### Doctors and Managers.

(For the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.)

We fully unite with the sentiments of "Medicus" and "Vindex," which appeared in Friday's issue of the BULLETIN, in reply to your account of the Orthopædic Hospital, recently published in your columns. A combination of government and service, that is, the authority of a director and the duties of a servant combined in the same person in the management of medical charities, is certainly a serious evil. It is a professional innovation of later date upon the practice of the ancient regime, and, in our view, open to every imputation which "Medicus" has cast upon it. We speak not only for ourselves when we say that we have regarded the authority and emoluments by tendency to increase upon the community of late years, with no little regret.

Indeed, any irregularity, with such an open door to self-interest and personal ends, must increase, unless its tendency be clearly exposed and checked by the force of principle. Nor will this thing die of itself. Therefore, with naught but kind feelings towards any, and without the slightest shade of prejudice, we desire not to blame men, who may be deceived, but to condemn a principle, which we think cannot be held in itself, and ever liable to abuse—a principle which leads to centralization and monopoly of professional interests, and to the establishment of a sort of professional oligarchy, or lines of ring in a fraternity that should know no cliqueships. As it will be readily perceived, such a ring, would become more and more proportioned, not to professional attainment, but to the arbitrary choice of a favored few—not to benevolence of motive, but to the spirit of gain.

"A prudent man foresees the evil." Let not time, then, for those who love a pure profession, and who would uphold its ancient standard, to pronounce this system incompatible both with the dignity of the medical profession and with the high name of Charity which it professes to serve; it tends to the subversion of the law in the beautiful code of the medical ethics; ethics, the pure spirit of which, if its practice be of such a system, would soon be "more honored in the breach than in the observance." May the great professional heart never so exchange the noble promptings of a Howard for the wiles of a Machiavel.

With these views, we are surprised to find that professional men of otherwise good standing should be willing to hold this ambiguous position in the Orthopædic Hospital, and that others venerable in years and in the esteem of good citizens, should seem to lend it their countenance and aid.

For the unprofessional gentlemen on the Board of this Institution, while we respect them for honor for only noble and generous motives in this effort—honor of which their presence and ostentation lives have proved them worthy—we have only to say that we think they have not given the military step in the movement that mature and deliberate consideration of all its importance demands. Besides, it is impossible that the uninitiated should see the evils alluded to so clearly as physicians themselves. We should suppose that these gentlemen had depended largely on their medical advisers in this enterprise, in which case it was for the latter to make a clean beginning, and not to have exposed themselves to the charge of double motives when seeking under the name of charity, gain.

No well-earned reward, after a clean conscience, which the Doctor expects for clean services in public medical charities, is an extension of a clean professional reputation. But—for the character of those services; call the same name Mr. A. on this committee, and Dr. A. on that committee; at the same time let Mr. A. of the Board make common cause in the Legislature for Dr. A. of the medical staff; and let Mr. A. use his influence and vote in the Board just to suit the interests of Dr. A. in the medical staff; further, let Dr. A. of the medical staff, be active in carrying out the views of Mr. A. of the Board—and Dr. A.'s reward, in the end, if it succeeds, will be a double emoluments and a doubtful reputation. Who can deny that such are the unavoidable temptations to such double-acting officials, or that, as "Medicus" intimates, however fair at the outset such a system of management may be, its direct consequence will be to embarrass the public, partiality, and intrigue?

We think, therefore—the necessity of mutual confidence between the managers and medical officers of all medical charities—a confidence difficult to maintain. *In fact, where members of these bodies have not been interchangeable*, according to the spirit and intent of the Orthopædic and a few other modern institutions, we have never known the professional character to fail so low as not to deserve and enjoy this. On the contrary, our experience in such institutions has taught us that "A Communication from the Doctors" is always respected, and we venture to say that such will ever be the case so long as medical men are more jealous concerning the purity of their aims and the interests of their high calling than for their pecuniary power and influence.

So far as advantages are to be derived from the Orthopædic Hospital, we agree with other friends, and do so firmly with the profession at large, in believing that the same effort and means in will be expended for the support, if extended in support of the department for the blacks" in the Wills' Hospital, which has long and endowed, built and organized for this very purpose—would be far more wise and reasonable and meet with a hearty response from our citizens.

There are other evils connected with the above described double-back-acting system of managing so-called medical charities which we will not attempt to point out. For instance, although of course there are no direct emoluments received for the "self-sacrificing" medical and surgical service, yet the easy method of indirect gain and aggrandizement in institutions so organized should be by no means out sight of. *But enough.*

Now, for the fair professional name of Philadelphia—among the noble mottoes of her institutions—we owe it to a hundred worthies, to keep that name spotless.

EDITOR.

### The Orthopædic and Pennsylvania Hospitals.

*Messrs. Editors of The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*: In your paper of March 12th a notice is made of the establishment of the Philadelphia Orthopædic Hospital, in which the writer takes occasion to say: "*In the Pennsylvania Hospital, for instance, persons with clubfeet or hip diseases are never, except in very rare instances, admitted, unless able to pay for their board and for the service of a physician.*"

I may say that neither the managers nor medical officers of the Orthopædic Hospital are responsible for this statement, as it was made entirely without their knowledge. The Pennsylvania Hospital does receive such cases, on the same conditions as other patients, with or without pay, according to their circumstances. Neither do the medical or surgical attendants of that Institution receive any fees for services rendered to patients in the Hospital. I feel bound to regret that any ill-nature should be manifested towards this new Institution, the necessity and usefulness of which must be obvious; and as to the charge of "personal interest and hostility to double functions of management and professional service," to speak seriously instead of jest, I may venture to say it is an other illustration of the extreme folly of voluntary opinions without a knowledge of the facts.

D. HAYES AGNEW, M. D.

### The Income Tax.

*To the Editors of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*: I have seen nothing in your journal of late which pleased me more than your remarks in the paper of the 9th on the income tax.

The four reasons for the repeal which you mention, are all that need be said or can be said. They are demonstrated to be, I agree with you, utterly as to the so-called "difficulty of collecting the widely tax." Those officers charged with this duty have the power, and want only the disposition to do it. Those officers are the manufacturers of nine-tenths of the poverty, murders and manifold misdemeanors of society; and why should they not be taxed to sustain the State which they are doing all in their power to destroy? In the tax on this abomination then remain, high as it is—but to collected at all hazards, and the "income tax," so "inquisitorial," offensive and oppressive, exempting, as it does, the rich and best portion of the community, will not be needed. My name is added to recall the attention of the readers to your observations rather than my own.

A letter from the United States consul at St. Croix, W. I., addressed to the Secretary of State, says that from the date of January to the 4th of February there were 11 cases and 7 deaths in St. Thomas, and 12 cases and 11 deaths by cholera in St. Croix. The number of cases up to the last date was 221, with 157 deaths. The disease broke out on December 21.

### THE ADMISSION OF ALABAMA.

#### Minority Report of the Reconstruction Committee.

The following is the minority report of the Committee on Reconstruction:

The undersigned members of the Reconstruction Committee having carefully considered the report of the majority since its publication, the acts of Congress known as the Reconstruction acts, and the constitution and ordinances rejected by the people of the State of Alabama, submit as their report to this House the following preamble and resolutions:

*Whereas*, An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States, passed March 2d, 1867, an act supplementary thereto, passed on the 23d of the same month, provided for calling a convention to prepare a constitution for the government of the State of Alabama, and the holding of an election in that State for the ratification or rejection of said Constitution by those persons who were authorized under said acts to register and vote in said election. *And whereas*, an election was held for that purpose in said State, commencing on the 4th day of February last, and continuing until the 6th of that month, which resulted in the rejection of said Constitution by a majority of 10,000 of the registered voters under said acts, and who were expressly authorized, under and by the provisions of said acts, to reject said Constitution, either by depositing their voice against it, or by not voting at said election. *And whereas*, the large majority of such voters were unanimously opposed to the ratification of said Constitution—

*First*—Because it deprives a large number of the white masses of said State of the right to vote or hold office.

*Second*—Because it confers the right to vote and hold office on all black males, thus disfranchising intelligence and virtue, and enfranchising ignorance and incapacity.

*Third*—Because it requires all persons before voting to subscribe to an oath that they accept the civil and political equality of all men, and agree not to attempt to deprive any person or persons on account of race or color or previous condition of any political or civil right, privilege or immunity enjoyed by any other class of men.

*Fourth*—Because it apportionings representation to the people of the several counties of the State, it ignores three counties, and leaves them without representation.

*Fifth*—Because it gives to twenty-four of fifty-nine counties in the State, which are recognized as having a white population of 52,843, and a black population of 52,510, sixty-five of the one hundred representatives which compose the House of Representatives, and it gives to the remaining thirty-five counties, having a white population of 280,901, and a black population of 111,159, but one representative each, and because it apportions representation in the Senate in the same way as near as may be.

*Sixth*—Because by these means it places the power to impose taxes and all other legislative power in the hands of those who will be most taxpayers, and it thereby deprives a majority of those who will have to pay the taxes the right to vote or the power to protect themselves against oppression, with which they will be inevitably visited.

*Seventh*—Because it makes no provision for and does not make it the duty of the Legislature to appropriate the money raised for the common schools equally and separately for the benefit of the white and black children of the State.

*Eighth*—Because, after defining in the first section of the third article, the powers of the Legislature of the State of Alabama shall be divided into three distinct departments, namely, legislative, executive and judicial, it provides in the fifth section of the eleventh article that the Board of Education shall exercise the legislative powers in reference to educational institutions of the State, and its acts, when approved by the Governor, or when re-enacted by two-thirds of the Board in case of his disapproval, shall have the force and effect of law unless repealed by the General Assembly.

*Ninth*—Because it divides the militia into two classes, namely, volunteer militia and reserve militia, and it is made the duty of the Governor, by an ordinance which was not published with the Constitution for the information of the people, to two others were, which were less objectionable, to organize immediately one hundred and thirty-seven companies of volunteer militia, who are to be armed and paid when in service at the same rate as United States officers and soldiers, and out of the State Treasury, the mounted men to be paid twenty cents per day for their horses.

*Tenth*—Because by the twentieth section of said Constitution, all the proceeds of the sale of contraband and captured property, which shall be turned by the military, or shall come into their hands, shall be paid into the State treasury, and in the fund of which they are to be made a part, the testimony of witnesses, taken in time of peace by unlawful science, and to provide the means of paying Generals, if the property seized is honestly turned over.

*Eleventh*—Because the Constitution provides a government which will cost annually from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000, a sum which the resources of the State are wholly unable to meet in their present impoverished condition.

*And whereas*, Such registered voters, believing that they had the right to decline a Constitution so objectionable as this, in either of the ways provided in the aforesaid acts, neglected to sufficiently