont's week. After the Dr. had left, a man came in with his face much swollen, and asked if I would pull a tooth for him; I told him I would see Dr. Clarke and get the instruments. I went to Dr. Clarke, and asked for the instruments. He said there was no more teeth to be pulled in the Hospital, they must go to the dentists. The patient had consequently to go away without getting his tooth drawn. I have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Clarke's general conduct is very gentlemanly. But, I do not think he had a right to refuse the instruments upon that occasion. The rooms of the Hospital, I believe, have been kept as clean as they could be under the circumstances. The female nurses have generally been very kind; and Burns, since the occurrence with Mr. Lennon, has changed his department a little. Until this winter the students of the Toronto School of Medicine have labored under every disadvantage. They were afraid to say anything against the Hospital, for fear of being plucked at their examination, but they have a charter now of their own, and were independent of the Medical Board altogether.

As it was now 6 o'clock the Investigation was adjourned until the following day at noon.

FRIDAY, 30th March, 1855.

The examination was resumed this day shortly after 12 o'clock. Dr. Widmer occupied the Chair for a short time, as he had done on the previous day and again gave place to Mr. Beaty who presided to the close of the Investigation.

Before the investigation opened, Mr. Dixon was asked to sign the evidence he had given on the previous day. This he refused to do because he considered there were various statements omitted, in consequence of which a different colouring was given to the evidence from that which he intended. Had all his evidence been taken down he would not have refused to sign it.

Mr. Bowes represented the imprudence of such a course. The Trustees had sat the whole day to hear evidence to substantiate the statements made in that letter, of which he acknowledged himself the author, and every opportunity was given him to study whatever he had to say against the Institution. It was very unfair in him to refuse to sign the statements he had made, and then in a measure render all their labour in vain.

Mr. Lennox said that the investigation was not properly conducted, and Mr. Sheriff Jarvis had told them so yesterday, and had left the room because Mr. Dixon was not getting fair play.

Mr. Bentley also made some remarks in regard to the way in which the investigation was continued.

Mr. Beaty and Mr. Bowes contended that the course pursued by the Trustees was a proper one, and that they had a right to insist upon Mr. Dixon's signing his evidence.

Mr. Gray who had given evidence on the previous day in regard to Dr. Clarke having influenced a patient to put herself under Dr. Bovell's care, reiterated a portion of it and stated his conviction that the patient had no letter of recommendation to any physician. She enquired for Dr. Aikins and having been told by him that it was Dr. Wright's week, she seemed satisfied to be put under his care.

Dr. Clarke said he was convinced when the statement was made on the previous day that he would be able to shew by his books that the young gentleman was in error. He would be sorry to impute motives to Mr. Gray but his unguarded statement yesterday had hurt him (Dr. Clarke) very much. Dr. Clarke here produced the Hospital book and said he was prepared to show by it as well as by the Dr's that this patient was admitted in Dr. Telfer's week and not Dr. Wright's. Dr. Aikins's week commenced on the 23rd Oct.

Dr. Wright's week came next, and was succeeded by Dr. Telfer's who attended the Hospital from the 8th Nov. to the 10th when he was taken sick and his place was supplied by Dr. Bovell. On the next day, the 11th Nov., that young woman was admitted into the Hospital, and consequently placed under Dr. Bovell's care who was officiating in the absence of Dr. Telfer; Dr. Clarke here produced Dr. Bovell's book and also the diet roll to show that they coincided with his own book. Dr. Bovell and Dr. Grant could testify to this also, for they were in the room when he was examining the patient.

Mr. LENNON contended that Dr. Bovell did not appear in the Hospital that day, and that the patient was taken into the Board room while speaking to him, and that the impression on his mind at the time was, that the patient was influenced, and he had seen no reason to change his opinion.

Dr. GRANT recollected perfectly that Dr. Bovell and he were in the room at the time alluded to.

Some little recrimination was displayed in regard to the time at which the entries were made, and the amount of weight to be put upon them as regards the date. Mr. Gray contending that sometimes the patient's names were not entered in the books for a week after they had come into the Hospital.

Dr. CLARKE stated that his own book was made up daily and therefore such an inaccuracy could not occur, although he was aware at the same time that sometimes several weeks elapsed before the patients were entered on the Dr's books.

Mr. FITZGERALD here stated that he had come here to discharge a public duty; he had been called away upon business, and would endeavor to be back as soon as possible.

Dr. WRIGHT said he would take the liberty of making a suggestion: Mr. Gray had given evidence to a matter of fact, and he believed that he was willing to swear to it. He had gone as far as he (Dr. Wright) conceived it was necessary for him to go, in fact as far as it was in his power, and there was no necessity for disputing about dates to disprove that statement for they could not do it.

Mr. DIXON said he remembered Mr. Gray some length of time ago mentioning the circumstance to the students of the Toronto School. He mentioned it also to Dr. Aikins at the same time.

Dr. GRANT asked if it was not ridiculous to think that Dr. Clarke would put down a wrong date. He was there himself when Dr. Clarke called Dr. Bovell into the room to see the patient.

The CHAIRMAN.—We will now proceed in order. We have got Mr. Gray's evidence and Dr. Clarke had produced his books which contradicted that evidence. We will proceed with any other testimony.

Dr. OGDEN having been called upon said, if they wished him to speak to any point, perhaps it would be better to put questions to him.

Mr. BENTLEY suggested that he should proceed as the others had done.

Dr. OGDEN.—I wish to state at the outset that I am not in connexion with any of the Schools of Medicine that have been named. It has been said that all the evidence was from one side. So far as I have anything to say, it would not go under the same category. I have been five years practising medicine. I have been in the Hospital occasionally, and have observed two or three of the servants treat the patients very cruelly. One of these was the Orderly, Burns, and another, viz. Mrs. Donelly. The other servants I have always considered very attentive. I have heard Burns make use of profane and vulgar language—language immoral in the extreme. I was speaking to a student in the hall one day, and when I stepped into the Surgery, Burns came in and made use of language the most vulgar—such language as you could scarcely hear in the lowest bar-room in Toronto. He made use of the language while asking a question about the young man, and the language was so vulgar that I turned away in disgust. That is all I know of the servants. With regard to the attendance of the medical men, I have come here for the purpose of going round with the medical officers. As I am a young man, I wish to get as much experience as I can. I have been here at the hour specified, and have been told that the physician had been here, and had gone by eleven o'clock; and, at other times, I have been told that they did not come till three o'clock. As regards cleanliness, I have heard students who have attended other hospitals, say, there is no comparison as regards cleanliness between this and other hospitals. I have taken patients from here when they were covered from head to foot with lice; you would not have found a square inch upon their body that was not covered. This was however, from six to seven years ago when I attended regularly. I do not know so much about it at present. I don't think however, that the beds are as clean as they ought to be.

Mr. BOWES.—The sheets you know are brown cotton.

Dr. OGDEN.—No—they are white cotton sheets, turned brown by dirt. As regards immorality, I think there is sufficient evidence of that; at least if you, Mr. Bowes, were to use such language as I have heard used in the institution, I would say you were a very immoral man.

Dr. BEAUMONT thought that language might be considered immoral by one that was not considered so by others. They could only judge of it by hearing the expressions used. He would therefore request the gentleman to repeat the language used.

Dr. OGDEN said he could not unless the women were first told to leave the room.

This having been done, Dr. OGDEN repeated the vulgar language used, and asked Beaumont if he was satisfied; satisfaction he might at least have spared

his audience, if he had no regard for his own feelings. But prejudice, often blinds the best of men.

E. W. GUSTIN.—I attended the Hospital regularly before the Christmas holidays. This is my third session. Upon several occasions I have seen the Orderly, Burns, abuse the patients that have to come here to be treated. I myself have said to the students that if a patient whom I knew was coming here to be treated and used in the same way that I saw others used, I would cause an investigation to be made to find out the reason why he was allowed to go on thus. Upon several occasions I have seen Mrs. Donnelly in the ward above, abuse the patients; and I have, upon more occasions than one, left the Hospital under the conviction that she was under the influence of liquor. I have seen vermin creeping over the patients here, and I think it is owing to the Hospital not being supplied with baths; this I have seen occasionally. I have seen patients so filthy that I passed them without examining them, although anxious to do so. I have seen Burns abuse patients on several occasions; I cannot at present mention instances. I did not report it to Dr. Clarke. This is my third session of attending the Hospital, I attended Trinity College last year. I have heard groups of persons frequently from both institutions, say that the management of the Hospital was not what it should be, and that students did not receive the instructions in the Hospital they expected, and thought they were entitled to, in consequence of the attending physicians not being forward at the hour fixed for the students. I heard it said, both at Trinity College and in the University, that the Hospital was a dirty place. Several of the students of Trinity College I know would be well pleased if some different arrangement could be made, so that they might be enabled to derive the advantages which the Hospital is calculated to give, in the way of increasing their knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Can you give the names of those patients you saw so filthy that you would not examine them?

Mr. GUSTIN.—No, I do not remember their names. I am certain that the vermin were not occasioned by a skin disease, but that if they had had a little soap and water they could have been cleaned.

S. SECORD.—As regards the cleanliness of the Hospital, I can say I have seen the bed-clothes in a very filthy condition, not on account of the particular disease of the patients, but on account of the scarcity of soap and water. I have not attended the Hospital very regularly; I do not consider it worth wasting my time upon, as the physicians are seldom to be seen; I have been a student of medicine four years, and have been in the Hospital very often; I have seen beds in a filthy condition, both upstairs and down stairs. I did not report this to Dr. Clarke; I have taken out a ticket for the course; I have seen very rough usage to patients coming here, but I don't know that I could call it cruelty. I don't know how often I have attended during this last session; I may have attended twenty times; but I have attended sufficiently often to see that the Hospital is, in my opinion, mismanaged.

ROBERT EMERY.—I have attended the Hospital a year; my year was up last October: I have seen lice upon the patients frequently; some of the medical gentlemen passed the remark that they were counter-irritants. It was in Mrs. Donnelly's ward that I have observed the lice. The other wards have been comparatively clean, so far as I have seen; I have heard Dr. Bovell call upon Mrs. Donnelly a different times to inquire about the patients during the night, and he hardly ever got a satisfactory answer from her and, he would have to refer to patients in adjoining beds to get information. On one occasion Dr. Bovell enquired why the brandy ordered to his patient had not been given, and he was told that there was no brandy; and he had to send out for it himself for the patient; I have seen Burns frequently shove the patients, both male and female, about in a very rough manner; I heard it remarked by physicians that he was an old soldier and was only fit to be amongst soldiers; I have seldom walked the other wards, but they appeared clean when compared with Mrs. Donnelly's; I did not call Dr. Clarke's attention to it.

Mr. BENTLEY said he wished to put a few questions to Mr. Lennon if the Chairman would permit. Do you know any one in indigent circumstances who refused to go to the Hospital, in consequence of the treatment they thought they would get.

Mr. LENNON—I was requested by a lady to visit a sick person, and did so; and after seeing the distress in which the person was, I said the best thing that could be done was to have the patient removed to the Hospital, as she was lying upon the damp floor upon a miserable straw bed. I stated that if she would go, I would endeavour to get a medical man to attend her. But the way in which some of her friends had been treated—I think her husband—prevented her from going. I have heard other persons say they would rather die than come to the Hospital.

Mr. BENTLEY.—Have you known any of the medical gentlemen prescribe for the patients and not get what they ordered?

Mr. LENNON—I heard Dr. Bovell frequently prescribe brandy, and upon one occasion when Dr. Clarke said there was no brandy, Dr. Bovell turned round and said, "Clarke, by Jove, I will leave the Hospital if I don't get the remedies I prescribe to my patients."

Mr. BENTLEY.—Have you seen any of the servants of the Institution, at any time, under the influence of liquor?

Mr. LENNON.—The only person I have seen under the influence of liquor, was the resident surgeon. I saw him on two occasions, when he was in that state. I consider that on the first occasion, he was so bad that he was not fit to appear in public. The next time he was talking about using his influence in favour of Trinity College, and if it was possible for a man to be worse than he was the first time, he certainly was the second time. One of the nurses, formerly in this Hospital, told me to-day, that she considered it the

general impression of all connected with the Institution, that the folks from Rolph's school, as it was usually termed, were worse than dirt. I believe, the woman previous to that time, had not been a year in the city, and had never known until then that such a school was in existence.

Mr. STEWART, (City Missionary) here stated that the feeling was very general amongst poor people against going to the Hospital.

A little discussion here took place between the chairman and Mr. Bentley, in regard to the trustees having prejudged the case, by the letter they had published a few days before, and as to the fact that the Trustees had paid so much attention to an anonymous communication in a newspaper, and yet had paid no attention to the statement of the Police Magistrate given in a court of Justice—to the effect that Burns was unfit for his situation and ought to be dismissed.

The CHAIRMAN said that the superintendent, the matron, and the nurses were all charged with a dereliction of duty. They have been appointed by the trustees to discharge the duties devolving on them, but it is said they have not discharged the same. If there was evidence enough that they had not done what was expected, the trustees would assume the responsibility of discharging them, and so far as he was concerned he would recognize the poorest individual in the Hospital as much as the highest in it.

Dr. WRIGHT having been called upon said, If they wanted any information from him they had better put questions to him. The trustees, however, thought he should give a statement as the others had done.

Dr. WRIGHT then said I am one of the Medical attendants of the Hospital. In respect to the statement made in the letter regarding Burns, I would only say that I do not consider Burns's treatment of patients has been at all marked by ordinary kindness. I refer more particularly to what took place a few weeks ago or, before the investigation was held in the Police Court. This is my week on duty at the Hospital as receiving physician, and I may state that his conduct has been unexceptionable so far. The change is so marked that I cannot fail to notice it. This I attribute to the investigation which took place in the Police Court. Seven weeks ago I was on duty as receiving physician and I took in a patient who got his leg fractured. The way that Burns removed the clothes from his limb was not characterized by gentleness to say the least of it. I found necessary to check him while he was doing so this is the only special case that I at present remember, but the impression upon my mind is that his conduct is not at all what it should be. In regard to the coloured patient, Jackson who was upstairs, Mrs. Donnelly did make the remarks attributed to her in the letter. Not only so, but she followed me from one ward to another to induce me to put Jackson out.

Mr. BOWES—What as to the general cleanliness of the Hospital?

Witness.—This is the only Hospital I ever attended. I am purely a Ca-

nadian student and as this is the only Hospital I ever attended. I am, consequently, unable to compare one institution with another I can say however that the floors are generally clean but I have seen the bed clothes very often in a very filthy state. I have seen lice in the Institution too. Two of the nurses, one up stairs and one down stairs, I have observed frequently, and I can say that they have been very attentive to their patients and have treated them with as much kindness as they could do. I made no complaints to any one nor should I have done so on any consideration. It struck me as being very singular that although Dr. Telfer and Dr. Beaumont had been known as Hospital attendants for a length of time, that it rarely happened that a fair share of surgical practice, fell into their hands. I thought they did not get their share of surgical practice and my impression was that they would have taken it if they could have gotten it. Before I became connected with the Hospital, I had heard that Dr. Telfer's reputation as an operating surgeon was as good as that of any one connected with the Hospital under the old system of things, and perhaps since. Dr. Telfer was spoken of as being a very good operating surgeon, and got a fair share of this kind of practice under the old system. Dr. Beaumont was also long connected with the Hospital, and I heard also of his getting a fair share of this kind of practice. After the change which took place nearly two years ago, it struck me that a very large share of this practice fell into the hands of Dr. Hodder. I am not prepared to say whether it was with the consent of Dr. Telfer and Dr. Beaumont that this was done or not. Being a young man and not known as an operating surgeon I could hardly expect to get as much of this practice, as those whose reputation was established. I did not expect even a fair share, supposing it were equally divided, and in that expectation I have not been disappointed.

Dr. HALLOWELL—You have given a very straightforward statement and I have no doubt you are sincere in what you have said. I expect therefore you will give me a straightforward answer to this question corresponding to your statement to the trustees. You have said in regard to Burns one of the accused parties, that you think the communication signed Medical Student has had the desired effect, of making Burns more civil and more humane to the patients.

Dr. WRIGHT—What I stated was, that since the occurrence at the police court I have noticed a material change on Burns's conduct.

Dr. HALLOWELL—You so far stated that the delinquent Burns has acted from time to time in a very unbecoming way, and that to a certain extent you were of opinion that the Hospital was not carried on in a cleanly way. I will now come to the question—do you—or do you not endorse the statements put forth in that letter, by "Medical Student."

Dr. WRIGHT—That is a question not all called for.

Mr. BOWES—What do you wish us to understand regarding Burns's general conduct,

Dr. WRIGHT—My impression is, that Burns's treatment of patients has not been such as I would allow a servant of mine to use towards the meanest pauper coming to my door.

Mr. BOWEN—As regards the attendance of the physicians—

Dr. WRIGHT—I will not be answerable for the attendance of any physician but myself, I have noticed that Dr. Herrick does not attend, and that his duty is very frequently performed by other medical gentlemen. I think he is generally here in his admitting week to see some of the out-door patients, but those that are admitted are placed under the care of some other person. I have frequently seen Dr. Bovell do duty for him. What I mean to say is that Dr. Herrick does not do Hospital duty. With regard to the other medical officers they attend pretty regularly—I attend my patients here as often as I think they require my visits, and quite as often as I would if they were private patients. When I have not been here Dr. Hodder has been kind enough to prescribe for out-door patients for me, but more frequently Dr. Aikins has done this in my absence. I do not know of any case where a patient has suffered in consequence of the neglect of the medical officer nor even in consequence of the neglect of the nurses. It may be that sometimes prescriptions are not given as they are ordered; and sometimes the diet has not been attended to properly.

Mr. LENNON—Have you seen the resident surgeon under the influence of liquor at any time?

Dr. WRIGHT—I have seen Dr. Clarke pretty merry, but whether under the influence of liquor or not, I have not the means of knowing.

Dr. COTTER here stated that Dr. Clarke suffered severely from attacks of neuralgia, and for that severe affliction had taken often large doses of quinine and morphia, and he wished Dr. Wright to say whether he was not aware of this fact.

Dr. WRIGHT—I have Dr. Clarke's own statement that he does—

Dr. COTTER.—I wish to know whether, under this suffering which Dr. Wright is well aware is a most severe one, Dr. Clarke is not obliged to take large doses of quinine and morphia?

Dr. WRIGHT,—I have Dr. Clarke's own statement for it that morphia does not do him any good, and therefore I infer he does not take it.

Dr. COTTER.—But that does not follow that he has not taken it.

Dr. WRIGHT.—My expression in regard to Dr. Clarke was most guarded. I said I did not know that ever I saw him intoxicated, but I have seen him merry, and my opinion is that morphia does not produce that effect, but rather the contrary. So far as I have witnessed its effects they are those of somnolency and stupidity rather than merriment.

Dr. COTTER.—That is not the opinion of many medical men.

Dr. WRIGHT.—Evidence can be adduced to show that that is its general tendency.

Dr. COTTER—The question simply was, whether morphia, or any of the preparations of opium, does not produce that excitement. I say it does and I will instance the Turks, who as a people are subject to this excitement and are constantly under its exhilarating influence.

Dr. WRIGHT—I may be permitted to state, as this is a professional matter more than any other, that Dr. Cotter here alludes to the effect of one of the active principles of opium. He must recollect that it is not morphia which the Turks use, they use opium in its solid state which is a very different thing. I am willing to admit that either solid opium or the tincture of opium will produce the effects alluded to by Dr. Cotter, but the general effect of morphia is that of a sedative.

Dr. COTTER—Does Dr. Wright mean to tell me that a person who has taken certain doses of morphia will not appear as if he had been drunk.

The CHAIRMAN—Dr. Clarke has been charged with drunkenness, and the question has been put by a medical gentleman, whether the particular medicine alluded to will produce a state similar to drunkenness.

Dr. WRIGHT—I stated that the action of morphia is first sedative.

Dr. COTTER—Every person knows that morphia is sedative. But I will put this simple question—Do the preparations of opium not produce an effect similar to drunkenness.

Dr. WRIGHT—I have myself proposed to Dr. Clarke to take quinine and iron but he said he derived no benefit from it.

To Mr. BOWES.—I can state no charge of neglect on the part of Dr. Clarke.

Dr. SCOTT—wished to know what deficiency Dr. Wright had seen in the arrangements of the Hospital which might have been rectified by application to the Trustees.

Dr. WRIGHT—The want of brandy has already been brought before the Trustees. In the treatment of eye affections, leeches were required and they were not allowed. I have taken in persons into the Hospital with chronic affections when leeches were required, and I could not get them. In other cases when I have wanted leeches patients have had to get them themselves.

Dr. SCOTT—Have you ever represented this deficiency to the Trustees.

Dr. WRIGHT—As far as the leeches are concerned I represented it to Dr. Widmer. Even at the present time I ordered a patient to be bled and I was told that there was not an hospital lance that could be used.

Dr. SCOTT—What did Dr. Widmer say in regard to the want of leeches?

Dr. WIDMER replied—that the Trustees would not grant them? Dr. Clarke has told me before that the Trustees had declined furnishing these, as the expense of furnishing leeches was so great that their funds would not warrant it. It occurs to me that I signed some request to the Trustees that instruments should be got for the Hospital.

Dr. SCOTT.—Are medical officers allowed to prescribe any other liquors but brandy?

Dr. WRIGHT.—I am not in the habit of prescribing brandy at all, and I do not know whether it is withheld when prescribed by others. I believe however, that ale, wine and whiskey, are allowed by the Trustees.

Mr. BOWEN stated, that the Trustees found their funds would not warrant their furnishing it. They continued, however, to supply wine, and beer, and whiskey to the patients. It was a mere matter of economy, the withholding of the brandy in so far as the Trustees were concerned.

Dr. HODDER saw that from some remarks which had been made, it was necessary for him to explain that Dr. Bovell and he were the only professors from Trinity College, and as the professors of surgery in that college, had no connection with the hospital, consequently Dr. Bovell had handed over to him all his surgical cases, and he in return, had handed over to Dr. Bovell all his [Dr. Hodder's] medical cases. He had therefore had a double share of surgical practice. Independently of that, Dr. Herrick, who had not attended the Hospital for some time past, as most of them had done, had occasionally sent him surgical cases, and Dr. Beaumont had done the same. Besides that, he had been industrious in getting his medical friends in the country to send in all their surgical cases to him to the Hospital. That would account very readily for his having more surgical cases than the others. He merely made this explanation to disabuse altogether the minds of the Trustees of any unjust suspicions that might be attached to Dr. Clarke in this matter. He knew there was a feeling that Dr. Clarke had given surgical cases to him when he ought not have done so. That was not the case, and the reasons he had given would show why he had so large a share of surgical practice.

Dr. WRIGHT said that that explanation did not in his estimation meet the matter.

Dr. AIKINS.—I do not know all the nurses. Some of them I do know. There are two sisters, one up stairs and one down stairs that I consider good nurses. So far as I have observed I have seen nothing objectionable in their conduct; I cannot speak in the same terms of Mrs. Donnelly; I heard her say that if Dr. Wright left Samuel Jackson in the Hospital, she would be the death of him, and she urged Dr. Wright to discharge him. Her language and conduct were such that, had they been manifested to me, I would have turned her out of the ward and have had the matter brought before the resident surgeon. As regards her cleanliness, I can only say that a patient put under my care experienced the reverse. Jesse Nunn, the son of a farmer, from Bolton village, was brought to the Hospital as a pay patient, and his mother took lodgings in the city to visit her child while in the Hospital. Some time after he came in I gave Mrs. Donnelly orders to remove the bed clothes. instead of putting on a clean sheet, however, she took a sheet from the bed of one of the most filthy patients in the Hospital and put it on his bed; the consequence was he was entirely covered with vermin; this his

mother can substantiate, as also can the person with whom the mother lodged in town, because she stripped off the boy's shirt and had it cleaned. Mrs. Donnelly also told the boy's father that she was sorry his son was not under the care of Dr. Hodder or Dr. Bovell, as he would be cured in a short time. Dr. Clarke also urged the mother to take away the boy from the Hospital, for he was certain he would die. The boy complained very much of Mrs. Donnelly's harsh conduct to him. It was very unkind, for he was but a small boy, about 17 years of age. From the treatment he received, I considered the Hospital was not the very best place for him, and directed his mother to remove him to the city. I myself have heard Dr. Clarke say that Mrs. Donnelly was very rough but that she was good natured. I did feel a little hurt at the remark of Mrs. Donnelly that the boy if under the care of Dr. Hodder or Dr. Bovell would have recovered so soon. I did not bring any of these things under the notice of Dr. Clarke, because I have heard him say that Mrs. Donnelly was rough but that she was good natured. I was under the impression that Mrs. Donnelly had heard the statement in regard to the boy from some other source than her own knowledge of the circumstances, for I am satisfied that she could not personally know much of the treatment of patients by the medical gentlemen named. Burns's general conduct was harsh and unkind. I have heard Dr. Clarke frequently correct him for his roughness. With reference to the ventilation of the building, it is very bad indeed; and there is not a water closet in the hospital from top to bottom. I remember that when the first letter appeared in the *Colonist*, Dr. Clarke said that every part of that letter could be substantiated, except that referring to moral pollution; more than that, he went on to say what I know to be the case, that he had requested the students to petition the Board of Trustees that the attendance of some of the medical men might be more regular, or that their fees might be returned to them. He said he did everything to keep the patients clean that he could; but there were no baths, and if a patient wanted a bath they had to go down to the washing room. I have seen vermin repeatedly upon the patients in the hospital.

Dr SCOTT.—Are you aware that there is a diet table prescribed to the patients, or are you in the habit of prescribing diet according to the circumstances?

Dr AIKINS did not consider the diet as deficient in regard to quantity.—Some of my patients have complained of want of food, and I have prescribed more for them; I felt that I had it in my power to do so if I considered it necessary. I remember of the coloured man being under my care. I don't know how often I saw him. I know that I did not consider it necessary to give him full diet because he was affected with aneurism. I don't know that I have found any difficulty, except in regard to the want of leeches, and I have mentioned this over and over again. I am aware there is an open bath in the hospital, and it may be had on an emergency, but I have never ordered it. The last time I spoke on this subject to Dr. Clarke, he said it was impossible for the servants to bring up water to supply such a bath. I do not consider it, easy to keep the

patients clean without a proper suite of baths, and even then it would be exceedingly difficult to do so; looking at the class of patients that come in here, being not only poor, but depraved, and their constitutions destroyed. I have not observed any deficiency in bed-clothing. I have found my prescriptions ordinarily prepared and sent up. I find the medicines always supplied according to my prescription. I think if the medical men ask for remedies not provided by the trustees that they should be allowed. I heard Dr. Bovell say that just so soon as fever came into the Hospital, if the trustees would refuse him brandy he would resign. I am in not the habit of prescribing brandy; I know that it is prescribed in large hospitals at home, but in ordinary cases, whiskey, or any other stimulus, would answer as substitute. I, however, think brandy decide any essential to be kept in the Hospital.

Dr. SCOTT.—Do you think the existing state of things warranted the strong language used in the letter of the medical student?

Dr. AIKINS.—I think a wrong construction is put upon the language, used.

Dr. SCOTT.—Do you think the language proper?

Dr. AIKINS.—I have only once glanced over the letter and would require to read it again before answering your question.

Mr. BENTLEY.—Have you ever seen any person in the institution under the influence of liquor?

Dr. AIKINS.—I have not seen any person under the influence of liquor here within the last two years. I have seen persons belonging to this Institution under the influence of liquor but not within the last two years.

Mr. BENTLEY I have heard that Burns was in the Asylum, and was there only ten days when they were obliged to dismiss him. Do you know that this is the case and do you know whether he brought a certificate of character?

THE CHAIRMAN objected to any attempt to impugn the character of Burns by such questions, because a good character was as much to him (Burns) as it was to James Beaty or Mr. Bentley.

Mr. GRAY.—Have you at any time, since your attendance at this Hospital seen Dr. Clarke under the influence of liquor?

Dr. AIKINS.—I have seen him under the influence of liquor, but not within the last two years, although I have heard students say that they have seen so.

Dr. RUSSELL.—Have you ever found Dr. Clarke inattentive to his duty?

Dr. AIKINS.—No. I must say, for myself, that whatever I have asked Dr. Clarke to do, has been done. I do not think that he has neglected any prescription that I entered upon the books. If he did so, it must have been an oversight.

Dr. SCOTT.—Are you in the habit of writing in detail the management and prescriptions for your patients?

Dr. AIKINS.—Sometimes I do, sometimes I do not.

Mr. GRAY.—did you at any time hear Dr. Clarke refuse the instruments for extracting teeth?

Dr. AIKINS.—I have. On one occasion, a poor looking, ill clothed, person came here to get a tooth taken out, and Dr. Clarke said there was to be no more teeth pulled in the Hospital. I asked him what poor people were to do? He said they must go to the dentists. I got the instruments from him at this time. I asked him if this was a rule of the Trustees? I think he said it was.

Dr. CLARKE did not remember having said there were to be no more teeth pulled in the Hospital.

Dr. AIKINS.—I again assert that Dr. Clarke said there was to be no more teeth-pulling in the Hospital; and I understood him to say it was a rule of the Trustees. There were two or three students with me at the time.

Dr. CLARKE.—Did I not say, that I would not give the instruments to the students, was not that all?

Dr. AIKINS.—I state most distinctly that when I asked what poor people were to do Dr. Clarke said they must go to the dentists, or the apothecaries.

Dr. CLARKE I deny ever having made such a statement.

Here one of the students made some remark but not sufficiently distinct to be noted—when the chairman said that he would not sit and be insulted by a parcel of young students who scarcely knew anything. If they had a question to put, let them tell him and he would put it.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—From the honourable position which Dr. Aikins holds in this City, he must be very well aware of the great responsibility of Dr. Clarke's position. [Question, question.] I have a perfect right to make such remarks, I want to know if Dr. Aikins does not believe the situation of a house surgeon is one of a very trying nature?

Dr. AIKINS.—I don't think it is so very difficult a position to fill. I have never heard any complaints of the great difficulty of it.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—Does the learned gentleman not think, that having so many tastes to please, his position is rendered more difficult than it would be under ordinary circumstances.

Dr. AIKINS.—I do not see that he has any tastes to please at all.—His duty is to put up the medicines prescribed by the medical officers.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—Has the general tenor of Dr. Clarke's conduct been such as to meet Dr. Aikins's approval?

Dr. AIKINS.—I answered that question before.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—Did Dr. Aikins, in his position as physician in this Hospital, ever see anything that he felt it his duty, not only to the Trustees but to the public, to report?

Dr. AIKINS.—Nothing further than I have stated.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—Did Dr. Aikins not state either directly or by implication, that when Dr. Clarke read that letter [signed Medical Student] over to him that he agreed with the tenor of it.

Dr. AIKINS.—I have answered that question in this way, Dr. Clarke himself said that every statement in that letter could be substantiated, except that of moral pollution.

Mr. BOWES.—Does Dr. Aikins believe the management of this Hospital is such as to give the impression that this Institution is in a state of moral pollution?

Dr. AIKINS.—I have not read the letter sufficiently to see its bearing. But if, by moral pollution he meant prostitution, then, I say, it is entirely incorrect.

Mr. BOWES.—Have you known any patient complain of the treatment they received in this Hospital.

Dr. AIKINS.—One patient yesterday complained to me of the treatment of Mrs. Donnelly.

Mr. BOWES.—Do you know that any patient left the Hospital in consequence of the neglect of the medical attendants, under whose charge they were?

Dr. AIKINS.—A patient under my own care, about five weeks ago, said she did not think she was not recovering quick enough, and would leave the Hospital, but this was not in consequence of neglect.

Mr. BOWES.—What is your opinion in regard to the cleanliness of the Hospital?

Dr. AIKINS.—I think there is not so much attention paid to the cleanliness of the patients as there should be, but I attribute this chiefly to the want of baths throughout the building.

Mr. BOWES.—Is it the duty of the physician to enter the names of the patients in his book, and the diseases with which they are afflicted.

Dr. AIKINS.—This is generally done, but it depends very much upon the nature of the disease.

Dr. TELFER.—Have you seen me frequently at the Hospital at the regular hour.

Dr. AIKINS.—I have seen you often at the regular hour:

Mr. LENNON.—I stated yesterday, that I never since the time I had taken out a ticket had had the pleasure of walking the wards of the Hospital with Dr. Telfer, because he always came here about 11 o'clock, and was generally through before any of the students came forward. I stated so distinctly; and I also said I had never had the pleasure of walking the wards with Dr. Herrick, for I had never seen him there but on the first day I went there.

Mr. BOWES.—Have you observed any jealousy manifested between the two schools?

Dr. AIKINS.—There is no use trying to conceal it, such is the case. There is a feeling of jealousy both among students and among the medical men. It has often been a puzzle to me that Dr. Telfer who has had the reputation of being the most skillful operating surgeon in the Hospital, gets no practice of that kind in the Hospital. I cannot understand how his private operations still continue, and his operations in the Hospital all at once cease. Yet, it is a fact, so far as I know.

Mr. BOWES.—Have you noticed any partiality on the part of Dr. Clarke in regard to patients when they came in here.

Dr. AIKINS.—I have not. But I have observed that there has not been the same amount of attention to Dr. Wright and myself, by at least two of the nurses, Burns and Donelly, as to the other medical men. Dr. Clarke's general bearing in this respect has of late been so marked that almost every one noticed it, was all in favour of Trinity College. I can not put my finger upon any particular facts, because I do not think it at all likely that facts of that nature would come under my observation. I could not point to any one case where I could say that Dr. Clarke had departed from the rule of the Institution, in regard to placing patients under the care of any particular medical officer. But at the same time I again repeat that his general bearing is in favor of Trinity College. The receiving physician for the week, has the disposal of the patients for the week except such cases as those already mentioned.

Mr. BOWES.—Is it customary for parties to send patients to the Hospital to be put under the care of certain medical gentlemen.

Dr. AIKINS.—It may be, but unless the order is by one of the regular medical attendants of the Hospital, it is not attended to, so far as I am personally aware.

Mr. BENTLEY.—Do you know of any instance where a patient was removed from the Hospital under some influence to get an operation performed.

Dr. AIKINS.—I do. A patient came in here under my care, and it was deemed necessary that an operation should be performed. That patient was removed shortly afterwards, and the operation was performed in a tavern within eighteen hours of the time he left the Hospital. I state most distinctly that I believe influence was used to get that patient removed, but I do not know the parties that used the influence, nor the channels through which that influence was used. The patient was removed shortly after he came to the Hospital, and the operation was performed by some of the medical attendants of the Hospital in a tavern shortly afterwards.

Mr. LENNON.—Have you reason to believe the patient came to this city a stranger, that you admitted him to the hospital and that it was found necessary that the limb should be removed, and when you came to perform the operation the patient objected, and afterwards went out into a tavern and

had it performed by Dr. Hodder, Dr. Bovell, and Dr. Philbrick? Have you reason to think that these gentlemen did not treat you with courtesy that they would have manifested towards one of the other professors? And are you aware that the expense of supporting this man in the tavern was borne by these three medical officers.

Dr. AIKINS—That the patient refused to allow me to operate was clear enough, and was dismissed from the Hospital in consequence, I do not know personally, but I was told that the operation was performed by Dr. Philbrick, Dr. Hodder and Dr. Bovell within eighteen hours after he left the Hospital. I do not know who supported the man in the tavern.

Mr. LENNON—Do you think Dr. Bovell treated you with that respect on the occasion with which you would have treated him?

Dr. AIKINS—I do not think that if Dr. Bovell had dismissed a patient that—

The CHAIRMAN—I would just like to know what the Trustees of the Hospital have to do with the opinions of these medical gentlemen. They seem to have different opinions in regard to their abilities, but I do not see that the trustees could settle that for them.

Mr. LENNON.—All the charges I had against the Trustees I brought forward yesterday but I was desirous to have that question answered distinctly.

Dr. BOVELL here stated that he knew nothing at all about the patient until within an hour of the time of the operation.

Dr. AIKINS—I understood the operation was performed by Dr. Bovell and Dr. Hodder, but that the patient was considered under Dr. Philbrick's care.

Dr. HODDER here denied most positively, and with considerable emphasis that he had anything to do whatever with the case, further than assisting Dr. Philbrick when he was asked by him to do so.

Mr. BOWES—Have you any suspicions that influence was exerted to get the patient removed.

Dr. AIKINS—My impression most decidedly is, that influence was used in the Hospital, but I cannot say by whom. I have also understood from Mr. Lennon that it was customary to notify the students of Trinity College when an operation was to be performed, without notifying the other students at all.

The CHAIRMAN—Is it the impression of the students of the Toronto School of Medicine that they are not treated with that courtesy and attention with which the students of Trinity College are treated.

Dr. AIKINS—It is, and I have heard them remark so repeatedly.

Dr. HODDER here stated that he was not aware of the patient having left the Hospital; that Dr. Philbrick called upon him, and asked him to assist in

an operation. He did not refuse to go, and he would not have refused, had Dr. Aikins, or any other medical gentleman, asked his assistance. He heard afterwards that the man had left the Hospital, in consequence of what some of the patients in the same ward had said to him. It was simply from the statements made by the patients in the same ward—patients who had been operated upon by other medical men—that he refused. They recommended him not to allow Dr. Aikins to take his limb off, and, in consequence, he refused. He merely mentioned this to prevent a wrong impression being formed.

This closed the proceedings of the second day.

SATURDAY, 31st March, 1855.

The investigation was resumed this morning. Mr. Beatty in the chair.

Mr. LENNON said he had a question or two to put to one of the witnesses.

Mr. Bowes said they had endeavored to give every one an opportunity to come forward to substantiate the charges made in that letter. They were still waiting for any person to come forward. He would wish, however, that gentlemen when they came forward would confine themselves to what had come under their own knowledge. Whatever had been stated on the evidence of a third party, would not be accepted as evidence by the trustees, and it would therefore save time if they would confine themselves to facts. He would see that Dr. Clarke, and Dr. Bovell, and the other medical officers were confined strictly to their own knowledge of facts. If they referred to what they heard from any other gentleman he would not consider it as the slightest evidence unless that party was brought forward to give evidence himself. He would not permit them to state anything here which they had heard from any other party, and by this means he hoped they would get more speedily through with the testimony.

Mr. LENNON.—I have a question to put to Dr. Aikins, if I am in order. Is Dr. Aikins aware whether the trustees have been made aware of the fact of Dr. Herrick's non-performance of Hospital duty, and Dr. Beaumont's stating that he would attend at such hours as suited himself?

Dr. AIKINS.—I am not aware whether the trustees as a body have been made acquainted with the circumstance, but I brought the matter before Dr. Widmer, as chairman of the board. I stated to him plainly that the

students complained of Dr. Herrick's non-performance of duty, and of Dr. Beaumont's coming at such hours as prevented them going the rounds with him to see his patients, and of Dr. Beaumont's stating that he would visit his patients at whatever hour suited himself best. I pointed out to him that there was a rule in the Hospital which he hoped he would abide by. I addressed Dr. Widmer, as chairman of the trustees, but I did not send him a written communication at the time. This is I think about twelve months ago.

Mr. LENNON.—Have you heard it urged that the whole staff should retire in case the trustees refused such remedies as were considered necessary for the treatment of the diseases in the Hospital?

Dr. AIKINS—I don't know that the whole medical staff had made such a statement, but I heard Dr. Bovell say that he thought the whole staff should resign, if they were not allowed what was required—one of the things mentioned was brandy. Dr. Bovell said that as soon as a fever patient came into the Hospital if the trustees refused brandy he would resign. I don't know that he referred to any thing else at the time. I do not know that leeches were mentioned, but I know that this was a complaint.

Mr. LENNON—Do the medical officers of this Hospital treat you with that courtesy you expect from your position?

Dr. AIKINS—Some of them have, and some of them have not, but this to me, is a matter of indifference. I shall never make any difference in my courtesy to them in consequence. I have no desire to make any accusation against any medical officer in this Institution.

Mr. LENNON—Are you willing to name any instance when you considered you were treated with disrespect, by any of the medical officers of this Institution.

Dr. AIKINS—I don't know that I should be compelled to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN—You are at liberty to refuse to answer any question that you think proper.

Dr. AIKINS—I can say that in several operations of Dr. Beaumont, I have not been consulted, while other medical men, not belonging to the Institution, have been consulted. No information has been given me of such operations, but I don't know that the Trustees expect that information should be given me when an operation is to take place.

Mr. BOWES—The Trustees expect that due notice should be given to all medical attendants when any operation is to be performed.

Mr. LENNON—If you were about to perform an operation would you think it your duty to take the advice and assistance of the medical staff of the Hospital in preference to that of any other medical gentlemen who might even be present?

Dr. AIKINS—I most decidedly would never think of passing by them, and asking the advice or assistance of any medical gentleman not connected with the Institution. I would not do it.

Mr. LENNON—Have you any proof that messages have been sent to Trinity College when an operation was to be performed, and no message has been sent to the Toronto School?

The CHAIRMAN did not think that the by-law required him to send notice to students at all.

Mr. LENNON—If we can prove that messages have been sent to Trinity College when an operation was to be performed, and no message sent to the Toronto School, it will show that favouritism has been shown to one Institution while the other has been neglected.

The CHAIRMAN did not think the resident surgeon was bound to send notice, but if he does so, it may show a species of favouritism on his part.

Mr. LENNON—Have any of your patients while in the Hospital ever observed to you that the other medical officers evidently disliked you, and did they give you any reason for this?

Dr. AIKINS—This has been mentioned to me once or twice by my patients. The reason given is, that I am a very young man, and that some of the older ones did not like to see me successful in my operations.

Mr. LENNON—Do you think it possible that Dr. Clarke can take so warm an interest in favour of Trinity College without, at the same time, most seriously impairing your usefulness in this Institution, in the minds of all connected with the internal management of the Institution?

Dr. AIKINS—I was not here when Dr. Clarke stated that he had so warm an interest in Trinity College but I understand he said so. I don't think he could take a deep interest in the students of one school without prejudicing them in regard to another school.

Mr. BOWES—Dr. Clarke did not state that he had exerted any influence in regard to that College.

Mr. LENNON—He stated that he was decidedly in favour of Trinity College because it was his *Alma Mater*, and because it was founded upon the religion he professed, and because it had a full staff of professors.

Dr. CLARKE said he would demand that as resident medical officer here, he should be protected. The parties who had accused him had no right to bring forward any charges which interfered with his right of private judgment, he would not submit to it. These charges were not founded upon any violation of the rules laid down by the Trustees. What he had said before, he would say again. He preferred Trinity College because it was his *alma mater*, and because he thought it had the best staff of medical professors in Upper Canada, and if any young man was recommended to his care, he

would send him to that college. He was not ashamed of the religion he professed—(warmly.) He was here as a gentleman, and he required the same treatment as a gentleman should get, and he demanded it.

Mr. BOWES—Beyond what the rules of the Institution say, they do not want to interfere; they did not want to have heard anything at all in reference to that point. He would again say that he did trust that the professional etiquette which governed medical men should not be lost sight of. They might ask if this professor, or that professor was competent to discharge his duties, but they had no wish to go further.

Mr. LENNON—Does not this preference satisfactorily explain to your mind the dereliction of duty on the part of some of the domestics of this Institution?

Dr. AIKINS—I repeat again what I stated yesterday, that I would never ask anything better from servants than what I receive from some of them. I only say if this advocacy in preference is open and warm, it will have the effect stated, especially with unconscientious servants.

Mr. LENNON was about to put another question, when some of the audience hissed slightly, after some remarks in reference thereto, he put a question in reference to the boy that was removed from the Hospital at Dr. Aikins' directions, but Mr. Bowes objected, as the parents of the boy were not present to answer for themselves. The question was then put from the chair in this form.

The CHAIRMAN—Have the parents of this boy ever told you that Dr. Clarke advised them to remove the boy from the Hospital?

Dr. AIKINS—Yes, both father and mother have, because they were afraid from what was stated that the boy would die in the Hospital.

Dr. CLARKE—You said that the air of the Hospital was not agreeing with him.

Dr. AIKINS—Yes, and I thought the conduct of Mrs. Donnelly was not agreeing with him. The parents told me prior to the introduction of the catheter into his bladder that Dr. Clarke had advised them to remove the boy, and this, consequently, was before the conversation I had with Dr. Clarke in regard to that matter.

Dr. CLARKE—I also told Dr. Aikins that, in my opinion, the boy's health was such that he could not stand to be operated upon, we talked about that boy repeatedly.

Dr. AIKINS.—Dr. Telfer stated also that the boy's health was not in such a state to be able to undergo an operation. I do not deny that Dr. Clarke and I had a conversation about the boy. I do not think, however, that although Dr. Clarke advised the parents of the boy to take him away, that he meant to injure me by any statements he made to them. But his statements were calculated to injure me, although not made with that intention.

Dr. CLARKE.—What has been my general conduct towards your patients?

Dr. AIKINS.—I answered this question yesterday. I stated then that I have never had any difficulty with you.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Really and truly, gentlemen, we are men of business, and to go on at this rate it would take two or three months to get through with the evidence. We have not come here to hear opinions. We want facts, although they would be very happy to hear all these points discussed if they had time.

Mr. LENNON.—Did you consider the reason stated by Dr. Hodder, for that man leaving the Hospital, was sufficient?

Dr. AIKINS.—I don't think it was offered by Dr. Hodder as a satisfactory reason for the man leaving the Hospital. His reasons, if given for that object, I would consider useless and frivolous. It was stated by Dr. Hodder that patients who had been operated upon in the Hospital urged this man not to allow me to operate upon him.

Dr. CLARKE.—The man stated that he would not allow Dr. Aikins to operate upon him, and Dr. Widmer recommended his dismissal, if he refused to allow Dr. Aikins to operate upon him.

Mr. BOWES.—Have you heard any of the medical officers or any other officers of this Hospital use abusive language.

Dr. AIKINS.—I never criticised the language of any of the medical officers; I would never think of doing such a thing.

Mr. BOWES.—Have the officers of this institution in any case used abusive language in your hearing. I refer to the medical gentlemen attending this Hospital.

Dr. AIKINS.—I don't remember having heard any of them.

Dr. RICHARDSON had a little knowledge of something that transpired 15 or 16 months ago in connexion with the Hospital, and would like to know whether the complaint made by Dr. Aikins in regard to the refusal of Dr. Beaumont, to come to the Hospital, at a certain specified hour, was in consequence of one of his patients in the hospital affected with aneurism, having been disturbed.

Dr. AIKINS.—In answer to Dr. Richardson, I have simply to say that I did not complain to Dr. Widmer of Dr. Beaumont not doing his duty; I have no right to interfere with him or any medical officer in doing his duty. I stated to Dr. Widmer that the students complained to me that Dr. Beaumont did not come here to the Hospital in time to meet them, to allow them to have the benefit of seeing his patients; I never heard any of the students say that Dr. Beaumont neglected his patients.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—Did not that arise from his patient having been interfered with by some of the students at that time in his absence.

Dr. AIKINS.—I do not think it did, but I wish you to understand that I never heard any of the students say that Dr. Beaumont did not attend to his patients.

Dr. TELFER.—Dr. Beaumont attends in his week for admitting patients but he asserts that at all other times he will attend his patients at any hour he chooses.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I think that Dr. Aikins said that Dr. Beaumont did not attend at the *hour* mentioned in the by-law.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—Did not this complaint originate shortly after the operation for aneurism.

Dr. AIKINS.—I will state most distinctly that it could not have done so, because it has been a complaint for four or five years to my certain knowledge.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—Did not Dr. Beaumont refuse to attend at that time because he was unwilling his patient should be disturbed. The fact was this, that Dr. Beaumont had a case of aneurism, which required a particular kind of treatment. He was anxious to prevent any person interfering with his patient. He would ask whether it was within Dr. Aikins's knowledge that Dr. Stratford came here and took the students of the Toronto School of Medicine into that ward and disturbed this patient, after Dr. Beaumont had given strict orders that no person should be admitted, and not only so, but that Dr. Wright did the same thing.

Dr. AIKINS.—I do not know anything of the kind, so far as Dr. Wright is concerned. I did hear, however, that something of that kind had occurred, in regard to Dr. Stratford.

Mr. BENTLEY wished to know whether the mere fact of the presence of a number of students would be apt to affect injuriously any patient at such a time.

Dr. AIKINS.—In some particular cases it might.

Dr. HODDER having been called upon to give his evidence, said he was anxious to read that letter signed Medical Student, and having done so, he would simply wish to ask Mr. Dixon whether he is the author of that letter.

Mr. DIXON—I stated distinctly that there is not a single word in that letter but what had emanated from my own brain.

Dr. HODDER—I am very sorry to hear you say so.

Dr. HALLOWELL I would ask whether Mr. Dixon was prompted to write that letter?

No answer.

Dr. HODDER—I consider that letter false, from beginning to end. All the testimony produced here has not proved one charge. The character of the witnesses, too, ought to have some weight. I would, therefore, beg to state

that the character I have heard of that young man, I am sorry to say—(hear, hear)—is far from what would give credence to the statements that have appeared. If rightly informed, that young man was once a preacher of the Gospel, and that he was—

Mr. DIXON—Since you have made allusion to that, I am willing that you should have the testimony of the Rev. Enoch Wood, as to my leaving the ministry. I have no hesitation in referring you to that gentleman for my character.

Mr. BOWES here objected to any more irrelevant matter being introduced. There had been too much of that already, and he hoped the parties would confine themselves simply to the facts, they had either to prove the charges, or to show that the statements in their letter was untrue.

Mr. DIXON said, Dr. Hodder had made insinuations regarding his character. He would solemnly declare that he was never dismissed from the ministry—that no charge was ever brought against him—but that he resigned from motives and reasons which he could easily state, if necessary. He would call upon Dr. Hodder to state whether any charge had ever been brought against him?

Dr. HODDER made no reply, but passing from that subject without further remark said, with respect to the charges made against Burns, he would say that he had never seen him use any undue violence in any one single instance whatever, nor had he known him to be guilty of any dereliction of duty whatever. He is certainly not the most polished man in the world. He is an old soldier, and like all old soldiers is in the habit of obeying orders in rather a *brusque* manner, but that was all that he had ever seen about him. With regard to the nurses generally, he did not think there was a public Institution in this country where they performed their duty better than in the Hospital. With regard to cleanliness, perhaps it might be better managed in some respects, but he attributed that entirely to the building, and not at all to the servants, for better servants he had not seen. He had seen dirty beds, but they were changed as often as they could be. He had an old patient upstairs at the present time who was very difficult indeed to keep clean. With respect to vermin, he would say that it was impossible to keep such places clear of them, but it is no worse in this respect than other Hospitals, and not perhaps worse in that respect than many abodes of the poor. He had visited houses of this kind, public Hospitals, in England, Scotland, and France and Germany, he had seen patients covered with vermin in all these Institutions, patients came in covered with vermin, and how was it possible they could be kept entirely from them.

Dr. HODDER here read the letter and said there was a charge of cruelty preferred. I have never seen anything in the Hospital to justify such a charge at least in regard to any servant of the Hospital. If I have ever seen it, it was on the part of one of the medical officers. The charge of moral

pollution he did not think could be substantiated. I have never witnessed such a thing either on the part of patients, nurses or medical officers. I am not aware of anything of the kind existing in the Hospital. By moral pollution I mean of course an immoral course of conduct, either licentiousness of speech or improper intimacy between male and female patients.

Mr. BOWES—What medical officer do you refer to as practising cruelty.

Dr. HODDER—The medical officer to whom I alluded was Dr. Aikins. I was personally cognizant of two separate instances of cruelty practised by Dr. Aikins. The first was in an operation for *fistula in perineo*. In that case Dr. Aikins made a transverse incision in the perineum instead of a perpendicular one which is the usual mode. The second act of cruelty was in his persisting to operate upon a boy named Jesse Nunn after he had repeatedly failed in his attempts to get the catheter into his bladder. I have been credibly informed that that boy was on the table five different times upwards of two hours each time, and would say that Dr. Aikins ought to have had the president and the senior officers of the Hospital to assist him if he was not able to perform the operation himself. With respect to the success of the operation, I believe that it was a student who told him Dr. Aikins where he would find the urethra, and I believe that after this information he succeeded.

Mr. BOWES—Was there any other Surgical operation performed in this Hospital which you considered unscientifically performed.

Dr. HODDER—I was only witness to the two I have mentioned. I was not present at the commencement of the operation on the second case, although Dr. Aikins stated to the contrary. I came into the room while the boy was on the table and found a section made down to what I supposed to be the urethra. I looked at it and from its shining appearance believed it to be the urethra. I had not an opportunity of passing the probe, but I believed it turned out to be a false passage. I have not witnessed any other operation by Dr. Aikins since, but I would say that most of the operations performed by him (Dr. Aikins) have not been performed in a skillful manner. I have been told that in an operation performed by him where an amputation was made below the knee it was performed in so unskillful a manner that the man very narrowly escaped losing his life.

A STUDENT—You will be pleased to observe Mr. Chairman, that this is only hearsay evidence.

Dr. HODDER indignantly—I don't wish to be interrupted by boys.

Mr BOWES—Are there any other cases that you know of?

Dr. HODDER—There was the case of a patient named Grace Sage, and a man in the lower ward afflicted with Ophthalmia. These two patients were in the Hospital for two months, without having a prescription ordered to them: The former of these cases is still extremely doubtful in consequence of this neglect.

There was another case, that of a woman named, Grace Heeley, who came into the Hospital with a fractured arm and I have been told that the patient had lost the use of the arm in consequence of the unskillful treatment of Dr. Aikins. I think that these were sufficient to prove want of skill and want of professional knowledge on the part of Dr. Aikins. He considered Dr. Aikins unfit to have charge of patients in a public hospital, either in a Medical or Surgical point of view.

Mr. BOWES—With respect to the general management of the Hospital as you have had experience in different hospitals, how do you think this one will stand comparison?

Dr. HODDER—With regard to the ability and attention of Dr. Clarke, I would say that a more skillful or attentive resident Surgeon could not be found. I believed that Dr. Clarke knows his profession as well as any man in Toronto, and is as attentive to his duty as any medical man possible could be. I know that Dr. Clarke has attended my patients here with as much interest as if he had to reap the benefit himself.

Mr. BOWES—Have your prescriptions been generally attended to promptly.

Dr. HODDER—I have occasionally ordered a change of medicine on going my rounds, and on the following day I have found that the patient had not got the medicine, but I attribute this to my own neglect in not entering the prescription in the book. I am the only party to bear the blame in all such cases.

Mr. BOWES—Do you think this Hospital is managed as well as can be done with the means within our reach?

Dr. HODDER—Thought the hospital was as well managed as possible with regard to diet, with the exception of brandy. He would here state that the trustees might not be aware that in particular cases brandy will remain on the stomach of a patient, when whiskey would not.

In answer to Mr. BOWES—Dr. Widmer said that if good malt whiskey was supplied, brandy might be dispensed with. He had lived as a medical practitioner both in a civil life and a military life and considered that, for Medical purposes, any good spirit although it had not the aroma of brandy was just as useful as brandy as a stimulant.

Dr. HODDER—said as a general rule he thought that the good beer, and the excellent wine and whiskey provided by the Trustees would answer every purpose, but there were some cases when brandy would agree with the stomach of a patient when none of the others would do as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN—Do you know of an instance where medical men have ordered brandy and it has been refused.

Dr. HODDER—Dr. Bovell has said so and he (Dr. Hodder) had ordered brandy himself frequently.

Mr. BOWES.—What do you know respecting Mrs. Donnelly as a nurse?

Dr. HODDER.—I believe Mrs Donnelly is a perfectly sober and trustworthy nurse. I have never seen her in such a condition as to excite the slightest suspicion that she had taken what she ought not to have taken. She has always obeyed any orders I have given her, and attended to the patients regularly. Like Burns she is not polished, but so far as I have seen her, she does her duty faithfully. I have never seen the slightest disrespect on her part to any of the authorities of the Hospital. With respect to the students, they have always paid the greatest courtesy that a medical officer could expect. Mrs. Donnelly's ward is not so clean perhaps as the others, but that does not arise from any want of care on her part but on account of the particular kind of patients that are placed under her charge. I have ordered baths occasionally, and always understood that the patients got them; I have never heard anything to the contrary; I think patients could always have a bath if absolutely necessary. I do not know that the bath is a portable one, but in cases where I have ordered it the patients go to it. It is usual in general cases in other Hospitals, where patients require a bath, to go to another room. I have seen in England a bath brought to the bedside of a patient but in large Hospitals in Europe generally there are bath houses where all the patients are required to go.

Mr. BOWES.—What is your opinion with respect to Dr. Clarke's moral character.

Dr. HODDER.—I have known Dr. Clarke for some years; I have been attached to this Hospital for two years, and from my experience I can say that I believe him to be an upright, honest, sober, gentlemanly person in every respect; I know nothing against his moral character whatever. He would not permit any immorality at all in this Hospital if he knew of it. I have never seen him exercise the slightest partiality to any student or students over the others; I have never known any case in which Dr. Clarke was drunk in this Institution.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—As you have testified to the character of Burns, I want to know if you ever heard that that functionary had been dismissed from another Institution.

Dr. HODDER.—Not until yesterday. I heard that Burns had been a servant at the Asylum, but I never heard that he had been dismissed. The superintendent of the female servants has discharged her duty in a most exemplary manner; I have never known any of the patients suffer for want of proper diet; but when hungry wretches come in here, I have no doubt they will think Hospital allowance very scanty.

Mr. BOWES.—Have you known any patients leave the Hospital in consequence of neglect on the part of the medical officers of the Institution?

Dr. HODDER.—I am not aware of any. I have known them leaving the Hospital convinced they might do better elsewhere, but not from neglect on the

part of the medical officer. The only one I can bring up at the moment is that man that refused to be operated on by Dr. Aikins, and consented rather to leave the Hospital.

Dr. AIKINS.—Do you not remember also a woman upstairs who refused to be operated on by Dr. Hodder, and left the Hospital on the same day?

Dr. HODDER.—I was not at all anxious to operate upon her, because it was a very malignant disease, and I considered the removal of the limb the only chance she had of her life.

Dr. WRIGHT.—What as to Hospital lances?

Dr. HODDER.—I consider the Hospital badly off for instruments, and I should have said that leeches had been refused by the trustees.

Mr. LENNON.—I wish to know whether it is usual to leave it optional with patients whether they will have a limb removed or not.

Dr. HODDER.—It is under certain circumstances.

Dr. AIKINS.—I am prepared to say that that woman who refused to be operated upon by Dr. Hodder consented to have her limb removed after she left the Hospital.

Mr. LENNON.—Do you think it possible that any of the patients in the Hospital could influence others in regard to medical attendants?

Dr. HODDER.—It is perfectly easy to do so; a man with a fractured arm could easily walk to the bed-side of another patient. Patients as well as students can exercise their own discrimination, and they have a perfect right to leave the Hospital if they find they can't be operated on as they wish.

Dr. WRIGHT.—What case had been operated on in this Hospital by Dr. Aikins before that one case alluded to?

Dr. HODDER.—The only cases are the two I have mentioned.

Dr. WRIGHT.—I do not recollect the exact time when the first case alluded to occurred, but I think it was about three months after we joined the Hospital. Now I should like to know what possible connection there could be between the cases.

Dr. HODDER.—I have no doubt that public rumour was the cause of the objections made to Dr. Aikins operating.

Mr. LENNON.—Happening to be present while the operation for fistula was going on, I wish to ask Dr. Hodder if he did not come forward and take the probe into his hand and remain nearly a quarter of an hour trying to find a passage into the boy's bladder?

Dr. HODDER.—I came forward, but I did not take Dr. Aikins's place.

Mr. LENNON.—Did you not use the probe?

Dr. HODDER.—I used it in my left hand. I did not take Dr. Aikins's place, and did not see the incision properly.

Mr. LENNON—I was present on that occasion, and I assert it to be correct that Dr. Hodder was offered every opportunity of using the probe. He had as good an opportunity of doing so as Dr. Aikins had, and that he failed in introducing the probe into the bladder. This I can prove, and would take my oath upon.

Dr. HODDER—I was close to the patient, if you mean by "close to the patient," that I was as close to his head as Dr. Aikins was to his tail, but I say it is totally false.

Mr. BENTLEY—Am I to understand that Mr. Hodder used the probe without looking what he was doing?

Dr. HODDER—No; but I was not in the best position in which I could use it.

Mr. BENTLEY—I understood that the probe was used about a quarter of an hour.

Dr. HODDER—It is simply false.

Dr. HALLOWELL—I wish to ask Dr. Widmer whether he has ever known, in his military or civil practice, a case of *fistula in perineo*, treated by a transverse incision.

Dr. WIDMER—No, Sir, I never have.

Dr. HODDER here stated, in answer to a question from Dr. Richardson, that some of the best nurses and servants in large hospitals were somewhat rough in their manner. He also stated that students attending large hospitals in Europe considered it a privilege to furnish their own instruments for cupping, bleeding and tooth-drawing. He referred to the cupper in Guy's Hospital, who made a large salary by the fees he received from the students for teaching them cupping.

Dr. PHILBRICK, here stated that he came on the first day to give his testimony, and being very weakly he had dropped down in a faint while going out. It had been said that he was intoxicated, he wished to know from Dr. Widmer or Dr. Telfer if that was their opinion. He did not wish to be traduced by these *trashy toadstools*.

Mr. BOWES—I am not aware that such a thing was said.

Dr. PHILBRICK.—It was said publicly, and I ask whether Dr. Telfer or Dr. Widmer believe it was the effect of disease or the effect of drink.

Dr. BOVELL.—It was stated in the presence of the Sheriff that he was drunk.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—I was told so by Mr. Gray.

Mr. GRAY. I say most distinctly that it is false. I said, that it was suggested that Dr. Philbrick should leave the room that he might not disgrace the Institution for it was believed that he was not sober.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—I beg leave to call that gentleman to order. He is only a student of medicine! I won't say behind a man's back what I would not say

before his face,—I appeal to you therefore, gentlemen, of this trust, and to the medical men present and to the students, if the conduct of this individual throughout this investigation has not been most unbecoming. (Order, order, hiasce.) and most disgraceful, (Order, order.)

THE CHAIRMAN—I will not permit this. I insist upon having order, to allow the investigation to proceed.

MR. BENTLEY—I wish to ask Dr. Hodder through you, Mr. Chairman, who it was that said the operations performed by Dr. Aikins were unskillfully performed.

DR. HODDER—I refuse to answer that question. But it can be proved. I referred to it, not from my own knowledge but from what I heard.

MR. BENTLEY—Could Dr. Telfer, or Dr. Bovell, or Dr. Russell corroborate that statement.

DR. TELFER—I could not corroborate that statement.

MR. BENTLEY—Was it a medical man who made that statement?

DR. HODDER. I should not have listened to any statement of a non-professional man.

MR. BENTLEY. I wish to ask Dr. Hodder whether from the fact of his having sat at the Board of Examiners with Dr. Aikins, and from other sources, he has not had abundant evidence that Dr. Aikins is very thoroughly acquainted with anatomy.

DR. HODDER—My belief is that he is a thorough anatomist, but that he is neither a surgeon nor a physician. There are many advantages which cannot be acquired in a small country town. A man may be a thorough anatomist and a very bad operator; I have known some men of the highest medical talent in London, the best medical surgeon to consult in any case not requiring operations. I need only mention Sir Benjamin Brodie, and Mr. Benjamin Travers, two of the best surgeons of the day, not good operators, but they were good anatomists and the best consulting surgeons in Europe.

MR. BENTLEY.—In this case in regard to the position of the urethra, it is said that Dr. Aikins did not know where to find it. This is a question peculiarly relating to anatomy and yet Dr. Aikins in spite of his knowledge of anatomy required information in regard to this point from one of his students. I would ask Dr. Hodder in what respect he considers Dr. Aikins deficient as a surgeon? is he unskillful? does he want nerve or what? Dr. Hodder had made a statement that Sir Benjamin Brodie and Mr. Benjamin Travers were not good operators, this is contrary to the general opinion.

DR. HODDER.—I don't think it is want of nerve, nor want of knowledge of anatomy, merely a want of practise in operation; I would let any one take the result of his operations, take the manner in which they were performed, and say whether they were skillfully performed.

Mr. BENTLEY—I would ask whether the incision referred to was a transverse or oblique incision, and what was its extent.

Dr. HODDER—It was what we call a transverse incision in the perineum, the length of the incision might be two inches.

Mr. BENTLEY—I was present on the occasion, and I did not think the incision was more than half an inch.

Dr. HODDER—Are you a medical practitioner?

Mr. BENTLEY—I am a medical student, and I am quite able to distinguish between half an inch and two inches.

Dr. HODDER—If it was only half an inch it was not half enough.

Mr. LENNON—Are you aware of any patient having died under an operation by Dr. Aikins?

Dr. HODDER—No—I never saw a patient die under an operation in my life unless in Guy's Hospital in London, I am not aware of any patient having died from hemorrhage in this Institution but even should a secondary hemorrhage occur, it is no blame in the operator.

Dr. PHILLBRICK—Did you not hear Dr. Aikins say that the only cases he did not enter on his book were cases of weakness where the patients required rest and nourishment?

Dr. HODDER—I did.

Dr. PHILLBRICK—Do you consider the Hospital a proper place for weak persons, or that strength would likely be gathered there?

Dr. HODDER—I think that cases of that kind should not be admitted to the Hospital at all, but occasionally such cases are admitted, because we have no Poor-house here.

The Chairman said there was a House of Industry in town, and he requested the medical gentlemen to understand that the funds of this Institution are not for that purpose. He hoped in future the profession would send such cases to the Poor House.

Dr. HODDER—Occasionally the House of Industry has been so crowded that we could not get such patients admitted there.

Mr. LENNON—I wish you to name the student who showed Dr. Aikins the passage into the urethra after he had been unable to find it.

Dr. HODDER—I cannot give the name of the student from my own knowledge; I merely heard that a student had pointed out the true passage.

Some further remarks here passed between Mr. Lennon Dr. Scott Dr. Philbrick and Dr. Hodder in regard to the operation for fistula already so frequently alluded to, when

Dr. RICHARDSON—Asked whether Dr. Hodder thought the statements in the letter of the 24th were true?

Dr. HODDER.—From my own knowledge I say they are false from beginning to end.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—Do you think such statements sent forth to the public will not have an injurious effect upon the Institution ?

Dr. HODDER.—Unquestionably.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—Is not such a letter most discreditable to the party who wrote it ?

Dr. HODDER.—I should be very sorry to be the author of such a letter, but I think the Institution will not be injured by it.

In answer to Mr. Lennon, Dr. Hodder said, that as a general rule, the names of the patients were entered on the books before receiving treatment, but that rule was frequently violated. It was possible, also, that in his own week patients may have been taken in, and allowed to lie some days without treatment.

Dr. AIKINS.—Are you prepared to prove that Grace Sage got no treatment for some days ?

Dr. HODDER.—I refuse to answer that question, because it is merely hearsay.

Dr. AIKINS.—It is very strange you have brought forward two cases to injure my character, and when questioned you say it is merely hearsay.

Dr. HODDER.—I shall say for myself. When the persons who told me come up, I shall put the questions to them.

Dr. WIDMER said the current that this enquiry had taken required him to bring before their notice the contents of a letter which had been addressed to the trustees. He wished that letter to be read and recorded upon the minutes. It was impossible for them to go on further with this enquiry without interfering with the whole business of the Hospital. The medical officers were all engaged here at a great sacrifice on their part, and all the servants of the Institution were kept from their duty. He thought that this letter, which would now be read, would do away with the necessity of any further examination of the medical staff.

The Secretary then read the following letter :—

“ To the Trustees of the Toronto General Hospital.

GENTLEMEN,—Having read in the *Colonist*, of Saturday last, a letter (signed ‘ A Medical Student ’) imputing to all who have any authority in this Institution, and knowledge of what is passing therein, the most disgraceful conduct, viz., that of permitting certain atrocities to pass unheeded ; we, as medical officers of the Hospital, beg to state, from our experience within its walls, that we regard this letter as a tissue of malicious falsehoods ; that we have never seen in the Hospital any “ corruption which exists and stalks forth in open day ; ” that it is false to call the Hospital a “ house of sin,”

meaning thereby that sin has an especial resort therein ; that it is equally false to call it a "fountain of moral pollution," or to say that "it is filthy."

We beg to say that we conceive that the greatest credit is due to Dr. Clarke, the resident medical officer, for the general good order and cleanliness of the Hospital, and also for the zeal, attention and ability which he has, for so many years, shown in the discharge of his onerous and, frequently, unpleasant professional duties. With regard to the orderly, Burns, and the nurse alluded to, we desire to say that we have never observed anything approaching to cruelty on their parts, and we believe them both to be steady, honest, and well-deserving servants of the Institution.

We trust that for the credit of the Hospital, and of all connected with it, nothing will be spared in investigating this matter, and in tracing the real author of the letter, and any other persons who may have been abettors in the slanders cast upon the Institution.

We have the honor to be, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servants,

WALTER TELFER, Surgeon.
GEORGE HERRICK, M.D.A.B.
W. R. BEAUMONT, F.R.C.S., Eng.
E. M. HODDER, M.D. & F.R.C.S., Eng.
JAMES BOVELL, M.D., Trin. Col., Toronto."

This did not close the investigation, however, as recommended by Dr. Widmer, for Dr. BEAUMONT, was called upon to state that he knew about the Institution.

Dr. BEAUMONT.—It is not my intention to answer any questions, but I wish to make some observations not quite irrelevant, to the matter before the Board. It has been said by some of the students that they do not get that amount of instruction they think they are entitled to on account of the irregularity of the medical officers. I beg to state that some time ago when this question came up in connection with Dr. Stratford's interference, I stated to the trustees that so far as the rules of the Institution, went, I would attend on my admitting week, but at other hours I would attend, when it suited my convenience, provided such attendance did not interfere with the business of the Hospital. I may state that Dr. Clarke and the other medical officers of this Institution are placed on a different footing from medical officers in similar Institution at home. They receive fees from the students for their instruction and have a claim upon their attendance. Here we do our duty gratuitously, and the public must know that whenever duty is done gratuitously a great deal of allowance must be made. The trustees did not say I should attend regularly at noon. I have however attended regularly so far as regards my patients. When in the Toronto University I did attend regularly every day but it is different now. I do not consider, however, that the students have the slightest claim upon me for instructions, I may have said something to them by way of instruction ; but the students have not the slightest

claim upon me. A great deal has been said to show error in practice, but error will some times occur with the most experienced men. Every man must begin to operate, but those are best qualified to begin who have seen operations performed, and Dr. Aikins and Dr. Wright I must say have not had opportunities of seeing a great many surgical operations performed. It cannot be expected that in a small place like Toronto they can have had an opportunity of seeing a great many operations,

Dr. AIKINS.—Can you prove that statement ?

Dr. BEAUMONT.—Dr. Wright has stated that he was educated in Canada, you I believe, were some time in Philadelphia and consequently may have seen more than he has.

Dr. AIKINS.—When you make a statement against my professional ability. I think you ought to be able to substantiate every word you say.

Dr. BEAUMONT.—I was speaking about those best qualified to conduct operations.

Dr. AIKINS.—I state most distinctly that Dr. Beaumont would lead any person to infer that I have not had the means of learning my profession perfectly, and therefore he ought to be able to substantiate this statement :

Dr. BEAUMONT.—I say you cannot have had an opportunity of seeing so large a number of operations as many gentlemen have. Those gentlemen who have been educated at home, and those who have spent some half dozen years in Hospitals in New York must have had many advantages that gentlemen educated in Toronto cannot have, and it would have been better that gentlemen not having so large experience had been appointed as assistants to the Hospital staff. There is a certain responsibility involved in taking part in operations which I should not desire to share, unless with persons whom I know to be in the habit of operating. I should not greatly desire to assist in an operation performed either by Dr. Aikins or by Dr. Wright. I should not desire to do so. I did once assist Dr. Wright in an operation but I don't know why he should ask me rather than Dr. Aikins to assist him.

Dr. WRIGHT.—Do you know that I did not ask Dr. Aikins.

Dr. BEAUMONT, after some hesitation, said he did not know whether Dr. Aikins had been asked or not.

Dr. WRIGHT.—I did ask Dr. Aikins and Dr. Telfer too, and I asked you as a matter of professional courtesy, as you were there at the time.

Dr. BEAUMONT.—I state again that I do not think that parties who have not had much experience should be appointed to Hospitals. I think also that as I and four of my colleagues have signed the letter to the Trustees, stating that we consider the letter signed "Medical Student," a tissue of falsehoods—I think it is right that it should be made clearly known whether Dr. Aikins and Dr. Wright deem the statements in the *Colonist* correct and justifiable.

Mr. BOWES.—I wish first to have an answer from you to one or two general questions in regard to the general management of the Hospital.

Dr. BEAUMONT.—I have seen nothing that I do not consider creditable to the Institution, considering its resources. Everything that I have seen on the part of Dr. Clarke, does him the highest credit. There is no man in the Hospital that I would ask to assist me in operating in preference to Dr. Clarke. Dr. Clarke is the most temperate man I ever met with. I have often taken a glass of wine in the Hospital with some of the examining Board, but I do not think that ever on such an occasion, Dr. Clarke would take a glass of wine. The general bearing of Dr. Clarke has been such as to give the highest satisfaction to all parties.

Mr. BENTLEY.—I ask Dr. Beaumont if he considers his dignity wounded by consulting with his associates Drs. Aikins and Wright?

Dr. RICHARDSON.—I assert that for him. I assert that Dr. Beaumont stands at the very top of his profession in Toronto.

Dr. WIDMER was next examined. He said, I have been connected with this Hospital since it was opened. We have had a vast variety of medical officers in it; some indifferent, some very bad indeed; but we have got one now who conducts it with great skill and great efficiency. He has the greatest confidence of all the medical officers. During the whole course of years that I have observed the conduct of Dr. Clarke I am highly satisfied with it. In respect to attention, zeal, integrity and courtesy, he cannot be surpassed in any one of these qualities. [Cheers]

Dr. CLARKE.—You are in the habit of visiting this Institution every day: Did you ever see me under the influence of liquor?

Dr. WIDMER.—No, I declare most positively that I never did.

Mr. BENTLEY.—Do the Trustees receive the fees of the students?

Mr. BOWES.—We receive the fees of the students, and we are not able after all to furnish brandy.

Mr. BENTLEY.—I wish the position of the students somewhat defined.—I merely wish to say that the students pay their fees for the benefit of the instruction they expect to receive here.

Dr. HERRICK.—I have attended the Hospital for about 12 years. In my admitting week I have been always regular in attendance. It is customary for the person receiving patients to attend them until they leave the Hospital.

The Doctor having made some remarks in regard to the course pursued in King's College in regard to clinical lectures, said, the receiving officer has a right to attend all the cases that are admitted by him. I know of no case where Dr. Clarke has departed from his duties. I have found him always impartial so far as I could judge; I have never seen anything where there was not the utmost attention. Until he was appointed, this Hospital was very badly arranged. I have had an opportunity of judging of Dr. Clarke's ability as a medical man and I think he would be a credit to any hospital. I should say that in a remote place like this, it is extremely difficult to get a proper person for such an institution. I have not known him show partiality to any of the students of any school of medicine over the other.

Mr. BOWES.—Is it customary for medical gentlemen to send a note to say who they wish a patient put under.

Dr. HERRICK.—I understand that some of the medical gentlemen have done so, but I never did. As to the management of the Hospital, I may say that I have been attending Hospitals for the last 30 years and I think I know as much of Hospital practice as any man in Canada; and for the last 8 years,—I only speak since then because the Hospital was not properly managed before—it is as well managed an Hospital now as any ever I saw. I have been in Hospitals in Dublin and Edinburgh and other places, and I never saw an Hospital better managed than this one has been for the last 8 years. I never saw anything wrong with the nurses. I never saw anything of cruelty, or anything but the utmost attention. So far as I am concerned I never saw anything but re-

spect and obedience on the part of Mrs Donnelly. I know Burns: I never saw any particular roughness about him. I saw a man come in with his hat on, Burns took his hat by the brim and said, every person here must have his hat off. There was no roughness that I could observe. He took the hat off and told the patient that he should be uncovered; this was only a week ago.

Dr. DIXON.—The case to which I referred occurred more than six months ago.

Mr. BOWES.—In the case of a person fainting from bleeding—What remedy would you apply?

Dr. HERRICK.—I would apply hartshorn, or I would take him into the open air. It is customary to throw water upon the face, I would do so by putting my hand in the basin, and then sprinkling it with my fingers,—so—[Here the Doctor suited the action to the word]. It would not be cruel to take a patient by the arms and draw him out in the open air. I don't know that it could be done otherwise. I would not consider it correct to leave him out in very cold weather. There is no building like this that you can keep free from vermin; but I have never seen them more here than in ordinary cases. In some of the Hospitals in the old country there is a bath room where such cases would be sent, and their wearing clothes would then be taken away from them. But here there is no Hospital dress, which there should be. Under the circumstances I think it is as well managed as any Hospital can be. It is kept as clean as such a building could be. I never saw any of the beds, or sheets, or blankets but what were ordinarily clean. I never heard any obscene language used by any person in this Institution, either by medical officers of the Institution, or by servants in the Hospital.

Mr. LENNON.—Have you been up stairs in this Hospital on more than one occasion this winter, at 12 o'clock—the hour appointed?

Dr. HERRICK.—I have been repeatedly up stairs but I thought one o'clock was the hour.

Mr. LENNON.—With regard to this bleeding case, does Dr Herrick believe that if a patient is bled to syncope, that water should be dashed in his face?

Dr. HERRICK.—It was your duty to have stopped him.

Mr. LENNON.—The patient came in here to get relief. It was granted to him by the Medical officer. I was ordered by the officer to bleed him. He got the relief he required, and had to go out in the middle of winter with his clothes all wet.

Dr. HERRICK.—Was it not humanity in Burns to do what he could to relieve the man?

Dr. RICHARDSON.—I would like to ask Dr. Herrick what he would think of the qualification of a young man to bleed a patient—who would bleed a man almost pulseless, and still keep up in an upright position.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—I beg to submit that this is entirely out of order.—Dr. Herrick has been called upon as the oldest Medical Man in the room and his testimony is attempted to be impugned by a young gentleman who has not the slightest qualification to stand upon.

Dr. HERRICK.—I don't think the young man got exactly fair play in this bleeding case. There ought to be bleeding cups marked to the proper quantity 4 oz. cups or 6 oz. cups or 10 oz. cups. But without these a young man might take 16 ounces instead of 10.

Dr. RICHARDSON.—I don't want to say one word to injure the young man. If I have said anything to injure his character or his reputation I am sorry for it and will take every means publicly to retract it.

Some little discussion took place between Dr. Cotter and Dr. Herrick in regard to whether it was cruelty or not to throw the water, as Burns had done, and then the Dr. made some allusion to the abolishing of the faculty of Medicine from the University. He was determined, he said to resign his con-

nection with the Hospital, but had been urged by Dr. Beaumont not to do so until there was no chance of the Medical School being again attached to the University. But the very thing that he feared had occurred; jealousy had come into the Hospital. He had determined, however, until saw how things would work to go on as before. He thought the Trustees had acted in a very impartial way. There is no hospital in Europe has so many Medical attendants as this Hospital has; most of them have only four. He had no wish to injure either of the Schools. On the contrary, as his own school is gone he did everything in his power to assist both of them. He was not aware whether Dr. Aikins and Wright gave clinical lectures in the Hospital; but if they give such lectures elsewhere, He thought the Trustees ought to insist that they give these lectures in the Hospital. He had never shown Dr. Aikins or Dr. Wright anything but the utmost courtesy. He understood that Dr. Hodder and Dr. Bovell had given clinical lectures during the winter in the Hospital.

Dr. HODDER I have not lectured during this last winter. Dr. Bovell has given clinical lectures. But I wish to know whether we are bound to lecture to any but our own students?

Mr. BENTLEY wished to know from the Trustees whether the Students paid their fees to see the practice of the Hospital, or only to see the practice of any particular officer. He had understood that the student paid his fee to see the practice of all the medical gentlemen, and not of any one in particular, and he wanted to know whether the Trustees in demanding a fee have not the idea that the students should have the benefit of instruction from all the medical officers. The hour for students is fixed at noon daily throughout the year, and the lectures which they attend are regulated so as to enable them to be here at that hour; but if the medical officers do not attend at that particular hour, the students it is very evident, cannot derive any advantage from their instructions.

Mr. BOWES thought, that so far as the rule was concerned, the Trustees had only a claim upon the medical officer for the week that he admitted the patients. It was then expected that he should be present at noon.

Dr. BEAUMONT—said it would be perfectly monstrous to suppose that all the medical officers should come to this Hospital every day at noon to visit one or two patients. It would be a tax upon their time which half the medical men could not give. He could not do so, and would be obliged to resign if the Trustees required it.

Some little conversation here ensued in regard to the practice of the Hospital.

Dr. HALLOWELL thought that if there were rules for the guidance of the medical gentlemen in regard to their attendance, they ought to be carried out. One rule is that they attend at 12 o'clock. He would like to ask Dr. Wright whether he had always attended at that hour.

Dr. WRIGHT—Not always.

Dr. GRANT—If the Trustees could not manage so as to get the medical officers to attend at 12 o'clock it was impossible for the students to derive any benefit at all from coming to the Hospital. He begged leave to say that in the old country this is particularly attended to. He had seen four medical gentlemen attend regularly all at one time, and the students have justice done them. Here it was evident that justice was not done the students and they cannot reap the advantage which the Hospital holds out as a school of practice. Here there were two schools of medicine in which they were training young men to go abroad through the great provinces to practise as medical men. How were they training them and sending them out to pursue their profession? By giving them very inadequate ideas of their business. Unless the Trustees could manage affairs in such a way that the students can reap this benefit, they were doing a gross injustice to the public at large as well as to the students.

Dr. BOVELL was next requested to give evidence. He said he would simply make a few statements which the Secretary need not detain the meeting by writing out, as he would furnish a copy of it after the examination was over. I have read the letter in the *Oregonian*, and I have signed a letter with my colleagues, which I think a sufficient answer to the falsehoods contained in that letter. From the turn things have taken in this investigation I feel so ashamed of the position which I occupy that I had resolved absolutely to refuse to answer any question at all. The characters of individuals have been most unparingly assailed, and the parties have not been upon oath who made the charges. I think it would have been far better if the Trustees had examined those persons privately or called upon the government to examine them by commission. The way some of the questions had been put was most insulting, and characters of individuals had been most wantonly assailed, and none of the parties upon oath.

The CHAIRMAN—You are aware that notice was given to all the parties that it was only voluntary on their part to answer any question at all. The officers of this Institution have been assailed by the students of a medical school in this city, and the Trustees thought it was absolutely necessary, believing as they did, that there was not a particle of foundation, much less of truth, in the statements made by that student—to put a stop to this vicious practice, emanating from a vicious mind no doubt, by taking testimony voluntarily from any gentleman who came forward to give testimony in relation to the conduct of this Institution. The management of this Institution has been assailed. You have been attending this Institution, and as you have had the kindness to come forward, we would feel much obliged to you for your opinion.

Dr. BOVELL.—I have been connected with the Hospital for over 15 years. I was eight years as a student in London and Dublin. The only fault I can find to this Hospital is its construction. I have had an opportunity of visiting many Hospitals in the United States, and I think it will bear comparison with any of them with the exception of the Philadelphia Hospital. I know of no one better conducted. It is as well conducted in every way as the one in Dublin, and it will bear comparison with any one that I have seen unless in regard to its construction. I refer of course to the behaviour of the nurses and the persons attached to it. Formerly I believe, and know it, and have heard it, that the nurses in this Institution were not of so good a class as they are now, and have been since Dr. Clarke has been connected with it. As a matter of opinion I may object to some of the details of management; for instance, I do not think the diet to be the very best that can be devised. It looks as if drawn up by a fresh hand. Notwithstanding the opinion of Dr. Widmer, I do object most strongly to the trustees withholding the use of brandy, for this simple reason, that although the whiskey supplied may be good, it has not—and I speak from actual experience—in cases of typhus fever, the astringent properties of brandy. I have given patients whiskey and they have rejected it by vomiting it. I have then sent out and purchased brandy at my own expense. I do not state this simply on my own authority. Dr. Todd, of King's College, has lately called attention to the peculiar value of brandy in cases of typhus fever. I believe there is another thing I have felt the want of viz leeches, I think therefore that the medical practitioner should be allowed to order anything which he considers absolutely essential to the benefit of the patients. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe Dr. Clarke to be one of the very best house surgeons that ever attended an Hospital any where. I do not except London or Dublin or any other place where I have been. He has a greater amount of duty to do here as house surgeon than any resident surgeon I have been acquainted with. I am quite prepared to say that I never saw Dr. Clarke drunk in this Institution. I am prepared to show the malignity

of the statement by saying that during the prevalence of cholera last summer I urged Dr. Clarke to take a little brandy as a preventative, but he could not be prevailed upon to do so, and during the whole time, from the first opening of the cholera sheds Dr. Clarke was incessant in his attendance at the sheds. One day indeed, after pressing upon him to take a little brandy, he did so when his stomach was empty, and the consequence was that he suffered very severe stimulus. I said to him you now see the evil of taking stimulus without taking proper food. I know he suffers severely from neuralgia. I have given him opium and morphine for this affection, and I have seen this produce effects similar to intoxication. It is possible the person who said that he was intoxicated may have seen him while suffering from this stimulus. But there is a difference between being stimulated and being intoxicated. I have known Dr. Clarke for seven years, and I have never seen him intoxicated, although I have frequently seen him under stimulus. It was said by Dr. Wright, I understand, that the effects of opium were sedative, but this although it might have been said, I do not think correct.

Dr. WRIGHT.—I uttered no such words.

Dr. BOVELL.—I was under the impression that you had said so. If I have stated anything wrong, I retract it.

Dr. WRIGHT.—I disclaim entirely having used words to lead to that impression. I stated that morphia, one of the preparations of opium, was sedative in its first effects. When Dr. Cotter referred to the Turks as using it, I stated that the Turks used solid opium and not morphia.

Dr. BOVELL.—I state distinctly that I have seen Dr. Clarke from the effects of opium intoxicated. I have also given him morphia with the same effect. I have known Dr. Clarke seven years and I have never seen him intoxicated.

Mr. LENNON here said that he was not aware that Dr. Clarke had suffered from that complaint; he had seen him stimulated, and considered it was from liquor, but it might be from some other cause. If he had been misled in any way by appearance, he begged to retract any statement he had made in regard to his being intoxicated.

Dr. HALLOWELL.—A deliberate statement was made that Dr. Clarke was intoxicated.

Mr. LENNON.—I hope you will accept the apology I have given for the statements I made in relation to that. I am sorry that I should have made such a statement.

* Dr. HALLOWELL moved that that part of the evidence given by Mr. Lennon be expunged.

Mr. BOWES, thought Mr. Lennon had acted in a straightforward manner. They might make of their own evidence what they pleased, but they of course had no control over the reporters' notes.

Dr. BOVELL resumed.—I think Mrs. Donnelly is a very trustworthy nurse. I have never known the slightest cruelty on her part. The reverse of this is the case, for on account of her kindness the children are generally given to her care. As regards the lice referred to, I have seen lice in every Hospital in the world, (hear, hear, and laughter,) that is to say wherever I have been. The bed clothes are generally clean, I have never seen the Hospital in a filthy state owing to the neglect of the nurses. The nurses here have occasionally committed a fault as they do in other places. I find the same degree of cleanliness as in any other hospital. The building is old and very shabby, and the linen is not new, but the Hospital is as clean and orderly as it can be. I feel some delicacy in speaking of Burns, because I recommended Burns to this Institution. I found Dr. Clarke in a dilemma one morning when I came here. I knew Burns to be a civil, orderly, steady man, and I said to Dr. Clarke if you can get hold of such a man, an old soldier accustomed to obey orders he would be your very man. Burns was at that time in the Lunatic Asylum, Dr. Clarke

and I went to his house and spoke to him, and the reason he did not come here the first day was, that he had to go to the Asylum for some purpose. He took the situation because it was nearer to his own house. I was not aware that he was discharged from the Lunatic Asylum, but understood that he came from that Institution to the Hospital, because he preferred it. So far as I have seen him he has been an orderly, and well behaved man. Patients sometimes come in here very rudely. I have seen Burns frequently take their hats off after telling them to do so, and even knocking them off when they would not attend. As an officer he is strict and attentive to his duty. I have no knowledge of the transaction that took place for which he was brought up before the police magistrate. I believe Burns to be incapable of an act of cruelty from what I have seen of him both before he came here and after. As regards the throwing of the water I would have taken the first thing that came to hand, and thrown it myself. I don't know that any person has left the Institution, for want of attention. Occasionally in going round the Hospital a patient has asked relief, but, on looking at the ticket and seeing that the patient was under the care of another, I have peremptorily refused it. The only case of that kind that occurs to me is, that of Grace Sage. One day Dr. Clarke said here is one of Dr. Aikin's patients who has not been prescribed for, and he asked me as a favor, to give her something. When I looked at the card and saw that it was Dr. Aikin's patient, I said no, Dr. Clarke, I cannot do it. He said she is suffering so much that I wish you to look at her. I then looked at her, and prescribed for her. I do not enter all my cases myself. I have been endeavouring to induce the students to act as clinical clerks. The books of the Hospital are kept by Dr. Clarke. I remember the case of syphilitic disease of the skin. The girl was taken in under my own charge and did not come in in Dr. Wright's week. She was the first patient I took in that week.

Mr. GRAY said, that it was impossible he could have been mistaken in regard to the week.

Mr. LENNON said, that that patient came in while he was in the Hospital, and he did know that while he was in the Hospital that day Dr. Bovell was not in it, although he might have come after.

Dr. Clarke here stated that it was Dr. Telfer's week. He entered all the names of the patients as they were admitted, and that patient was admitted in Dr. Telfer's week, as he had before stated. He made a weekly report of the patients to the Trustees, and also an annual report of the whole affair of the Institution.

The CHAIRMAN—Then it appears that it was not in Dr. Wright's week at all.

Dr. BOVELL—No, nor Dr. Bovell's either. It was a very insolent thing in a young man to make such a charge. The man that would say that the dates of the books had been changed, is just the very man that would do it.

Mr. GRAY here stated that he had no wish to impeach the correctness of the dates, but they did not coincide with his knowledge of facts.

Dr. BOVELL, after some remarks, resumed. I have never taken upon any occasion a patient under my care who had come recommended to any other medical gentleman. I have never seen any partiality on the part of any of the medical gentlemen. The only preference I make is when I require the services of a clinical clerk. I take one from my own class. The students generally attend my clinical lectures in this Hospital, when I have had occasion to do so. I have given fewer lectures this year than I did last year, for this reason, I have had fewer patients. I defy any student to say that he has detected in my manner to him any difference between himself and the students of Trinity College. Sometimes the students of Trinity College have said that they were crowded out by the students of Dr. Rolph's school, but I invaria-

bly told them I could not help it, I could make no difference. I also encourage all the students to examine the patients: they do not do this enough. I have ordered baths, and I believe they have been given. I do not think the bath room sufficient, but in extreme cases patients can get a bath. I have never heard obscene language used by any officer of the Institution. There was a remark made calculated to injure Mrs. Donnelly, "That I will be the death of you." I have heard the same remark made by her twenty times. She is the very person to make such a remark, and just the last person to do it.

Dr. AIKINS.—I want to make a remark in regard to Grace Sage. I am not aware whether she was entered upon my book, but I know that from the day Grace Sage came in, I prescribed for her. She had no chest affection when she came in: That developed itself subsequently. Several of the students can testify that they saw me prescribe for Grace Sage.

Dr. CLARKE.—The patient is under my own treatment, I have attended to the case ever since you neglected her:

Dr. AIKINS.—I state that that girl's gums were tender from the effects of mercury under which I put her:

Dr. CLARKE.—I say this girl is under my care, and that she was put under mercury by me under Dr. Bovell's advice.

Dr. AIKINS.—I say that the very day Grace Sage came in, I prescribed for her, and have done so subsequently. It was too bad to say that because this case may not have been entered on my book that therefore she had been neglected.

Dr. CLARKE.—Did you not say that you did not know what was the matter with her?

Dr. AIKINS.—No, I did not. But I said I wondered why the pain should continue so obstinately after she came under the influence of mercury. I recollect ordering for her Iodide of Potassium and bitter infusion on the very day of her admission, and after the pain in the chest came on, pleural friction developed itself, and then I put her under mercury until her gums became tender.

Dr. TELFER was asked to give his testimony, which he did at some length. He said, I have every confidence in Dr. Clarke as a house Surgeon. I have been a practising surgeon for from thirty to forty years. I have been thirty-one years in Canada. I have had opportunities of judging of the management of the Hospital generally, and I have never had occasion to find fault with its cleanliness. The nurses were always very attentive. Mrs. Donnelly is quick and more hasty than other people may be, but I never thought she was unkind. I never saw anything in her conduct which I could characterize as inhumane. So far as my observation goes, she is a good nurse. I never saw her incapable of discharging her duty through the influence of liquor. I never suspected it. I never saw anything in the Hospital that I could disapprove of. I have seen nothing like moral pollution in the Institution, the contrary was the fact, for when persons come here, they go away much better than they come in, so that as a reformatory Institution it is better than many other places I have seen. No case of neglect of the medical officers has ever come under my notice. I know Burns. I never saw any cruelty on his part. With regard to the patient that was bled, there was nothing cruel in throwing the water in his face. I think it was just the treatment that medical gentlemen adopt. It was not cruelty to drag him out to the verandah even on a cold day. I have never found at any time Dr. Clarke absent from his post, or incapable of discharging his duty. He is particularly attentive to his duty. It would be difficult to get one to fulfil the duties as well as he does. He has a very responsible situation, for if the medical men are not present he must necessarily act, and it requires a person of intelligence to act in such cases.

Dr. HALLOWELL—Do you think the letter which has given rise to this investigation is excessively discreditable to the source from which it originated?

Dr. TELFER—Of course I do. My evidence goes to say so. It is extremely delicate to judge of any medical man, I think I would refrain from making such remarks. Dr. Aikins was accused in that case of amputation. I do not think that accusation was at all handsome to Dr. Aikins, for Dr. Beaumont and himself knew that they had made as bad stumps as Dr. Aikins. That case was attended with very great difficulty. The man was badly bruised and the muscles were much lacerated. The stump was as good a one as could be made under the circumstances. I was consulted in reference to it and if any blame is to be attached, I will share it. I have known worse cases in the Hospital under the operation of Dr. Hodder.

Dr. HODDER—What case was that?

Dr. AIKINS—Did you ever hear of any case of malpractice in this Hospital, and whose case was it?

Dr. TELFER—I have, but I think that no medical man has a right to prejudge another. In the case of the amputation, I was as much to be blamed as you. I really don't think it right to answer any such question.

Dr. AIKINS—Very true—Dr. Telfer, but my professional character has been assailed here, and therefore I have a right to insist upon an answer to my question. Have you seen a case under one of the medical officers of this hospital which was pronounced double pneumonia, when it was a case of hydrathorax on each side.

Dr. TELFER—I have.

Dr. AIKINS—What was the name of the Medical Officer?

Dr. TELFER—Dr. Hodder.

Dr. HODDER, and several others—name, name, name the case.

Dr. AIKINS—I don't know the name but I know the facts. Are you aware, Dr. Telfer that this was a case—

Dr. HODDER—Before Dr. Aikins proceeds further, he must produce the name, or he must sit down.

Dr. AIKINS—I will not sit down.

Dr. HODDER—Then produce the name of the patient.

Dr. TELFER—I recollect the case very well. A very uncommon operation was performed. Water was drawn from the patient's chest by Dr. Hodder.

Dr. HODDER—I wish to cut this investigation short as possible and to give the lie direct to the insinuations made by that man (pointing rather significantly to Dr. Aikins.) I shall show you by my books that the whole statement is false.

Dr. AIKINS—I asked Dr. Telfer if he knew of a case stated by the medical man to be double pneumonia, when it was a case of hydrathorax. I shall ask the same question of Dr. Wright. Do you, Dr. Wright know of a case of hydrathorax treated by Dr. Hodder as double pneumonia?

Dr. WRIGHT—I objected last night to going into any inquiry of this sort, but if it was found necessary that an investigation of this kind should be made, that it should not be done in this public manner. But a charge has been made publicly against Dr. Aikins and in defence of himself he has brought forward this case. I do remember somewhat of the circumstances that occurred that day. There was a consultation on a patient of Dr. Beaumont's on the same day and after seeing that patient Dr. Hodder said, gentlemen as you are here, will you go in and see a case of double pneumonia in the adjoining room. Several of us went in and as the examination proceeded Dr. Widmer threw up his spectacles over his brow and said, "what are you going to do Dr. Hodder, are you going to tap him?" I am confident that Dr. Hodder said it was a case of double pneumonia, of this I am positively certain and I make the statement with all due deliberation.

Dr. HODDER—It is possible that some other case was confounded with that one. But here was *black and white* for it. The Dr. here handed up his book to show that the case was entered *hydrathorax*, and not double *pneumonia* and said that that was a devilish deal better than any mere recollection of what took place.

Dr. WRIGHT—I care nothing for such remarks. My veracity is quite as good as that of any other man. I made the statement with all due deliberation. I do not wish to impute motives, but I do say that you treated Dr. Aikins in a most ungentlemanly way.

The book was here handed to Dr. Telfer as evidence that he was wrong in his impression.

Dr. TELFER examined the book, and said the case certainly is entered as *hydrathorax*, but the treatment prescribed is the treatment for *pneumonia*, consequently the difficulty is not removed.

This caused a little excitement, and the book was handed to the chairman for examination, but no remarks were made.

Dr. WRIGHT said, that if Dr. Hodder was mistaken for a day or two, as to the disease, he is not the first that has been mistaken. But his firm conviction was, that at the time these statements were made, Dr. Hodder had not the case entered in his book. This was his firm conviction on the statement of the students.

Dr. HODDER—All that he would say was that that statement was totally false. He could call a number of students to say that all his cases were entered in his book the day they were admitted.

Dr. BOVELL here said in answer to Dr. Aikins that he was certain that Dr. Hodder stated at the time that it was a case of *double pneumonia*.

A learned discussion here ensued between Dr. Bovell and Dr. Wright as to the appearance of the lungs in a post mortem examination, which took place on the same patient.

Dr. AIKINS here called the attention of Dr. Telfer to a case of amputation of the thigh, in which an immense quantity of blood was lost by the artery not being properly compressed.

Dr. TELFER did not remember the case.

Dr. WRIGHT said in reply to Dr. Aikins, that Dr. Widmer had charge of the tourniquet in that case.

Dr. TELFER considered that the fact of Dr. Widmer having applied the tourniquet was sufficient precaution, that it was correct.

Dr. AIKINS—Do you, Dr. Wright, remember seeing Dr. Hodder operating upon the patient? And do you consider it the duty of the operating surgeon before he plunges the knife into the limb to see that the tourniquet is properly applied.

Dr. WRIGHT—I did see Dr. Hodder operating, and although the tourniquet was applied by no less a personage than Dr. Widmer, it still was the duty of the operating surgeon to see that the circulation was stopped.

Dr. BOVELL explained. He saw the boy was put upon the table in a very weak condition. Dr. Widmer applied the tourniquet. He turned to the old man at the time and said you are a little too much to the outer side. But it was not changed and he therefore put his thumb on the artery to prevent the blood flowing. He had seen the same thing happen under the very best surgeons. The boy was extremely thin, had it occurred to a strong man the loss would have been less severe.

Dr. AIKINS—I am much obliged to Dr. Bovell for his explanation because it has been stated here that I am too young to attend to such an institution as this. But here a case has occurred to Dr. Widmer himself. If such a thing had happened with me the most serious charges would have been brought against me of incapacity.

Dr. RICHARDSON did not well see the connection between the

cases. If Dr. Aikins would point out that connexion he would be much gratified.

Dr. AIKINS—If you don't now see through the matter a repetition of it would not brighten your perception.

Dr. AIKINS asked Dr. Bovell if he did not think the loss of blood in that case alluded to, was likely to issue in death.

Dr. BOVELL—Of course, it was a very bad thing. The bleeding was very unfavourable to his condition.

Dr. AIKINS—And the boy did die?

Dr. BOVELL—Yes?

Dr. AIKINS—And his death was hastened by the loss of blood?

No reply.

Dr. AIKINS said he would never have thought of bringing these things forward, but he had been seriously attacked and he considered it necessary to defend himself. He would appeal to Dr. Clarke if the first *perineal fistula* case cured in the Hospital had not been cured by him (Dr. Aikins) he would practice medicine and Surgery as he pleased, his reputation depended upon his doing it properly, and he would endeavour to find the urethra if he looked for it.

Here some remarks were made by Dr. Scott in reference to what Dr. Lizars, of Edinburgh, had said with regard to the medical faculty of Canada, in alluding to a case of Dr. Rolph's, and a good deal of practical professional acrimony followed.

Dr. AIKINS—Dr. Clarke stated to me over and over again that that *perineal* case of which so much has been said, was the first that went out cured, since he came to the Hospital.

Dr. CLARKE—I could not have said so, but until lately there was never any record of the proceedings of the Hospital, and I stated that was the first upon the record, but as to its being the first I could not have said so. It is not to be expected that I can remember all the case.

Dr. AIKINS—Is a surgeon compelled in any operation to follow the rule in regard to any case that he may find laid down in books?

Dr. TELFER—No, certainly not.

Dr. AIKINS—I ask that question because it was stated by Dr. Hodder, and I consider what he says of no importance; while I consider the statements of Dr. Hallowell of no importance; it was said by Dr. Hodder that I made an oblique or transverse incision in an operation, when I should have made it perpendicular.

Dr. TELFER—I certainly would not judge my neighbours in regard to their mode of performing.

Dr. AIKINS.—Do you Dr. Wright remember being present at an operation on a little fistula patient Jesse Nunn.

Dr. WRIGHT—I remember being present, and I know several medical gentlemen were present: An attempt was made to introduce the catheter into his bladder.

Dr.—AIKINS.—Was not every courtesy shown to Dr. Hodder in that case of Jesse Nunn?

Dr. WRIGHT.—My present recollection is that Dr. Hodder was present at the commencement of the operation in this case although he has said to the contrary—and that he assisted by his advice at the operation, and when Dr. Aikins had sought for the passage in the usual way making the usual incision, Dr. Hodder thought he saw the end of the urethra, and came round and took Dr. Aikins's chair between the boy's legs and made repeated and persevering efforts to pass not only the probe but the catheter into the bladder.—Not only so, but he showed a good deal of anxiety to succeed, and a willingness to render assistance.

Mr. LENNON.—My firm conviction is, that Dr. Hodder was treated with every courtesy. He did not leave the impression on the mind of any person present, which he now states, that he was not treated with courtesy by Dr. Aikins.

Dr. HODDER.—The expression I made use of was, that Dr. Aikins appeared dis-

inclined to take my suggestions: I did not accuse Dr. Aikins of cruelty in not finding the urethra, but after failing two or three times it became his duty as a young man to ask the advice of some of the senior medical gentlemen. It was very true the boy, was under the influence of chloroform, and was therefore not so susceptible of any pain. I do not mean to say that he tortured the boy but certainly he was subjected to repeated operations.

In reply to Dr. Aikins, Dr. Wright said, my impression is that instead of being censured for that case, you are entitled the highest credit for the patience and perseverance you used upon the occasion.

Dr. TELFER thought this case was a difficult one. He did not think there was anything wrong in the management of it.

Dr. WRIGHT.—In reply to Dr. Aikins said—there is no doubt that you found the urethra yourself.

Mr. LENNON.—I was present at the time, and assert that Dr. Aikin, had found the urethra himself.

Dr. WRIGHT.—I state again that you deserved the greatest credit for the skill, the patience and perseverance manifested on this occasion. I have seen the boy since the operation,—the wound is nearly healed.

Dr. HODDER—I merely said, if any charge of cruelty existed, it was in not consulting a senior officer. It was his bounden duty to ask for the advice of some of the senior medical officers, Dr. Beaumont, Dr. Widmer, Dr. Telfer, or Dr. Hodder, yet none of us were consulted. I merely wish to say that if any cruelty could be attached to Dr. Aikins in this case, it was in consequence of his not consulting the senior officers.

Dr. AIKINS.—So far as this is from being the case that I cut deeper than I would have done, because Dr. Hodder suggested I should do so. But the continual oozing of the blood caused delay in the operation; and it was only by proceeding most cautiously, and cutting most carefully, not more than the sixteenth of an inch at a time and then wiping the blood and sponging it away and then proceeding a little farther, that I succeeded.

Dr. HODDER.—I grant you succeeded in your operation.

Mr. BOWES.—Dr. Aikins, Dr. Hodder, and all the professional gentlemen have given us a notice of all they have cured in this Institution? Now, for the benefit of the public, I ask how many they have killed?

In regard to the amputation case, Dr. Telfer, said, he had been consulted in regard to that case by Dr. Aikins, and concurred with him in the opinion that it would be better to cut into the parts below the knee bruised, though they were, than expose the man to the severe shock of cutting into the thigh, and the risk of immediate death.

This so far closed the Medical Investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD considered it only an act of common justice to Mrs. Donnelly to say that a more attentive nurse there never was in any Hospital. She was rough a little, but she was attentive and kind. He had seen Dr. Clarke every day for two months at a time, and had seen him frequently during the last seven years, and had never seen him under the influence of liquor.

Dr. SCOTT expressed his entire satisfaction with most of the points. But he wished to detain the Trustees for a short time. The charges in the letter were very strong, perhaps something might transpire to show occasion for some of it. He had been given to understand that very obscene language was used by one of the medical officers of this Institution towards a female patient and he believed there were two persons before them ready to testify to that.

WILLIAM HEWAT, a young man, was here brought forward to prove that Dr. Wright had used unseemly language in the surgery, in the presence of Dr. Clarke. The young lad was compelled to pollute his own mouth, and

the ears of the audience, by repeating some expressions he said he overheard Dr. Wright use when in conversation with Dr. Clarke,---he being Dr. Rovell's clinical clerk, was in the little room off the surgery.

Some of the servants of the Institution were here examined.

Dr. WRIGHT was asked by Mr. Bowes whether he would sign the letter which the other medical gentlemen had sent to the trustees. He replied in the negative; as he had already stated in his evidence that he had seen improprieties in regard to both Mrs. Donnelly and the orderly, Burns. He did not endorse the letter signed Medical Student, but he would state most distinctly that having given his opinion as he had done he could not stultify himself by signing that letter. As far as the statement of moral pollution was concerned he would give his testimony in favor of the trust.

Mr. Bowes—As a Trustee he should no more sit at the Board and have gentlemen endorsing letters of that kind against the Institution of which he was a Trustee. He would resign at once, unless the medical officers were able to say they disapprove of that letter.

Dr. HODDER said he believed that the whole of the statements in the letter had been satisfactorily refuted, and five at least of the medical officers having signed the letter. If the testimony which has been offered did not remove the impression contained in the letter signed "Medical Student," they were prepared to resign with the trust.

Dr. WRIGHT said, so far as he was concerned as an individual, after having stated what he did state in regard to Burns it would be stultifying himself to sign that letter, after having said that Mrs. Donnelly did what she did, and said what she said, in regard to the colored man, Jackson, he could not sign that letter, at the same time he expressed his disapprobation of certain parts of that letter as strongly as any one of them could do.

Dr. HALLOWELL then said that he had been accused of taking an unduly prominent part in the proceedings of these three days. The part he had taken had been dictated by several reasons: first, he had been accused gravely, by several students, of having been the writer of the letter, signed "Veritas." He begged leave most distinctly and most positively to deny that he had any hand, directly or indirectly, in that production. The motives, that induced him to take a prominent part in the proceedings were three-fold—as a citizen, as a medical man, and as a colleague of two of the gentlemen whose characters have been assailed through a newspaper communication signed 'Medical Student,' he felt it his duty to take part in the investigation. Notwithstanding the very flattering amount of testimony given by the learned gentlemen who had preceded him, he trusted that the weight of his testimony, however humble, would be received in behalf of his friend Dr. Clarke. Although not an officer of the institution, he had some experience in hospital practice, not only on this continent, but on the continent of Europe, and in all his experience he would say that a more efficient house surgeon than Dr. Clarke he had never seen. With regard to his bearing towards himself personally, it was irrelevant to speak; but with regard to his bearing towards the patients, with regard to his medical efficiency, with regard to his moral qualifications, so far as they enable him to discharge his duty as a surgeon to this public institution, a superior to Dr. Clarke could not be found on this continent. While giving this humble testimony in favour of Dr. Clarke, he would say that from his experience in a military hospital—having had the exclusive charge of one for nearly two years—that he considered the military plan the only one for keeping the patients in proper subjection, and therefore it was that he justified the conduct of Burns. He had never seen anything in him to blame, and considered that he had conducted himself in a most respectful manner to all connected with the institution.

Dr. PHILLBROOK, gave testimony in favor of the management of the Hospital and particularly in regard to the efficiency and attention of Dr. Clarke. He referred also to the case with which his name was associated.

Dr. HODDER here rose to say if anything was necessary to show that the malignant attack made upon the hospital had signally failed, it would be the fact that a bribe was offered to get a man to come here to substantiate some of the statements made. [Name—name !] The name of the man to whom the bribe was offered is Edward Stewart, formerly an orderly in this hospital.

Dr. COTTER here made some remarks in reference to his acquaintance with Dr. Clarke, and passed a high eulogium on the Doctor for his skill and unremitting attention to the hospital.

EDWARD STEWART, a brusque-looking man, stated that two students called upon him to know if he could speak to some things connected with the hospital. He told them that he had his work to attend to, and if he went away his men would be idle. They said they would pay him for whatever loss of time he or his men might suffer if he came up, but he would not do it. The name of the students were Martin and Dixon. (He went over a rigmale story about what the students said to him)

Mr. MARTIN wished the chairman to say whether the fact of offering to pay the man for loss of time while giving evidence could be construed into bribery.

The CHAIRMAN made no definite reply, but Dr. HALLOWELL said it was a clear case of bribery.

One of the patients here spoke at some length and with great fluency in regard to the kindness with which the patients were treated. He read a letter which the patients had drawn up in reply to the letter signed, Medical Student. The letter replied to all the charges in a very cavalier way, denying most positively every charge made against the institution. It was signed by all the male patients and was addressed to the Editor of the Colonist, for publication.

Dr. SCOTT then asked permission to make a few remarks. Having been nearly six years attached to an hospital he considered himself not an inadequate judge of the management of such an institution, and therefore felt that he was entitled to offer his opinion upon what had transpired. A serious reflection had been made upon the conduct of the trustees, and a serious imputation had been made against the medical attendants. With regard to the attack upon Burns he would say, that from the testimony adduced, had he no other means of knowing, he was decidedly of opinion that Burns is a very efficient person in his station; that he was a man of a rough exterior, but capable of performing his duty in a most kindly and feeling manner. The statements made in regard to his treatment instead of showing that that treatment was unwarranted, only satisfied him that the treatment of the patient was extremely judicious. One remark was necessary in regard to the size of the vessel in which the water was held which Burns was accused of dashing so unfeelingly. It would be remembered that it was stated distinctly that this vessel was no larger than the one in which the patient was bled; that altered the complexion of the case entirely; for they were first led to believe that the man had come with a pail of water and dashed it on the patient. He was satisfied that the vessel was as small (described by one of the witnesses) as a dipper, and, therefore, though the whole of its contents had been thrown upon the patient, it could not have interfered very materially with his comfort. With regard to the brutal manner in which the man was lifted, he contended that it could not have been otherwise done unless by four men; in fact it was done in the usual way. He therefore looked upon the charge against Burns not only as not substantiated, but utterly futile. It appeared to him singularly unfortunate that some expressions should have dropped from the young gentleman that brought these charges, and stating that

they found they occupied an inferior position in this Institution, as being students of a particular school of medicine, and yet they brought forward no proof of such a thing; but they all knew what effect such a belief was calculated to have upon any man's judgment. With regard to Mrs. Donnelly he would say, that his whole experience, and it had not been small, forced him to say that she had the qualities of the best nurse you could ever meet, quick and abrupt in her manner, but kind and feeling-hearted—an unpolished diamond in her way. He was convinced that her character fully stood the test of the investigation. The doctor here alluded to the comparison that had been drawn between the Montreal Hospital and the Institution in which they were, and stated that from his experience in London, Edinburgh, Dublin, and other places, he was convinced that this Hospital would stand comparison with any hospital conducted in a similar way, and not attended by persons religiously devoted to the care of the sick. He then alluded to the charge of vermin, and said that it was impossible in such institutions, without a regular supply of baths, to keep vermin away; but, at the same time, he did not consider that they existed to anything like the extent attempted to be proved by the persons bringing the charge. The charges against the house surgeon required no comment. He would only say that from a residence in Toronto of now 15 years, he had occasionally, in former years, heard great complaints as to the state of this institution, but from his own knowledge of persons who had, within the past two years, been in the Hospital, some of whom he had himself sent to it, he had received a more flattering description of the Institution and of the treatment they experienced than he was prepared to receive. He could point to several instances, and he had never any difficulty in urging a patient to return to the Hospital who had been there before. One grave charge, to his mind, had been brought against the Institution, with regard to the irregular attendance of the medical men. This institution, he conceived, was not only established for the relief of the indigent poor, but for others who wished to pay for the treatment they received; and while established for these purposes, he believed it also is supported to afford an opportunity for young professional men of acquiring knowledge and skill in their profession, and the students, in his opinion, had a right to look for the regular attendance of the medical men. In that they seem to have been disappointed. But it was rather remarkable that all the complaints had come from the same source. While they had three medical schools in Toronto, the old University, Trinity College and the Toronto School of Medicine, no complaints had come from either of these two institutions—the old University or Trinity College. They have all emanated from one quarter. It must have appeared strange to the trustees that while these young gentlemen had their proper representatives here, they seemed to have thought little of their attendance; they looked, in fact, for the services of those most capable of affording instruction—the most efficient men connected with the Hospital. He had no hesitation in saying that the medical officers were not all chosen on account of their professional standing, but because they were the representatives of the different medical schools, and he had no doubt they chose the best; as it is, however, the delinquents are those whose services are most appreciated. This was a striking incident connected with the matter. He begged to say, in conclusion, that the trustees had shown great patience and forbearance, and had conducted the investigation with feelings of the strictest impartiality. They had done everything in their power to elicit information from both parties, and under this conviction he would propose a vote of thanks to the trustees, for the impartial manner in which the investigation had been conducted.

Mr. LENNON said, while agreeing with some of the remarks of Dr. Scott, he would beg to remind him that it was not because the students of Toronto

College overlooked their own professors, that they found fault with the others not attending. He would say that the general opinion of the students in regard to these two gentlemen, Dr. Alkins and Dr. Wright, was this—that they looked upon these two gentlemen as second to none connected with this institution. They were as much pleased with Dr. Wright or Dr. Alkins as with Dr. Bovell, but at the same time they considered they should have the attendance of all the medical gentlemen, in order to get as much experience as they could while prosecuting their studies. With regard to the vessel in which the water was brought by Burns, he would say that it was a tin vessel capable of containing half a gallon of water or more. He could say that it was half full at least, for the patient's clothes were saturated with the water.

The following note was read as an appendix to the letter of the medical officers of the Hospital:—

From our personal knowledge of the Toronto General Hospital, as well as from the evidence which has been adduced, during the prolonged investigation into the charges contained in a letter signed "A Medical Student," we feel bound in justice to add our testimony to the statements made in the communication, exculpating the Hospital from those false charges.


(Signed)

JOHN SCOTT, M.D., M.R.C.S.L.
JOHN GRANT, L. & P.S.G.
W. HALLOWELL, M.D., M.R.C.S., Edin.
F. M. RUSSELL, M.D., M.R.C.S., Eng.
J. RICHARDSON, M.D., M.R.C.S., Eng.
N. BETHUNE, M.D., M.R.C.S., Eng.
CORNELIUS JAS. PHILBRICK, F.R.C.S.

Dr. HALLOWELL having been called to the chair, awarded the thanks of the meeting to the trustees for their impartial investigation.

Dr. CLARKE then produced a number of letters in reference to character from Mr. G. P. Riddout, Mr. Gamble, Dr. O'Brien, the Lady Superior of St. Joseph's Convent, Rev. Dr. Baldwin, Rev. Mr. Grasett, &c., all speaking in the most complimentary terms of the kindness, urbanity and attention of Dr. Clarke. A similar testimony was paid in favor of the orderly Burns.

The proceedings closed at 9 o'clock on Saturday night, having occupied three days.



ERRATA.

In page 68, for "I have been connected with the Hospital for over 15 years," read,

I have been connected with Hospitals for, &c.

In page 73, for Dr. Bovell here said, in answer to Dr. Aikins," read,

Dr. Rowell here said, &c.

