rate of only 6.44 per 1000, which would be considered an excellent record for troops well cared for in good barracks in times of peace.

The lists of battle casualties show that 11 men were killed and 12 officers and 104 men wounded, 1 officer and 7 men dying from the effects of their wounds. In the attack on Manila, August 13, the field hospitals were not moved forward, as Camp Dewey was only four and a half miles from the scene of action. All the wounded were dressed and comfortably in bed by 7 P.M. of the day of the attack. No amputation was considered necessary, although there were some severe wounds complicated with fracture of the limbs. The field hospitals were removed from Camp Dewey, August 17, to the Spanish military hospital in Manila. This hospital is in fair repair and has room for 400 patients. Prior to placing our people in the wards the woodwork was cleaned and thoroughly disinfected. It is probable that some of the sick at Cavite will be transported to this establishment.

During the voyage to Manila Colonel LIPPINCOTT prepared a circular for the guidance of medical officers and typewritten copies bearing the approval of the commanding general, were issued before the attack. The instructions thus conveyed proved of great value at a time when the conditions are said to have been most trying. It is officially reported that the Surgeon-General may well be proud of the field and hospital work of the volunteer medical officers.

The health of the command is stated to be fairly good, although the sick list is larger than it would be were the troops better situated in a sanitary way. They are all quartered in buildings; some are well housed, others are not. There is a great tendency to stomachic and intestinal troubles referred to the difficulty in restraining the men from eating and drinking unwholesome articles. Dysentery is common and malarial fevers are of frequent occurrence.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Judge Kohlsaas and the Probate Court.

CHICAGO, Oct. 31, 1898.

To the Editor:—Some of the statements which have appeared in the medical press of late criticising the official acts of Judge Kohlsaas appear very strange to the thousands of citizens of Chicago who have known him, as has the writer, for twenty years or more. His reputation as lawyer and judge is so very different from that sought to be given him by the critics, that the thought at once arises that there must be a mistake somewhere. If it were a fact that Judge Kohlsaas habitually, or even occasionally, ruled differently in regard to physicians from his rulings with others, that fact alone would show his unfitness for the bench, and not only physicians but others should unite to secure his defeat. The writer, having waited in vain for some one to make reply to these criticisms, and thinking it due to the profession that they should be informed if these things are so, has undertaken a somewhat hurried investigation on his own account and desires to publish his results and conclusions. And believing it but just that Judge

Kohlsaas should have the opportunity to be heard in his own behalf, the writer addressed a note to him in which he asked him if it were a fact that he as a judge ruled that he "would not in any case allow more than one bill for medical services to be collected against an estate in his court," and that he would not allow more than \$2 per visit to a physician under any circumstances." Judge Kohlsaas's reply is certainly sufficiently explicit on these points. After stating that these criticisms had been called to his attention, but that he had not thought them worthy of notice, he says: "I answer the statements you quote categorically." "I have not stated, nor have I held that I would not allow more than one physician's bill against an estate." "The claim is too ridiculous for consideration." "The records of the court utterly refute the charge." "I suppose I did refuse some doctor's bill in some particular case, owing to the circumstances of that case, but I do not recall any one such case." "No such general line of action has ever suggested itself to me." "As to the other matter, i. e., that I will not allow to exceed \$2 per visit, I can only appeal to the record, in which the statement is contradicted a hundred times." "Both of these allegations are the malignant offspring of some disgruntled claimant who makes no allowance for the particular facts in the case as they appeared to the court at the time, or the harassing and oppressing duties of the probate court in this county." "Any one acquainted with the working of the court here will know that the constant and imperative effort of the court is necessary in order to make the administration expenses as small as possible. To do this in the great volume of business, requires almost infinite patience and diligence. Lawyers, doctors, administrators, executors, guardians and undertakers have often taken exception to what seemed just to the court. Certainly any one of these classes has just as much reason to complain as have the physicians."

It so happened that Dr. M. P. Hatfield of this city was the first one to whom the writer spoke about this matter, and he at once said that in one case coming under his personal knowledge, a case in which he had been called to give testimony as to the value of medical services, \$3 per visit had been allowed by Judge Kohlsaas.

Personal examination of the docket of the probate court shows incontrovertibly that Judge Kohlsaas's statements are correct. Running through the records of November, 1897, far enough back to be of unmistakable value, we find, as can any one who chooses to make the examination, numerous cases where more than one physician was allowed to collect from the same estate, and where more than \$2 per visit was allowed. A few instances only will be quoted. Both Dr. W. K. Harrison and Dr. E. J. George were allowed their bills for services against the same estate, the former being allowed his charge of \$2 per visit in all cases but one, in which a charge of \$3 was allowed. Drs. St. John, Loring, Warren and Butler were allowed bills aggregating five hundred and fifty-odd dollars against the estate of Peter Ross, two of the charges being consultations at \$25 each. One of these bills was reduced from the claim as presented, but the aggregate allowed was as stated above. Dr. A. V. Hutchinson was allowed \$2, \$3 and \$4 a visit. Dr. P. H. Matthei was allowed \$3 per visit, and Dr. J. S. Mitchell \$3 per visit and \$2 for office consultation. These examples could apparently be multiplied indefinitely were not this sufficient.

The writer has no particular concern that Judge Kohlsaas should be re-elected, and would not object to any fair and honest means brought to bear to prevent his re-election, but he does resent that any one should attempt under false pretenses to use the intelligent medical profession to further a personal grudge or to pull political chestnuts out of the fire.

Respectfully,

HORACE M. STARKEY, M.D.