

## **The Sheffield General Infirmary: Correspondence between Amicus Montgomery and Dr. J.C. Hall.**

### **Contributors**

Montgomery, Amicus, pseud.  
Hall, John Charles, 1816-1876.  
University of Leeds. Library

### **Publication/Creation**

Sheffield : J. Pearce, [1861?]

### **Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/n9g53hja>

### **Provider**

Leeds University Archive

### **License and attribution**

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The University of Leeds Library. The original may be consulted at The University of Leeds Library. where the originals may be consulted.

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.

**wellcome  
collection**

Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

✓

THE SHEFFIELD  
GENERAL INFIRMARY:

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

AMICUS MONTGOMERY

AND

DR. J. C. HALL.

[REPRINTED FROM THE SHEFFIELD DAILY TELEGRAPH.]

SHEFFIELD :

J. PEARCE, JUN., PRINTER, DAILY TELEGRAPH OFFICE.

1861

H-She-3.6M



**"AMICUS MONTGOMERY," ANXIOUS FOR THE WELFARE OF AN  
OLD INSTITUTION AND FOR THE CHARACTER OF THE WORKING  
MEN OF SHEFFIELD, BEGS THEIR CANDID AND EARNEST  
CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE.**



# SHEFFIELD GENERAL INFIRMARY.

---

## TO THE ARTISANS OF SHEFFIELD.

To say that I admire the perseverance shown by Dr. Hall in his advocacy of the claims of the Dispensary and Hospital, or that I admire the resolution shown by you to support the institution even by personal sacrifices is only what any one might be expected to say when talking on these subjects. They are patent to all the world, and therefore I premise that I have a different object in view.

England is proverbially famous for charitable institutions and Englishmen for charitable deeds. Do we hear of misery or want anywhere under the sun, and not rushed open-handed to the rescue? Is it the starving Christians in Syria or famine stricken Ireland for which some one appeals to us for aid, and do we stand idly by? Is it the multitude of heathen we are invited to assist in evangelising and civilising? Is it the blind and the deaf,—the broken-down tradesman, and the reduced gentlewoman, and the diseased in all forms of physical suffering, and are there not hospitals, and retreats, and infirmaries, and public and private charities innumerable for one and all? So many magnificent buildings dedicated to the alleviation of suffering, and so many well managed schemes of benevolence as adorn our native land are not to be found in any other country. These things illustrate the Victorian age and shed lustre on the names of many of the highest and mightiest, while the middle, the industrious and hard-working classes, are found ever ready to fill up the gaps left for the outburst of kindly English feelings. Loyalty,—in an age like this, when our admirable Queen is ever the first to suggest or to lead the way in acts of well-timed benevolence, and who alike as Queen, as wife, and as mother sets a glorious example to crowned heads,—is to follow in her footsteps. Political loyalty is now our pleasure as well as our duty. Disloyalty is to be uncharitable, inhumane, selfish, and wicked! May this ever be the case in our highly-favoured land!

To you artisans of Sheffield I venture now to appeal. By your spirited liberality the Dispensary in West-street has been rebuilt, and a few beds furnished for the suffering poor. But do you remember that while you have been doing this, the institution cherished by our late lamented Montgomery, and carried on for 70 years by the energy, perseverance, and liberality of the gentry and inhabitants of the town—has been forgotten by you? That institution contains 150 beds for in-patients, and has alleviated the suffering of thousands on thousands of you, the working men of Sheffield, either by yourselves or your families. In furthering one scheme of benevolence do not lose sight of another, which, up to this day, is conferring incalculable benefits upon you. Have you ever



helped the directors and managers in their arduous task? Have you, yourselves, made any sacrifices to forward the funds of that institution? Have you, out of your little, spared the trifle which, like the widow's mite, is more blessed than the rich man's abundance? I call upon you to aid in this good work also. Let not the tradesmen and gentry of the town, who year after year subscribe their guineas to find you help and succour in the time of need, say that you are ungrateful—that your thank-offering does not go to swell the means at the disposal of those who give their money, their time, and their labour for your sole benefit. Let us reason together and see whether we are justified in forgetting past benefits for new friends. I do not counsel you to withhold your aid from the Dispensary—it is a laudable institution; but I do earnestly and heartily advise you to consider whether it is not your bounden duty to distribute the means which are at your disposal into more than one channel. The Infirmary is for your sole benefit. The patriotic and benevolent Montgomery worked for it with a hearty desire that the building might prove of inestimable value to the suffering poor. Has it not been so? For many years have not the sick, the lame, and the wounded found speedy help and relief from it? Do your richer brethren, who yearly support, it, themselves use it? No, it is for you, and you alone. Let me, therefore, urge upon you in the year that is just entered, to take such steps as you have shown yourselves to be capable of, with respect to the Dispensary, to add a considerable item to the funds at the disposal of the managers of the Infirmary, and let them say that the working men of Sheffield have ennobled themselves by the spontaneous aid they have afforded to that time-honoured institution—the Sheffield General Infirmary.

AMICUS MONTGOMERY.

Sheffield, Jan. 1, 1861.

---

Sir,—I have never, as your correspondent "Amicus Montgomery" implies, urged the working classes or any other of the inhabitants of this town to forget the claims of the Sheffield Infirmary; on the contrary, I proposed, only a few weeks ago, a plan to the chairman of its weekly board, the Rev. T. Sale, D.D., which, if carried out, would greatly add to the funds both of the Infirmary and the Public Hospital and Dispensary, viz., that here as in Birmingham, at the beginning of each year, a sermon should on some given day be preached at every place of worship in the town, and collections made for the *joint benefit of the two institutions*. This is done every year at Birmingham for the local medical charities, and several thousand pounds are raised. I can only repeat publicly the offer I have made in private, that I am willing to take all the trouble that the carrying out this scheme would involve, and as this would be great, perhaps "Amicus Montgomery" might be induced to give his valuable assistance. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see the 150 beds at the Infirmary and the 51 beds at the Public Hospital and Dispensary available for our poor; because, even with 200 beds, Sheffield would be behind other towns in hospital accommodation.



“ Amicus Montgomery” will pardon my telling him that the “ perseverance shown by Dr. Hall in his advocacy of the claims of the Dispensary and Hospital” arises from the fact *that this institution has no funded property—no houses—no freehold land, nor land to let for building purposes.* It has never yet been able to boast of having an income larger than its expenditure. The Hospital and Dispensary having no property relies, therefore, altogether on voluntary subscriptions for its support; and, if “ Amicus Montgomery” succeed in diverting any portion of its present income into other channels he will most certainly close the doors of the hospital against the artizans of Sheffield, an event which, were he living, would cause no greater regret to any one than to that venerable poet I had for many years the honour to call my friend.

I am, Sir, your very obedient Servant,  
 JOHN CHARLES HALL, M.D.  
 Honorary Secretary.

Surrey House, Sheffield, January 2nd, 1861.

---

Sir,—It was far from my wish to enter into controversy with Dr. Hall, and I think he would have been wise to have accepted the praise I accorded to him, without entering further into the question. However, as Dr. Hall claims for himself the merit of having *urged* the working classes to *forget* the claims of the Infirmary, I must be allowed to point out the logical inference that he has never urged them to *support* it. He has compelled me to draw the attention of your readers to this fact, which in my former letter I ignored, purposely and from respect to him.

Dr. Hall next alludes to a plan which he says he has suggested to our respected vicar, for raising means for the *joint benefit of the two institutions*, by sermons at every place of worship on some given day. Now really this is exceedingly generous and amiable. For does not every one know that it was customary formerly to have such collections, and that they have been given up solely because of their unfruitfulness in consequence of the many other calls upon the religious public from the pulpit, and that many of those that would be disposed to give, were already large subscribers to the institution. The proof, therefore, on which Dr. Hall relies in his letter, of his good wishes to the Infirmary consists in making a bare suggestion, at once impracticable, already tried and found wanting. On the other hand, through the liberality of the papers, do we not see almost weekly that he has taken the trouble to address bodies of working men and urge upon them the claims of the Dispensary? Has he once said a good word for the Infirmary at these meetings or elsewhere? I do not mention these things invidiously, but I do think it is too bad, while praising Dr. Hall for his great efforts in favour of the one institution, that he should endeavour to *prevent* me from advocating the claims of the other! This is not at all consistent with his declaration of goodwill towards it, and evinces a little too much egotism and determination that Dr. Hall only shall be the major commanding the volunteers in favour of our local medical charities.



One word more, and I have done. In his last paragraph Dr. Hall insinuates that it is *because* the Dispensary has no funded property, &c., that he perseveres in advocating its claims. Now, there is a very ill-concealed sneer embodied in this remark, which disfigures the fair face which it would otherwise present. He should not have indulged in it. It is dangerous work, very, but I won't imitate him, but will your readers ponder for one moment, how it would have been possible for the Infirmary to have existed so long without the working classes themselves helping its funds, had not many charitable individuals left sums of money, property, &c., to carry it on with? Can 150 beds and a large institution like the Infirmary be carried on with as little expense as eight beds and a small establishment? Therefore, it is that, with all their "funded property," &c., the managers may be as poor, as is actually the case, as are those of the Dispensary. I want the working classes to help both institutions; and as they have handsomely and abundantly responded to the appeals made by Dr. Hall, let them now do something for the Infirmary also. The funded property will come to the Dispensary in good time; and as Dr. Hall has really done great things for it, all I wish him to do is to stand for a little time on one side and let the contributions of the working men flow where they ought at last to do, into the coffers of the institution which has for 70 years distributed its benefits to the suffering poor.

Through you, Mr. Editor, I again appeal to the working men of Sheffield to show their gratitude, their honesty, and their patriotism by assisting the funds of the Sheffield General Infirmary.

Yours respectfully,

AMICUS MONTGOMERY.

Jan. 3, 1861.

Sir,—As honorary secretary of the Sheffield Public Hospital and Dispensary, it would indeed be inconsistent with my duty to permit the incorrect and unfair statement of "Amicus Montgomery" to remain unrefuted. I have no time, and far less inclination, to indulge in personalities; and so little wish to assume the mantle of a "*major commanding*," that at any time the governors think they have found a gentleman who will more efficiently and zealously discharge my duties, I shall only be too happy to resign my post. As to the "*sneering*" and the "*egotism*," if Amicus Montgomery will throw off his mask, and thus become as well known to the readers of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* as he is to myself, I shall be quite content to let them put the cap on the head they consider the most deserving of it. Your correspondent asks if "I have once said a good word at the meetings of the workmen, or elsewhere, for the Infirmary?" To which I reply, that I have never spoken without doing so; because, at the first, one great difficulty arose from the circulation of the report, which I had to refute, that one institution would become the rival of the other; many times, and more particularly when speaking near the Infirmary, have I suggested that it might be well to divide the subscription I was asking for. Too many working men are aware of what I am stating to render it necessary to add another word on this part of the subject.



My suggestion to the vicar, of a sermon on a given day once a year at every place of worship, was made because a friend at Birmingham wrote to tell me how much might be raised by the means pointed out. If practicable at Birmingham, why should it be found "impracticable" in Sheffield? and I yet hope that the common sense of the town will conclude that of the "many calls" made upon the "religious public," to which class "Amicus Montgomery" doubtless belongs, there is not one more urgent than that which is created by the sick and suffering poor.

I will now endeavour to point out, and to correct, a few of the errors into which "Amicus Montgomery" has fallen. He said in his first letter—"by the spirited *liberality of the artisans the Dispensary was rebuilt.*" Not one shilling, sir, was contributed to the building fund either by Amicus Montgomery or the working men of Sheffield. It is true that our artisans most nobly assisted in raising a portion of what was called the "shilling fund," out of which the Hospital was furnished. But all classes, as your correspondent very well knows, gave to that fund. Even "Amicus Montgomery" brought some shillings, which had been collected by himself and friends, to my house, and I shall never forget the kindly and gentlemanly manner in which the offering was presented, nor the expression of benevolence which lighted up his benign countenance when wishing every success to the undertaking.

It is incorrect to say that the working classes have not supported the Infirmary. As "Amicus Montgomery" claims to be "*one of the richer brethren who yearly support it*" he knows very well that when his subscription is paid a report is given to him. If he really have the reports he will find what is put down for "*contributions from workshops.*" In two reports upon my table I see it is more than £100, the only difference between the two institutions being that at the public Hospital and Dispensary, the tickets are given to the workmen themselves, who pay the money; while at the Infirmary, the 14th rule provides—"in case of subscriptions from workmen, the cards of recommendation shall be signed by the employer of such parties."

Of the misrepresentation of "Amicus Montgomery," when he describes the Public Hospital and Dispensary as "*a small establishment with eight beds,*" and would have the working men and others, there ore, to look upon it as almost beneath notice I shall leave the inhabitants of Sheffield to form their own conclusion, after stating that *there are at present in the Public Hospital 51 beds for patients; of these 32 are completely fitted up, and at all times available for cases of disease or accident; that in the two weeks before Christmas we had 21 patients at one time in the house, and that last year the Hospital and Dispensary afforded relief to upwards of twelve thousand of the sick and suffering poor of Sheffield.* The least he can now do to atone for his error is by doubling his present subscription. "Amicus Montgomery" tells us "that funded property will come in good time," and admits that the institution has nothing to depend upon at present save voluntary contributions; and yet, although an hospital has been opened to supply an admitted want—to place Sheffield in the same position as Birmingham and other large towns—he asks "*Dr. Hall to stand on one side*



and let the contributions of the working men flow where they ought at last to do." He knows very well that, on the faith of the promises made to me by working men, the weekly board have entered into certain engagements—that if we are deprived of the anticipated income the institution might be closed; and yet, most ungenerously does he seize upon the moment when the time for sending in the collecting cards has arrived, to endeavour by every means in his power, to deprive the Public Hospital and Dispensary of support by small weekly contributions—a plan which I have advocated, because it would thus secure an ample income, and that too without injury to the elder sister charity.

Be the "*friendly* Montgomery" young, or be he old; a shade, or a reality; he has, doubtless, read that once upon a time there were two men in one city, the one rich and the other poor. The poor man had nothing save one little lamb, which he had bought and nourished up; and this the rich man took away from him. While "*Amicus* Montgomery" reads this history, once more, and ponders over the lesson which it teaches, I appeal to the working men of Sheffield to forward the collecting cards to me without delay, in full confidence that the promises they have made will not be broken, and that the fact of having to depend entirely on voluntary contributions will ever secure for the Public Hospital and Dispensary their hearty support.

I am, sir, your very obedient servant,

JOHN CHARLES HALL, M.D.,

Honorary Secretary.

Surrey House, Sheffield, Jan. 4th, 1861.

---

Sir,—I was sure Dr. Hall was more generous than he appeared. He has granted me my proposition, and I thank him most sincerely. It is dangerous in all cases to judge of a man by first impressions, for I really thought I should never be able to convince him that I had a good object in view, and yet now he says, "many times have I suggested that it would be well to divide the subscription I was asking for." In my last I asked if he had ever said a good word for the Infirmary, and as this expressed a doubt of the fact, and as he has now put it in print that he has "many times" advised a division of the proceeds, I humbly beg his pardon. We work together now. He admits my premises that it is the duty of the working men to assist the Infirmary, and they cannot, therefore, object to my proposition that they shall now turn their attention to that charity. Let them do so with a good will as hearty as seems to be Dr. Hall's, and we shall speedily see the result.

Dr. Hall says that he experienced a difficulty from a report which he had to refute, that one institution would become a rival to the other. Let us look into this matter a little, and I wish most heartily to bespeak the attention of the working men to what I have now to say as the result of experience in this matter. What possible object can I have but their good?

First, I beg their attention to the following table, shewing that at the close of each year from 1850 the patients in the Infirmary numbered as follows:—



1850	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
79	82	84	84	115	112	128	117	116	103	107

The gradual rise of the numbers here recorded is striking, till 59 and 60. But the Infirmary possesses 150 beds, and the highest of the above figures is 22 short of that number. The pressure has never, therefore, been equal to the provision made for it. It appears then that the necessity for another hospital existed only in the imagination of Dr. Hall.

Again, let us try it in another way. In January, 1860, there was an aggregate of 75 beds empty, Feb. 63, March 81, April 81, May 126, June 206, July 112, August 224, September 182, October 215, November 203, December 99, leaving a daily average of 31 empty beds. Now, the highest number of occupied beds in the Dispensary, quoted by Dr. Hall, is 21 for the two weeks before Christmas, leaving still an excess of 20 beds in the Infirmary beyond the actual requirements of the whole town up to the present time. So much for the fallacy of the reason advanced by Dr. Hall to persuade the working men to support the Dispensary alterations originally, and more especially when the Infirmary wards will contain 200 beds, which the board were at any time ready to provide when the times called for them.

However, let that pass. Dr. Hall has admitted the justice of the working men dividing their subscriptions, and I forgive him the special pleading by which he obtained their support.

As far as I can gather from the reports in the *Telegraph*, the working men have subscribed about £500. He says more than £100 was subscribed to the Infirmary from workshops in one year. The board of directors will be, therefore, much obliged to him to hand over £250, the half of the amount. He cannot object, for he says he suggested that "it might be well to divide the subscriptions he was asking for." I think so too. Why should he then complain of my letters? We agree in opinion! If he will back this opinion by sending a cheque for £250 I am sure the working men of Sheffield will cordially endorse his act, and the Infirmary Board pass a vote of thanks to him for the trouble he has taken. Just look at the accession of honour, and I hope he won't let false modesty stand between him and charity. He quotes £100 as subscribed by the working men in one year for the Infirmary, and he has got them to subscribe about £500 in the same time. He admits the justice of a division. Let him therefore at once glorify himself and the working men who have listened to the voice of the charmer, and divide the amount between the Dispensary and the Infirmary. Nay, it is scarcely a matter for choice. If these subscriptions were actually given with the suggestion that they should be divided he is bound in honour so to divide them. I do not say it is so. I only take Dr. Hall's words. If they are worth anything they are worth £250 to the Infirmary.

To my great surprise Dr. Hall in his letters speaks as if I were fighting against the Dispensary. How absurd! Did I not begin by praising him highly for the efforts he has made to establish it on its present foundation? I attacked neither him nor the Dispensary. Far from it. I rejoice that Sheffield



has two such hospitals as the Infirmary and Dispensary. It is a matter of pride to me. But I contend that if the working men can afford to give subscriptions to the one, they are bound by a much stronger and sounder argument to provide means for the other, which for seventy years has been conferring inestimable benefit upon them.

Again I appeal to their honest and manly feelings. They have subscribed a large sum of money for the Dispensary. If it be not now rich, let the gentry do their part, and give it their donations and subscriptions. They have handsomely done their share, at all events for the present. Let them come now to the help of the old claimant upon their notice. Though Dr. Hall says I am wrong in stating eight beds, I imagine if they take such an account of the Dispensary as I here give them of the Infirmary they will find my statement more correct than his; while in the latter there has been an average of 107 beds occupied by suffering members of their class, and the returns show that the only effect of the additional accommodation at the new Hospital has been to empty the beds at the old one. 107 beds continually occupied by the sick and wounded poor. Think of this, my friends, and do not let sophistry or prejudice blind you to the fact that if you can afford to give, the Infirmary has the prior and stronger claim.

Nevertheless, if Dr. Hall at once sends a cheque for £250 and continues to get subscriptions for division between the two institutions jointly, I will then, as he requests, "throw off my mask," when he will know me a great deal better than he does now.

Yours respectfully,  
AMICUS MONTGOMERY.

January 7, 1861.

---

Sir,—If inclined to treat a subject so serious as the wants of the sick and suffering poor of Sheffield in the same spirit as that displayed by "Amicus Montgomery" in his letter of this morning, I might at once express my perfect willingness to "divide" the incomes of the two institutions whenever he can persuade the managers of the Infirmary to agree to his proposal. He can hardly expect me seriously to reply to the statements made in his last letter, the unfairness of which must be obvious to all. In one part of his letter he tells you that "*the necessity for the Public Hospital only existed in the imagination of Dr. Hall;*" in another part "*he rejoices that Sheffield has two such hospitals as the Infirmary and Dispensary; it is a matter of pride to me.*" How are you to deal with such a man? It is not for "Amicus Montgomery" but for the inhabitants of Sheffield to decide whether he has or has not been "*fighting against the Dispensary.*"

In conclusion, may I tell "Amicus Montgomery" that if, for obvious reasons, in discussing such a subject as our local medical charitable institutions, he refuses to give his real name and address, so far as I am concerned there is an end of the discussion; and may I tell him, also, that, if he affix his real name and address to any statement on this important subject then no refutation could by any possibility be required, for that



name has only to appear before the working men of Sheffield to prevent them from being "blinded," either by his "*sophistry or prejudice.*"

I am, sir, your very obedient servant,  
 JOHN CHARLES HALL, M.D.,  
 Honorary Secretary.

Surrey House, Sheffield, Jan. 8, 1861.

Sir,—Dr. Hall leaves me in possession of the field, and in the situation of conqueror I might sing a pæan for the victory. But I am not inclined to be vain-glorious; I regret rather that my late respected antagonist has thrown down his weapons in a sulky spirit, instead of meeting me with the gallantry and pluck of a model Englishman.

In yielding me the post of honour, however, Dr. Hall says for "obvious reasons" I refuse to give my real name and address, and that "my name has only to appear before the working men to prevent them from being blinded, &c." What does he mean? He knows as much about me as he does, I regret to say it, of the rules of conducting an argument, when he leaves the subject itself to attack, by insinuation, some one whom he fancies to be "*Amicus Montgomery.*" Can eternal truth and even-handed justice be converted into their opposites by Dr. Hall's personal adhesion? They remain. The disciple or the opponent passes away. His conduct, therefore, in passing by the argument to throw insinuations on me *whom he does not know at all*, is equally mean and cowardly.

Moreover, when he means the working men to draw the conclusion that I have only to give my name to stamp my advocacy of a time-honoured charity in their eyes with discredit, he draws altogether a false conclusion. My real name has not been mixed up with any public matters at all, as he seems to think. I am a volunteer, anxious to serve a good cause, and let me tell Dr. Hall that I am and have been for many years a subscriber to the Infirmary, and that I am and have been also for many years a subscriber to the Dispensary, and that I am and have been for many years, as far as my means would allow, a subscriber to all the charitable institutions of the town, but I do not care to make a parade of the fact. Some do. Their right hand always knoweth what the left hand doeth! Can Dr. Hall say that he has been a supporter of the Infirmary for many years? and that he is therefore on an equality with me in good feeling for the "wants of the sick and suffering poor of Sheffield." I grant him great praise for his efforts for the Dispensary, but let the working man remember this, that the very efforts which he made to establish that charity on an enlarged foundation, went directly to reduce or destroy the utility of the Infirmary, and but for the "funded property" which in a former letter gave him room for one of his apparently habitual sneers, would no doubt have done so. At all events, he has left no stone unturned to get all that any one would give for the one institution only.

I confess my utter surprise, disappointment, and disgust at the conduct of Dr. Hall. When I ventured with timid spirit to take pen in hand to advocate the claims of the Infirmary,



knowing that the Dispensary had so powerful an advocate as Dr. Hall was reported to be; that he was a man who had published books, and who, in lecturing before the Sheffield Philosophical Society, had corrected the errors of such men as Darwin, Lamarck, Oken, &c., it was with fear and trembling I undertook the task which I regretted no more able friend of the Infirmary took up. But now, when Dr. Hall has abandoned the courtesy of a gentleman to resort to the vulgar weapons of insinuation; when he has not only declined the challenge I gave him, but actually run away from the argument, and attempted to stab in the dark the reputation of one of whom he is totally and supremely ignorant, I can only feel the most profound pity. I thought him a kind of intellectual hero—a Wellington, a Garibaldi. I will not say what I now think him. I gave you some statistics in my last. Allow me to add a few more. Figures are very hard nuts to crack. Dr. Hall asserted that for two years the working men had subscribed £100 (I suppose he meant each year) for the Infirmary. Now see the real facts, and then look at Dr. Hall's motto, "Be just, and fear not." In 1860 subscriptions for working men amounted to £31; in 1859, to £39; in 1858, to £27; in 1857, to £34; in 1856, to £79. Thus during the last five years no one year has produced *one-half the amount stated by Dr. Hall*, except in 1856, when it was £21 short of the sum. Now compare a former period, and see if there is not reason for the working men of the present day to feel ashamed of their supineness. In '48 they gave £180; in '49, £284; in '50, £260; in '51, £160. These are noble memorials of the gratitude of working men of former days.

Now, friends and fellow-labourers, working men of Sheffield. You have seen my letters—you have seen the replies. I accord you great praise for the sacrifices you have made. You appear to have subscribed about £800 in the last year for the Dispensary. I ask you now to consider the cause of the Infirmary. It is not now poor, certainly, but can you tell how soon a visitation of Providence on you and your families may make it so? Let your generous, your honest, your manly feelings urge you to assist that institution, which for 70 years has been the relieving angel to your sick and suffering brethren and families—which was one of the chief objects of the care and help of our revered poet and patriot Montgomery, which has been the recipient for so long of the dying bequests of the rich and the benevolent, *for your sole benefit*, and for which so many active and charitable individuals have given their time, their anxiety, their labour, and their thoughts. You in your numbers are strong. You can do great things. You have done great things for one institution. Earnestly, honestly, I call upon you to remember the other. I have no interest in the one more than the other. I support both. I counsel you with a single heart to do the same. You will thereby earn for yourselves the reward of an approving conscience, and the noble distinction of having served your country well.

Yours, respectfully,

AMICUS MONTGOMERY.