

tration of remedies must be associated—at least in rural districts. I have little sympathy with certain fine gentlemen who affect to despise this form of practice, or desire to rid themselves of the name by which it is indicated.

Alas! Sir, “men would be angels;” and a morbid feeling of this sort has vitiated much that was sterling in society. Among agriculturists, where is now the genuine yeoman, who “owed vassalage to no man?” Aspiring to gentility, he clung to a rope of sand; and afforded, as some medical reformers may yet do, melancholy proof that “pride goeth before destruction.”

Now, I am quite satisfied with things as they are, and cannot understand what is meant by your correspondent “On Medical Reform” in your last number, when he says, “a vast amount of insult and degradation” has been heaped on provincial surgeons. On occasional visits to the metropolis, I find my way to the College, look over the museum, spend hours in the library, and attend lectures gratuitously. Setting aside the qualification for practice, I deem these advantages cheaply obtained by the twenty-two pounds paid some forty years back for my diploma.

Even the *newly created dignity* is open to me, notwithstanding my connection with pharmacy. I can *rub up* a little, and claim examination, but I desire not this for myself; I consider it valueless to the generation with which it originated, though highly important to the next. The education of my sons might have stopped short of University degrees, but for the stimulus of the new charter.

I do not murmur at my own non-election: nothing has been taken from me. I live for my family, and hope they will realize the advantages intended for a higher order of surgeons.

The agitation of the *soi-disant NATIONAL Institute*, as well as that of the party recently sprung up against it, appears to me pregnant with mischief. We have all the protection we require.

I admit the temperate tone of your own articles, and believe that a large majority (the calm and considerate portion) of the members of our Association, find “a head and a home” in existing institutions.

I remain, Sir,

Yours very respectfully,

March 28, 1849.

A QUIET MAN.

PROSECUTIONS BY THE SOCIETY OF APOTHECARIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,

I have very often heard it said, and also have frequently seen it in print, that the Apothecaries' Company would not prosecute any party holding a diploma or degree from any College or University, whether English, Irish, Scotch, or Continental. I want to know by whom the illiberal prosecution in the unfortunate Dr. Lobo's case was brought, whether by the Apothecaries' Company, or the rich and powerful Medical Protection Society, (who have, or are said to have, mustered some 800 members out of 30,000,) or some private party; I think it very illiberal indeed to select a poor foreign medical man, when (taking the most favourable view you

can,) there are at the very least twenty practising druggists to one illegal medical practitioner at the present time; and if the profession want to do any good, stop at once the druggist from prescribing, by a prosecution, and then you will really benefit the medical profession, for the druggists, and druggists alone, spoil half the practice of both London and provincial medical men. There are at present numbers of surgeons with only the College diploma, compounding all their own prescriptions; also numbers of Edinburgh physicians doing the same; and why, I ask, select a gentleman with a foreign degree, when that diploma was obtained after a most strict examination, quite as much so as the examinations here? Why differ one with another of the same profession, when by only stopping the prescribing of druggists, you will at once give an increased good practice to all?

I am Sir, yours &c.,

A CONSTANT READER AND LIBERAL MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION.

April 9, 1849.

Medical Intelligence.

LIFE ASSURANCE OFFICES.

REMUNERATION OF MEDICAL MEN FOR THEIR REPORTS.

In the list of Life Assurance Offices which have adopted the principle of remunerating medical men for their reports, as given in the last number of this Journal, the London and Provincial Joint Stock Life Insurance Company, 39, Nicholas Lane, London, which started originally on that principle, was accidentally omitted.

SOCIETY OF APOTHECARIES.

Gentlemen admitted Licentiates Thursday, March 29th:—Frederick Charles Spackman, Bradford, Wilts; George Bullen, Ipswich; Johnson Kaye Baines, London; John Sherwood Stocker, London; John Moore Swain, Long Clawson.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

Gentlemen admitted Licentiates Monday, April 2nd:—Francis Sibson, M.D., London; Augustus Henry Novelli, M.B., Cambridge; John Augustus Tulk, M.A., Cambridge.

OBITUARY.

March 15th, at Clapham, Surrey, aged 29, Walter Yonge, M.D.

April 1st, at Liverpool, aged 30, Edward Dunn, Esq., Surgeon, Ulverston.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications have been received from Mr. H. Williams; the Birmingham Pathological Society; a Constant Reader, &c.; Dr. Ballard; Mr. C. Anderton; Mr. R. King.

We regret that our arrangements did not admit of the insertion of the Petition of the Convention of Poor-Law Medical Officers this week; the petition will appear in the next number.