

to their pauper patients; and at the same time preventing the union or parish authorities from giving indiscriminate relief to the sick at the expense of the medical officers. Should, however, any other mode of payment appear more desirable to the majority of union medical officers, this meeting, convinced of the extreme importance of unanimity, will do its utmost in support of such mode as may be generally approved of.

"6. That a copy of the above resolutions be sent to the medical journals."

"SAMUEL DREW, Chairman."

ALLEGED FORGERY OF A DIPLOMA OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

Court of Queen's Bench, Westminster, January 30. (Sittings in Banco, before Lord Campbell and Justices Coleridge, Wightman, and Crompton.)

EX PARTE THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

Mr. J. WILDE, Q.C., moved for a rule calling upon Henry Frederick Hodgson, a person residing at Cradley-heath, in the county of Stafford, to show cause why a criminal information should not be filed against him for the forgery of a diploma of membership of the Royal College of Surgeons. It appeared that Hodgson had been assistant to a surgeon named Higgs, in the same place, and on his death he gave it out that he was going to practise as a surgeon on his own account. He invited several persons into his house to inspect his diploma. The name of "Hodgson" appeared to have been written over an erasure; and it turned out that the year 1850 had been altered to 1855, and that one of the examiners who had signed the diploma was an examiner in the year 1850, but was not so in the year 1855. It also appeared that the number of the diploma was 25,921, and that no diploma with so high a number had been ever given. The number of Mr. Higgs's diploma was 2,592. It was also stated that Hodgson, by representing that he was duly qualified to practise as a surgeon, had got himself appointed vaccinator by the board of guardians, but his appointment had since been rescinded on the discovery that he was not duly qualified. He had thus been guilty of a forgery at common law, and was indictable for the misdemeanour.

Lord CAMPBELL said, the College of Surgeons would do well to have the case investigated, and, if proved, the party should be punished; but his Lordship thought it was not a case in which the Court ought to interfere.

The other judges concurred.—Rule refused.

ALLEGED POISONING AT MANCHESTER.

On Wednesday, January 23rd, a charge was brought before the Manchester magistrates, against James Monaghan, aged 25, George Barry, Edward Dunn, and Mr. T. B. Holland, a surgeon, of poisoning Monaghan's father, in August last, in order to recover the sum of £300 from the Diadem Life Assurance Company, under a life policy effected on the old man.

Mr. Bradleugh, who conducted the case for the prosecution, having satisfied himself that he could not justly include Mr. T. B. Holland in the charge, applied to the Court that he might be discharged from custody, and allowed to give evidence in this case. This application was granted, and Mr. Holland was transferred from the dock to the witness-box.

Mr. BRADLEUGH stated that the prisoners were charged with the murder of John Monaghan, the father of the prisoner James Monaghan, by administering to him acetate of lead. From the statement made, it would appear that the old man Monaghan had the sugar of lead given him in some whiskey, of which liquor he was in the habit of drinking considerable quantities; and the nature of the defence to be set up on behalf of some of the prisoners was, that he was suffering from dysentery, and that the sugar of lead was given him as a recognised agent in the treatment of that complaint. It is said, that the poison was administered in repeated doses, always in whiskey, in which liquor the acetate of lead is colourless, though a solution in water becomes turbid and milky. During the illness of the old man—for he is said to have had an attack of dysentery—we are informed he was attended as a pauper by Mr. John Hutton, surgeon, Oxford Road, as medical officer of the Chorlton Union.

THOMAS BULL HOLLAND, surgeon, of Salford, gave evidence, in the course of which he stated:—Dunn and Barry were at my house one Sunday afternoon—I believe in the month of September, after the death of old Monaghan. We had some whiskey to drink. It was during that time mixing up a lotion containing liquor of lead. Dunn said, "That's a curious mix-

ture; how is it that it's milky?" I said, "When it is mixed with water, it goes that way; that it was a poison, and therefore I labelled it poison." Dunn asked if it was milky with any other fluid? I said, "It's not generally so in spirituous liquors." Dunn asked me, "If a little lead were put in the whiskey, would it be the same colour as if mixed with water?" I said, "No; it would be colourless." In the latter part of the year, Dunn and Monaghan called upon me at my house. It was in the afternoon. We had some whiskey together in my sitting-room. I drank the whole of my whiskey, unless it was a little which was rinsed out. I believe I threw it away, because it contained a few grains of acetate of lead. I had put them in with a spatula, just to show the difference of the colour between mixing it with water and with spirit. [The witness seemed to give this portion of his evidence with great reluctance.] Dunn stated that the old man had drunk a great deal of whiskey, and that that was the cause of his death. Dunn said that old Monaghan had taken small quantities of acetate of lead in his whiskey. He then asked me what it was for, and I told him it was sometimes given in cases of dysentery, in very small doses. I said it should not be given to any man without medical advice, as it was poison. I told him it would take at the least a scruple to half a drachm to produce death. He asked me where it could be got from. I said I got mine at Peatson's, in Broughton-road, and he asked me if he could get it there as he was passing to go to a place called Barlows. I did not know what he wanted it for then. This was after old Monaghan's death.

After some further evidence the inquiry was adjourned. It was resumed on Wednesday last, and is still in course of investigation. Much mystery appears to be connected with it; and a new charge has been raised against two other men, of forging a will purporting to be that of the late John Monaghan.

ACCIDENTAL POISONING. On Tuesday week last, three gentlemen were accidentally poisoned at a dinner party at Provost M'Iver's house, Dingwall, Scotland. It appears that the party consisted of Provost M'Iver, Mr. L. M. Mackenzie, of Findon, two Catholic priests, and several ladies. After dinner, and when the ladies had retired, the gentlemen were seized with pains in the throat and mouth, and in half an hour the two priests and Mr. Mackenzie were dead. Provost M'Iver has recovered. The roast meat was garnished with aconitum napellus instead of horse-radish. The names of the priests are the Rev. James Gordon Beanley, and the Rev. Angus Mackenzie Eskdale. Mr. Mackenzie was about to become son-in-law to Lord Lovat. None of the ladies were affected.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

LETTERS and other COMMUNICATIONS for the JOURNAL should be directed to the private address of the Editor, 39, Curzon Street, May Fair.

TO CONTRIBUTORS. The Editor would feel glad if Members of the Association and others, would cooperate with him in establishing as a rule, that in future no paper for publication shall exceed two pages of the Journal in length. If the writers of long communications knew as well as the Editor does, that lengthy papers always deter the reader from commencing them, this great evil would never arise. Brevity is the soul of medical writing—still more than of wit.

Members should remember that corrections for the current week's JOURNAL should not arrive later than Wednesday.

THE £1000 FUND. In answer to several correspondents who have inquired respecting their subscriptions to this Fund, we beg to reprint the advertisement which appeared in this JOURNAL of September 21st, 1855. "The £1000 Fund.—Notice to Donors. The proposals to raise a Thousand Pounds for the secure establishment of the ASSOCIATION MEDICAL JOURNAL having been unsuccessful, notice is hereby given, that all monies collected for such Fund, will, on and after the 1st of November, be returned to the Donors, minus a small deduction for postage, printing, etc., the exact amount of which has not yet been determined, as the disbursements were made by various parties. In the mean time, communications addressed to the £1000 Fund Committee, will be received by John Rose Cormack, Hon. Sec. to the Committee."

In addition to this notice, we need only add, that as the Association in its corporate capacity had nothing to do with the raising of this Fund, and as other means have been taken to pay off its liabilities, it cannot take upon itself to collect any of the contributions, and to put them to the credit of members who have not already paid their subscriptions.

MR. JOHN GORHAM. We accept the correspondence with thanks. It shall be published next week.

Communications have been received from:—MR. H. HALL; MR. D. KENT JONES; DR. JOHN KOKOLLY; MR. HENRY DAYMAN; MR. G. B. MASHVEN; DR. RADFORD; MR. G. M. HUMPHRY; DR. MURPHY; MR. J. R. HUMPHRIES (Shrewsbury); MR. CRAWFORD; MR. JOHN GORHAM; MR. W. B. KESTEVEN; MR. JOHN WINDSOR; DR. C. J. HARE; MR. J. C. S. JENNINGS; DR. SNOW; DR. F. J. BROWN; MR. AUGUSTIN PRICHARD; MR. KING (Bath); MR. ERWIN CLARKE (Worcester); MR. M. JACKSON; MR. JOHN PROPERT; DR. P. H. WILLIAMS; DR. D. NOBLE; MR. SAMUEL DREW; MR. T. HOLMES; DR. TYLER SMITH; and MR. HOOPER.