"I hope you will do me the justice, moreover, to admit that I am not in any way responsible for the opinions contained in that biography, either in reference to myself personally, or to my relation with the Free Hospital, and that I was not, in the slightest degree, made aware of their nature prior to their publication."

"It is, however, a significant fact, that the person who was called upon to make that denial did not comply with Mr. GAY'S request!"

"A resolution declaratory of a want of confidence in Mr. GAY having remained on the books from the 10th of August to December, without eliciting any satisfactory explanation or conciliatory statement from that gentleman, his friends (members of the Committee) re-introduced the subject at the month last mentioned. It was again resolved to summon a special meeting of the Committee. Once more the whole subject was fully discussed, and finally, a motion for Mr. GAY'S removal from the hospital having been proposed, nineteen out of a Committee of thirty members being present, not a hand was raised against it. In conformity with the laws of the hospital, your Committee then convened a general meeting of the Governors, for the purpose of taking that resolution into consideration, with a view to its confirmation or rejection. The attendance on the occasion was numerous and highly respectable, when, after a lengthened discussion, and Mr. GAY had addressed the meeting in explanation and defence of his conduct, the motion was confirmed by a very large majority."

"Your Committee now confidently appeal to the entire body of the Governors of THE ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL, for an approval of their proceedings, from first to last, in relation to this disagreeable and painful transaction. Your Committee feel that it cannot justly be alleged against them that they acted precipitately, or without having afforded to Mr. GAY the most ample opportunities of considering whether he was not bound by every honourable feeling to renounce imputations against the hospital that had been published in *his own biography*, and confessedly written, *in part, by himself*. It was hoped that a fraternal professional feeling for his colleagues, with whom he was discharging his duties on terms of perfect amity, would have induced him to disavow aspersions injurious to their professional reputation, and detrimental to the interests of a hospital in which he held a highly responsible office; but unhappily no such conciliatory act resulted from a brotherly professional motive or from any other kindly consideration that influenced the conduct of Mr. GAY. On the contrary, that gentleman appeared to your Committee to have given himself up, bound hand and foot, to the enemies of the hospital, utterly regardless of the fate of the charity, and of the reputation and professional position of his brother medical officers. It was quite evident that Mr. GAY would not, or that he could not, disclaim the stigmas that had been cast upon the hospital, upon the Committee, and upon the medical reputation of the institution. Unless therefore your Committee had betrayed the confidence reposed in them by the Governors, not any measure was open to them except the one that was adopted. This conviction is most emphatically entertained by them. Your Committee would remind the Governors that within the last few months arrangements have been made for founding a MEDICAL AND SURGICAL SCHOOL in connexion with the ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL, thus rendering the whole establishment a Medical College, capable of affording peculiar facilities for giving scientific instruction to a large number of students. It is exceedingly satisfactory to be enabled to state that the CHAIRS of the different Lecturers are occupied by gentlemen of the highest reputation and attainments, and your Committee could not but consider the position in which these distinguished Teachers were placed by the refusal of one of the surgeons of this hospital to disclaim the imputations upon it that were contained in his own biography, and admitted by him to have been partly composed from materials that he had furnished. Had not the injurious conduct of Mr. GAY led to the interference of the governing authority of the hospital, the justly eminent men at the head of the school might have quitted their chairs in disgust. The Committee therefore felt most strongly and decidedly that it was their imperative duty not to allow the interests of the hospital, the success of the school, and the reputation of the medical gentlemen connected with both departments of the establishment to be sacrificed, merely because one of their officers would not, or could not, disavow the slanderous aspersions that had been directed against the charity in a biography, written in part by his own hand."

THE ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL.

[The following letter has been sent for insertion to the editor of the *Medical Times and Gazette*:—]

SIR,—Without acting in opposition to every principle of justice, you cannot refuse to publish this communication.

In an editorial paragraph at page 45 of the last number of your journal, you state that a correspondent had informed you "that he saw Mr. T. Wakley, jun., vote at the meeting of Governors when Mr. Gay's dismissal was confirmed." What is the inference intended to be conveyed by this assertion? It is obvious. But what is the fact? I deny most positively and emphatically that I gave any vote whatever on the motion for Mr. Gay's dismissal.

Now, Sir, I think I have a right to demand the name and address of your correspondent, who, it appears, has further stated that I "took a most active part in whipping-in" at the general meeting of governors. Again, I ask, what is the fact? While quietly seated in the theatre I saw an individual enter who I knew must have obtained his admission under a false name, he not being a governor of the hospital, and having no right whatever to be present. I considered it to be a duty to acquaint the secretary with what had happened. That officer immediately caused the withdrawal of the intruder. This transaction scarcely proves that I was a "whipper-in" on the occasion. If you wish for the name of the offender, I am prepared to furnish it.

You next state that, though I was not a member of the Committee, "I attended at three out of the five meetings" of that body. Once more I inquire, what is the fact? From first to last I was not present at *any one* of the meetings of the Committee.

You further remark that a correspondent adds, "there can be no doubt that he drew up the questions about the biography." Again, I say, what is the fact? Those questions were never once seen by me until they were in print, and I was no more concerned in framing them than was your veracious correspondent himself.

Such are my answers. Such are the point-blank refutations of the calumnious and malicious statements of your informants.

Now for a word regarding your own conduct.

All the time that you have been pretending an honest advocacy of the cause of one surgeon, you have done your utmost to injure the reputation of another who has not furnished a single ground of offence; but I feel perfectly confident that an appeal from the unworthy and well-understood objects of his traducers, to the honour and justice of his professional brethren will not be made in vain.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS WAKLEY, JUN.

Guilford-street, Russell-square, Jan. 13, 1854.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

LOCK HOSPITALS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—About a year ago, you did me the favour to publish three letters of mine on the necessity of establishing Lock Hospitals at our chief naval and military stations, and your approval of the suggestion was evinced in several leading articles in THE LANCET at the same period. You will therefore be glad to hear that a step has at length been taken in the right direction, and that, in this quarter, active exertions are now being made with the view of mitigating a disease fearful in its consequences, and of which, irrespective of higher considerations, it is not too much to affirm, that it is a powerful cause of sapping the foundations of our nation's strength.

At the annual meeting of the Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital, held last week, the following resolution, submitted by Mr. W. Grant, was carried by a large majority:—"That the subscribers fully recognise the advantages to be derived from establishing Lock wards for females in connexion with the Royal Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital, and will most cordially co-operate with the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in that benevolent undertaking, provided funds be supplied from the public revenue for erecting the necessary building and furnishing the wards, as well as the sum of £500 per annum for the maintenance of twenty beds for female patients, in which case the said wards shall be exclusively devoted to that object, and free to all such applicants."