

Our readers would think that this overwhelming evidence in favour of rescinding the obnoxious rule would have been duly weighed by the governors; but they know little of the stuff Somerset squires are made of. To have budged a step in the way of setting themselves right with their outraged medical officers, would have been, as one of them observed, "to stultify themselves"—a sacrifice too awful for us to contemplate! Accordingly, the governors refused to budge; and, as a natural result, Drs. Burridge and Woodforde, and Mr. Welch, are no longer officers of theirs.

Of all the miserable shams which flourish in this world, the sham for the sake of which these governors have turned out gentlemen who have served them well is the most flagrant. No word has been uttered against the honourable conduct of the medical officers of the Taunton and Somerset Hospital; no imputation has been directed against them. On the contrary, they are dismissed "with the warmest thanks of the governors, and the public generally, for the zealous, assiduous, and able manner in which they have discharged their duties since their connection with the Hospital." If such was the opinion of the governors, as to the manner in which their medical officers have behaved, what possible excuse could they have for passing a resolution which they know must prove offensive?

And what do they expect to gain by this sham? They force their medical officers to sign their names and time of attendance in a book, but have they, by so doing, advanced one step towards proving their more earnest attention to their patients? If any medical officer is inclined to shirk his duties, will this petty entry have any possible effect in holding him to them?

Each day the entry will be a source of irritation to the high-minded men who sign it; for it will be a silent intimation to them that their good faith is doubted. Half confidences, as the Reverend W. A. Jones very justly observed in the discussion, are injurious both to those who give and to those who receive them; and we predict that there will be no more peace in the Taunton and Somerset Hospital until the Governors have rescinded their very objectionable order.

An attempt was made by Mr. Badcock to accommodate matters, by moving that the order should be made prospective, and not retrospective; that it should not affect the present officers of the hospital, but only their successors. We are glad to find, however, that this attempt at postponing the difficulty was defeated. If the retiring medical officers decline to receive so gross an insult, we scarcely think that they should acquiesce in its being offered to those who may wish to succeed them. They may rest assured that the obnoxious order will share the fate of similar ones previously made in other hospitals; in which case they will return to their posts with the proud satisfaction that their protest was made on the behalf of the profession, irrespective of their own personal interests.

Meanwhile, this unjust move on the part of the governors should lead medical men to consider whether, in justice to themselves, they should continue to give their services gratuitously to hospitals. If, instead of honour and respect, they gain nothing for their labours but insult and misconstruction, we say they have no right to make the sacrifice; and we should like to know what all governors would say if the profession were, only for one week, to prove true to itself, and *strike* from all hospital work. At all events, we trust that no medical man

will be found to fill the posts rendered vacant by the extraordinary conduct of the Taunton Governors; and, if any do come forward, they must expect to be marked as black sheep by those who have the power and the resolution to resent the tyranny of even such local magnates as the Governors of the Taunton and Somerset Hospital.

## THE WEEK.

THE "scheme" of the President of the Poor-law Board is likely to excite a good deal of attention among the Poor-law medical officers. This day's JOURNAL contains several letters on the subject, mostly deprecatory of several of the proposed alterations: and we have been requested to publish the following note from Mr. Griffin.

"Mr. Griffin presents his compliments to the Poor-law Medical Officers, and hopes they will not reply to the 'Scheme' of the President of the Poor-law Board until they have received the re-amended plan, now in preparation, in which important changes will be made, founded upon the suggestions already received.

"12, Royal Terrace, Weymouth, 12th Jan., 1859."

In addition to the meeting at Chippenham, of which the resolutions are given at page 55, we learn that a conference of the medical officers of the metropolitan unions was held at the Freemasons' Tavern, at eight p.m., last Thursday; and that a meeting of the profession in Norwich and its neighbourhood is intended to be held on Wednesday next, under the presidency of the senior physician of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, to take Mr. Estcourt's proposed plan into consideration. We would earnestly press on the profession in general the importance of doing all in their power to promote Poor-law medical reform, now that the President of the Poor-law Board invites the opinion of those who are interested in the subject of medical relief.

The formation of Medical Registration Associations is proceeding steadily, and much good may be expected from their labours. Besides those the institution of which has been already chronicled in the JOURNAL, two others have been formed, at Bedford and Chichester. The resolutions which were passed at these places have been forwarded to us; but we have been obliged to defer their insertion, on account of the length of the report of the proceedings at the Taunton and Somerset Hospital. We would again urge on our readers to form registration associations; and would direct their careful attention to the abstract of the report of the Committee of the London Medical Registration Association, which they will find in this day's number.

## Association Intelligence.

### YORKSHIRE BRANCH.

A SPECIAL General Meeting of the above Branch will be held at the Medical School, Leeds, on Wednesday, the 19th instant, at half-past Two P.M.,

"To consider if any, and what steps, shall be taken to secure efficient Registration, under the new Medical Act."

GEORGE HORNBY, Hon. Sec.

York, January 10th, 1859.

## MEDICAL REGISTRATION.

### NEW REGISTRATION OFFICE.

THE Medical Registrar presents his compliments to the Editor of the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, and begs to inform him that an office for the business of Registration is now opened at 32, Soho Square, where all letters for the Registrar or for the Medical Council should be addressed.

Office hours from 11 to 4.

January 10th, 1859.

## THE MEDICAL COUNCIL.

### BRANCH COUNCIL FOR IRELAND.

Monday, December 20th, 1858.

PRESENT:—Dr. Smith, in the Chair; Drs. Apjohn, Leet, Williams, Corrigan, and Stokes; Dr. Maunsell, Registrar.

The minutes of last meeting were approved and signed.

Several claims for Registration of Diplomas obtained from Foreign Universities having been considered, it was resolved—

“That they should be reserved for the General Council, under the provisions of the forty-sixth section of the Medical Act.”

Claims for Registration from persons acting as Medical Officers of Public Institutions, without qualifications, were also reserved for the General Council, in accordance with the same provisions.

In reply to inquiries, the Secretary was directed to state, that the Branch Council consider that qualifications that may be obtained after the 1st of January, 1859, may be registered by persons whose names already appear upon the Register, on payment of a fee of five shillings for each such Registration in addition.

Ordered—“That a notice stating the names of the several bodies from which certified lists have been obtained be published once in the *Advertiser* and six other journals.”

Mr. T. Roney was then appointed Clerk, at a salary of £80 a-year, the engagement to be terminable at any time at a month's notice. The hours of attendance to be from ten till four daily.

The Council then adjourned till Monday, 3rd January.

## Reports of Societies.

### ROYAL MEDICAL AND CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14TH, 1858.

SIR CHARLES LOCOCK, Bart., M.D., President, in the Chair.

#### CASE OF EXCISION OF THE HEAD OF THE HUMERUS.

BY JOHN BIRKETT, ESQ.

A MAN, aged 57, came under the care of Mr. BIRKETT in July 1855, on account of acute disease of the right shoulder-joint. He was cachectic and much reduced, and suffered intense pain. Two years and a few months before, he had the right shoulder injured by being thrust violently against a wall. The clavicle was fractured; inflammation and suppuration of the shoulder-joint ensued, and abscesses and sinuses were developed. From local indications, it was quite clear that diseased bone existed; and Mr. Birkett, being unable to feel the dead bone with a probe, exposed the head of the humerus, and sawed it off. There was a piece of necrosed bone in the head, but all the other parts and the glenoid cavity were healthy. The wound healed rapidly, although sinuses formed and remained open for some months after. The health of the patient rapidly improved, and all pain subsided. In about eighteen months after the operation, the sinuses were all healed; and for very nearly the last two years, he has been able to use the limb in the varied occupation of a farm labourer.

The details of another case were given, in which Mr. Aston

Key excised the head of the humerus from a healthy man, aged 34, in January 1849. The bone, especially the cancellous tissue, was affected with scrofulous degeneration. The case was highly successful, and the man has been actively engaged now for many years as a workman in an engineer's factory. The head of the bone was shown, together with a drawing illustrating the condition of the upper extremity seven years after the operation.

#### DISARTICULATION OF THE SCAPULA FROM THE SHOULDER-JOINT, WITH REMOVAL OF THE ACROMIAL END OF THE CLAVICLE.

BY GEORGE MATTHEW JONES, ESQ.

[Communicated by F. C. SKEY, Esq., F.R.S.]

The patient, a girl aged 14½ years, had enjoyed good health until December 1857, when she first felt pain at the top of the left shoulder, ascribed to the exertion of carrying a heavy child; severe inflammation about the shoulder followed, being most intense over the upper part of the humerus; an abscess formed, and burst spontaneously. The constitution suffered severely. When Mr. JONES first saw the patient, there were four large fistulous openings over the left shoulder; two communicating with the clavicle, one with the head of the humerus, one with the glenoid cavity, and one with the dorsum of the scapula, bare bone being easily felt in each. Several small fistulae, which did not apparently lead to necrosed bone, existed in the scapular region, and yielded an offensive discharge. The textures covering the shoulder were generally thickened and puffy, and tender to the touch. The patient's health and strength were failing rapidly; and on the 19th of May, 1858, the patient having been placed under chloroform, the operation was performed. An incision was first made along the whole extent of the spine of the scapula, and carried an inch beyond towards the mesial line of the back; another incision was then made to meet this along the upper border of the bone down to its angle. The integuments were raised by careful dissection; and by this process the whole bone was fairly exposed, its periosteal investment being everywhere found so thickened, pulpy, and softened, as to yield easily to pressure of the finger. The acromial end of the clavicle being found to be softened and altered by disease, an inch of the bone was removed. The posterior scapular artery was the only vessel which needed a ligature; several small ones were closed by torsion. Sutures and strips of plaster were used to bring the edges of the wound together, the deeper cavities, including the glenoid fossa, being plugged with lint. The operation occupied three quarters of an hour.

On examination, the scapula was found so extensively diseased that its characters were almost destroyed. The glenoid surface and neck were entirely removed, and no vestige of the spine remained, its position being occupied by new, irregularly-deposited osseous matter, at the base of which lay a deep chasm, that extended three-fourths across the body of the bone. The inferior angle of the bone was the seat of extensive caries. The body of the bone presented two deep perforations, and all these different cavities contained sequestra of dead bone, while other portions of the scapula were in different stages of exfoliation. There was also a large amount of new osseous matter deposited in different situations about the bone. The head of the humerus was found healthy, and covered with its natural cartilage.

With the exception of a very critical condition during the first two or three days, which was ascribed to the action of the chloroform, the patient made a good recovery. The wound healed entirely by granulation, the head of the humerus being exposed for some time. She was unsparingly supplied with nutritious diet and stimulants. She left her bed and walked in the garden in three weeks and as many days, and at the end of a month she could sew without pain or difficulty. At present she can raise her arm twelve inches from her side, and can support it horizontally from the body, with very slight exertion; she can raise the hand to the opposite shoulder or to the mouth with ease, but not to the top of the head; she can put her arms behind her, can lift a large and heavy hospital register book, and can scrub the floor or make her bed. There is a decided falling of the shoulder, but by no means amounting to deformity. There is no wasting of muscular substance on the chest or back, and when dressed it would not be perceived that any serious operation had been performed. The deltoid is fully developed. The head of the humerus is easily felt moving freely in its new bed, and not the slightest pain is felt on any amount of motion. Up to this present time, the range of this motion has steadily increased, and, with the exception of the movements for which the scapular organ of the deltoid

## Medical News.

### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, DEATHS, AND APPOINTMENTS.

\* In these lists, an asterisk is prefixed to the names of Members of the Association.

#### BIRTHS.

- BEAMAN. On November 27th, 1858, at Hoshungabad, the wife of Ardern Hulme Beaman, Esq., Surgeon 28th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, of a son.
- COOPER. On January 6th, at 19, Berkeley Square, the wife of W. White Cooper, Esq., Surgeon, of a son.
- CROSSMAN. On January 11th, at Whites Hill, Hambrook, near Bristol, the wife of \*Edward Crossman, Esq., Surgeon, of a son.
- DIPLOCK. On January 10th, at 1, Sydney Street, Fulham Road, the wife of Thomas B. Diplock, M.D., of a son.
- GODFREY. On January 4th, at Carlton House, Enfield, the wife of Benjamin Godfrey, M.D., of a daughter.
- HALDANE. On January 6th, at 5, Shandwich Place, Edinburgh, the wife of D. Rutherford Haldane, M.D., of a daughter.

#### MARRIAGES.

- ALLEN—MADDY. \*Allen, Richard, Esq., Surgeon, of Didsbury, near Manchester, to Catherine, eldest daughter of the late William Maddy, Esq., of Fairfield Mount, near Liverpool, at St. Stephen's Church, Kirkstall, on January 5th.
- ANDERSON—HUTCHINSON. Anderson, Thomas Goldsborough, Esq., of Carshalton, to Celia, daughter of Francis C. Hutchinson, M.D., of Brisco, Carlisle, at Upperby, Carlisle, on January 5th.
- CARR—KNAGGS. Carr, John Rodham, LL.D., barrister-at-law, Durham, to Ellen, daughter of John Knaggs, Esq., of Euston Square, London, at St. Pancras Church, on Jan. 6.
- HARRIS—COOPER. Harris, Henry, Esq., Surgeon, of Park Street, Grosvenor Square, to Caroline Augusta, youngest daughter of the late William Cooper, Esq., of Eaton Square, at St. George's, Hanover Square, on January 8th.
- KEMPTHORNE—THOMPSON. Kemplthorne, the Rev. John, M.A., of St. Paul's School, to Eliza Gertrude, eldest daughter of Theophilus Thompson, M.D., F.R.S., at St. George's, Bloomsbury, on January 4th.
- LUCY—SWAIN. Lucy, William, Esq., Surgeon, of Fenny Stratford, to Kate, younger daughter of the late Captain Swain, of Sea Mills, near Bristol, on January 6th.
- MURIEL—LYNN. Muriel, William George, Esq., Surgeon, of Wickham Market, to Susan, elder daughter of the late Edward Lynn, Esq., of Runcorn, Cheshire, at Wickham Market, on January 8th.
- REYNOLDS—PRICE. Reynolds, Robert, Esq., Surgeon, of Helions Bumpstead, Essex, to Martha Mary, only child of Joseph Price, Esq., of Mile End, at St. Dunstan's, Stepney, on January 6th.
- SIMPSON—SIBBALD. Simpson, B., M.D., Bengal Medical Service, to Agnes, eldest daughter of the late Brigadier Sibbald, C.B., Bengal Army, at Trinity Church, Upper Chelsea, on January 8th.
- STEGGALL—KENWRICK. Steggall, Charles, Mus. Doc. Cantab., of Grafton Square, Clapham, to Henrietta, youngest daughter of George Kenwick, Esq., Surgeon, of Halesowen, at Christ Church, Marylebone, on January 4th.
- TYRRELL—WRENCH. Tyrrell, Walter, Esq., Surgeon, of St. Helen's Place, Bishopsgate, to Sarah, eldest daughter of the Rev. Thomas W. Wrench, rector of St. Michael's, Cornhill, at All Saints', Norwood, on January 7th.

#### DEATHS.

- ARCHER. On January 4th, at Kentish Town, aged 2½, George Lewis, son of Lewis Hitchin Archer, Esq., Surgeon.
- CLACK, William G. S., Esq., Surgeon, at Eton, on January 5th.
- CLARKE, Frederick, Esq., Surgeon 2nd Dépôt Battalion, Fer-moy, at Cork, aged 33, on January 3rd.
- JARMAN, Thomas, Esq., Surgeon, late of Holbrook, at Ipswich, of aneurism of the heart, aged 40, on Nov. 26th, 1858.
- PICKERING, William Boulton, Esq., Surgeon, at Denton, of disease of the heart, aged 43, on December 18th, 1858.
- RAY. On December 29th, 1858, at Dulwich, aged 6, Jessie Emma, youngest daughter of \*Edward Ray, Esq., Surgeon.

YOUNG. On December 6th, 1858, at Marchfield, Barbados, Marianne Charlotte, wife of Dr. Young.

### HEALTH OF LONDON:—WEEK ENDING JANUARY 8TH, 1859.

[From the Registrar-General's Report.]

In the week that ended last Saturday, January 8th, the number of deaths registered in London was 1338. In the ten years 1849-58 the average number of deaths in the weeks corresponding with last week was 1227; but as the deaths returned for last week occurred in a population which has increased, they should be compared with the average after the latter is raised in proportion to the increase, a correction which will make it 1349. The actual number of deaths in last week approximates very closely to the result obtained by calculation.

The deaths from zymotic diseases, which in the previous week were 400, decreased last week to 317; but they are still rather above the corrected average, which is 299. Measles declined from 53 to 43, scarlatina from 135 to 119, whooping-cough from 61 to 45, typhus from 52 to 31. Last week there were 15 deaths from small-pox. There were 2 from intemperance, besides 4 in which the cause is returned as delirium tremens. A woman died from destitution in the Westminster workhouse, to which she had been removed before her death.

Last week the births of 886 boys and 852 girls, in all 1738 children, were registered in London. In the ten corresponding weeks of the years 1849-58 the average number was 1561.

At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the mean height of the barometer in the week was 30.421 in. The mean daily reading was above 30 in. from December 31st to January 8th, both days included, and last Saturday it was so high as 30.526 in. The barometrical readings varied from 30.25 in. to 30.56 in. The mean temperature of the air in the week was 35.4°, which is 0.6° below the average of the same week in 43 years. The thermometer in the shade attained its highest point 43.5° on Tuesday; and fell to its lowest 29° on Saturday. The range of the week was therefore 14.5°. The mean daily range was 7.4°. The difference between the mean dew-point temperature and air temperature was 1.8°. The mean degree of humidity of the air was 94; on Sunday and Tuesday the humidity reached 100 (or complete saturation). The mean temperature of the water of the Thames was 40.8°. On the last four days the wind blew from the north-east. The amount of rain in the week was only 0.04 in. Fogs were prevalent.

### HEALTH OF LONDON DURING THE QUARTER.

In the thirteen weeks that ended January 1st the mortality in London was high. The deaths registered in that period rose to 17,688, whereas in the four corresponding autumnal periods of 1854-7 they ranged from 13,840 to 17,238, the latter number having been in part the result of cholera and scarlatina in 1854. The excess of mortality in the quarter that has just passed arose from two causes: scarlatina (including diphtheria) which has been extremely prevalent throughout the period, and in the earlier part of it carried off about 160 persons in a week; and bronchial complaints which became unusually fatal towards the end of November, the air at that time having been remarkably cold for the season. Though the mean temperature for the quarter, 44°, was high, the early severity of the weather and its quick transitions proved fatal to young and infirm constitutions. Pulmonary diseases, which include chiefly bronchitis and pneumonia, carried off 4,075 persons; in the four corresponding quarters the numbers ranged from 2,510 to 3,732. Scarlatina was fatal in 1,814 cases, 70 of which occurred in Westminster, 141 in Marylebone (59 of these in the sub-district of Christchurch), 206 in Pancras, 84 in Islington, 88 in Poplar, 110 in Lambeth. These are some of the parts in which it was rife.

Of 471 violent deaths, 396 were by accident or negligence, 12 by murder or manslaughter, 63 by suicide.

### POOR-LAW MEDICAL REFORM.

#### MEETING AT BEDFORD.

At a meeting of members of the medical profession of Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire, held at the George Hotel, in Bedford, on January 6th, 1859, for the purpose of forming a Medical Registration Association, and of considering the heads of a "scheme for Poor-Law Medical Relief", submitted by the Poor-Law Board, it was resolved *nem. con.*—

"That this meeting expresses its confidence in the judgment of Mr. R. Griffin, relating to the 'Heads of a Scheme,'

lately issued by the Poor-Law Board: that Mr. Griffin be requested to negotiate for the alterations suggested in the several clauses of his amendment, and for the addition of Clause 17. That Mr. Griffin's attention be directed to Clause 10, which, in the opinion of this meeting, does not leave the diet of the patient sufficiently under the direction of the medical officer; and, lastly, that he be requested, if possible, to procure the withdrawal or modification of Clause 3, inasmuch as it appears that this clause will be likely to act prejudicially to the profession."

## MEETING AT CHIPPENHAM.

At a well-attended meeting of the Poor-Law Medical Officers of North Wilts, held at Chippenham, January 10, 1859, the following resolutions were passed:—

"That this meeting accepts Mr. Estcourt's invitation to comment upon the scheme submitted to medical officers, and are unanimously of opinion—

"1. That every union appointment should be permanent: and such opinion having been affirmed by a parliamentary committee, and sanctioned in most cases by the Poor-Law Board, those gentlemen holding union appointments regard them as vested rights, and are unwilling to make any surrender or modification of a privilege conceded to all other public officers.

"2. That their own interests, and the public service, would both suffer by a system which would subject the medical officers to pauper suffrage—introduce a system of professional rivalry into every village—unnecessarily concentrate the medical staff of a union on every parish in succession—and entail considerably increased expenditure, by rendering the area of service unlimited—and also interrupt that professional harmony which recent legislation tends so much to encourage.

"3. The meeting unanimously accepts the principle of a sufficient fixed salary, based upon a system of payment per case, revisable triennially, and begs to call attention to the undermentioned notes agreed to by them, and signed by their chairman.

"Clause 1. Dissented from. Appointment to be permanent. 2. Agreed to, but residence in district not necessary. 3. Dissented from *in toto*. 4. Dissented. 5 to 10 inclusive. Agreed to. 11. On a uniform and definite scale, with mileage, if one mile from residence. 12. Remuneration insufficient both on 1st and 2nd heads, and 3rd head a definite sum necessary. 13. See No. 3. 14, 15, and 16. Agreed to."

ARTHUR ADYE, *Chairman*.

## MEDICAL REGISTRATION: MEETING AT BAKEWELL.

A MEETING of medical gentlemen was held at the Rutland Arms, Bakewell, Derbyshire, on Monday, 20th December, 1858. There were present—James Walters, Esq., Chas. Evans, Esq., Thomas H. Newsam, Esq., and David Knox, M.D., of Bakewell; John Gregory, Esq., and Edmund Spencer, Esq., of Youlgreave; William Condall, Esq., of Baslow; John Armitage Pearson, Esq., of Buxton; Edward Brown, Esq., of Matlock; John L. Parke, Esq., of Tideswell; Thomas Fentem, Esq., of Eyam. James Walters, Esq., F.R.C.S., was called to the chair, and the following resolutions were passed.

1. Proposed by W. CONDALL, Esq., seconded by J. A. PEARSON, Esq.—

"That an Association be formed, and that it be called the Bakewell and North Derbyshire Medical Registration Association."

2. Proposed by THOS. FENTEM, Esq., seconded by T. H. NEWSAM, Esq.—

"That the object of the Association shall be to cooperate with the Medical Council and Registrar in carrying out the provisions of the Medical Act."

3. Proposed by J. GREGORY, Esq., seconded by E. SPENCER, Esq.—

"That the sum of 2s. 6d. be paid by each member on admission towards defraying the expenses of the Association."

4. Proposed by W. CONDALL, Esq., seconded by C. EVANS, Esq.—

"That a committee be formed of all the gentlemen present, three to be a quorum."

5. Proposed by J. A. PEARSON, Esq., seconded by E. BROWN, Esq.—

"That Dr. Knox be appointed Honorary Secretary and Treasurer."

6. Proposed by J. A. PEARSON, Esq., seconded by J. GREGORY, Esq.—

"That J. Walters, Esq., be the Chairman of this Association. That the Hon. Secretary be requested to invite every legally qualified orthodox practitioner in the district to join this Association."

7. Proposed by J. A. PEARSON, Esq., seconded by W. CONDALL, Esq.—

"That this meeting stand adjourned to Monday, January 17th, 1859."

A vote of thanks was then accorded to the Chairman for his efficient conduct in the chair, after which the meeting separated.

DAVID KNOX, M.D., *Hon. Sec. & Treasurer*.

## LONDON MEDICAL REGISTRATION ASSOCIATION.

THE General Committee of this Association met on Wednesday, January 5th, at the British Coffee House, Cockspur Street. The "Vigilance Committee" brought up a Report, in which they stated, that they had waited on Dr. F. Hawkins, and had recommended the adoption of a form to be filled up by every applicant for registration. They had also sought an interview with the Executive Committee of the Medical Council for England; and, in doing so, had enclosed copies of the following resolutions, passed at a meeting of the Committee of the Medical Registration Association, on December 22nd, 1858:—

"1. That this committee having learnt from Dr. Hawkins, the Registrar of the Medical Council, the mode at present adopted for registering practitioners under the New Medical Act, declare their conviction that such mode is loose and inefficient, and does not afford an adequate security against fraudulent registration.

"2. That it is within the knowledge of this committee that many persons are practising the medical profession with diplomas fraudulently obtained, and that as such persons may seek to be registered under the New Medical Act by virtue of such diplomas, this committee would urge upon the Executive Committee of the Branch Medical Council the necessity of adopting a 'form' of declaration of qualifications to be used by all persons applying to be registered, and which should be duly attested by the signature of a credible witness, whereby persons obtaining registration by fraud would be amenable to Clause xxxix of the Act."

No reply having been received from the Executive Committee, the committee have drawn up and forwarded the following protest to Sir B. Brodie, the President of the Medical Council:—

"To Sir Benjamin Brodie, Bart, F.R.S., D.C.L., etc.,  
*President of the Medical Council*.

"SIR,—As office-bearers and a Committee of the London Medical Registration Association, we beg most respectfully to call your attention to the plan of registration as at present adopted by the Registrar, Dr. Francis Hawkins, and we are induced to do so because we feel that the profession to which we belong is in peril of being deprived of the boon which the recent Medical Act undoubtedly confers on it, by the inefficient and unsatisfactory manner in which the provisions of the Act relating to registration are put into practice. The Association which we have the honour to represent, perceives, with much concern and regret, that the instructions given to the Registrar by the Executive Committee of the Medical Council do not require him to pursue a mode of registration sufficiently stringent to prevent unqualified persons from enrolling themselves on the register, and thereby usurping the privileges of duly-qualified medical practitioners. All that has been hitherto required for registration consists in the payment of a fee, and the handing in a name which appears on one or other of the 'certified lists.' Any production of the documents conferring the qualifications professed, evidence of the lawful possession of these, or proofs of identity, are deemed unnecessary, the *exception* being thus followed rather than the rule prescribed by Clause xv of the Medical Act. We therefore feel it incumbent upon us to protest against a course which is so palpably inefficient and open to abuse.

"A deputation from our Association waited on Dr. Hawkins on the 22nd ultimo; and, on learning from him that he was acting under the directions of the Executive Committee, we communicated by letter with that body, but, not having received their reply, we address ourselves to you as President of the Medical Council, in the full assurance that you will not disregard so strong an expression of opinion from your medical brethren on a subject which so materially affects their interests. We earnestly hope that you will, without delay, use

your influence to improve the present system of registration, which must result in the publication of an inaccurate and incomplete register, alike injurious to the public and the profession. Before closing this communication, we think it right to express it as our opinion, that it is essential to registration that the Registrar should, in the case of *every* applicant, require a simple form of declaration to be signed, to the effect that he is (or has been) lawfully *possessed* of the document of the qualification which he claims to register, and that he is the person mentioned in the document or documents evidencing his qualifications; this declaration to be attested by the Registrar, or some credible witness. Such a plan, we believe, will be both simple and effectual, and will not impose an irksome task on the qualified members of our profession, while it will deter unqualified persons from attempting to register, by bringing them within the severest penalty of the Act, as provided by Clause xxxix. We respectfully inclose a copy of a form which appears to us to be suitable for the purpose. Awaiting your reply,

"We have the honour to remain, sir, your very obedient servant,

"Geo. Webster, M.D., *President*. John Brady; John Lavies; John Propert,—*Vice-Presidents*. Theo. E. Ladd, M.D., *Hon. Secretary*. William Adams; Robt. Cross, M.D.; Charles Day; E. A. Kirby, M.D.; Matthew Ledger; Wm. Thorn, M.D.; H. G. Wright, M.D.,—*Members of the Committee of the London Medical Registration Association*.

"Committee Room, British Coffee House,  
27, Cockspur Street, Jan. 9th, 1859."

A large number of members have joined the Association, and Mr. Fergusson has consented to become one of its Vice-Presidents.

#### TAUNTON AND SOMERSET HOSPITAL: DISMISSAL OF THREE MEDICAL OFFICERS.

A SPECIAL meeting of the governors of the Taunton and Somerset Hospital was held on Thursday, January 6th, in conformity with the subjoined circular:—"The governors, at the last general annual meeting, having made a rule requiring each of the medical and surgical officers to record his attendances at the hospital in a book provided for that purpose, the Committee have received communications from three of those officers that they consent to comply therewith, and from the other three that they decline so to do. The Committee, therefore, hereby give notice, that a special general meeting of the governors will be held at the Hospital, on Thursday, the sixth day of January next, at one o'clock in the afternoon, to consider the said communications, and to take such steps thereon as the governors at such meeting shall think fit."

F. W. NEWTON, Esq., presided, and there were also present Messrs. E. A. Sanford, J. R. Allen, R. K. M. King, W. E. Gillett, J. Young, W. Barrett, F. Rossiter, T. Rawle, W. Blake, C. H. Cornish, F. Welch, F. H. Dickinson, D. Blake, R. M. King, A. G. Lethbridge, W. Moody, Jno. Wood, B. Abraham, R. Hedley, jun., T. P. Broadmead, Jno. Norman, and R. G. Badcock; Revds. W. A. Jones, T. Sotherby, W. J. Allen, J. M. Cox, G. R. Lawson, F. Howse; Lieut.-Col. Todd, Capt. Patton, Drs. Kinglake, Woodford, Lidden, Burridge, and Metford; Messrs. W. W. Coker, C. A. Moody, M.P., W. H. P. G. Langton, M.P., G. Trenchard, S. Pollard, W. F. Elliott, H. Alford, H. J. Alford, W. Kelly, G. Beadon, E. Beadon, J. Halliday, J. C. Easton, C. Bluett, W. Rawlinson, W. P. Pinchard, H. C. Trenchard, F. Welch, and B. Pinchard.

The CHAIRMAN having opened the proceedings,

The SECRETARY read the resolutions and letters relating to the subject before the meeting. The resolutions of the annual meeting added to Rule 6 of the "Regulations for the Medical Department," a proviso that the physicians and surgeons of the hospital should, "at each of their attendances, enter the date and time of such attendance in a book to be provided for that purpose." To this regulation the medical men objected; and communications passed between them and the Committee, resulting in Dr. Kinglake, Mr. Alford, and Mr. C. H. Cornish assenting to the regulation, and Dr. Burridge, Dr. Woodforde, and Mr. F. Welch refusing to do so, on the ground that it was derogatory to the profession to which they belonged.

Dr. KINGLAKE stated that he was not willing to convert to the regulation. He proposed compliance therewith to his colleagues because he thought their resignation—and to his mind there was no other course open—would be more injurious to

the interests of the hospital than conforming to the rule would injure their professional status.

Dr. WOODFORDE thought it would tend more to the harmonious settlement of the question if he at once entered into the reasons himself and his colleagues had for declining to accede to the proposition. They had been told, and he believed it was the only reason which had been assigned for the alteration of the rule, that the alteration had taken place with a view to protect the medical officers. As the alteration had taken place, it was stated that in declining to accede to the rule they resisted the authority of the governors. He begged most respectfully to disclaim altogether anything like a feeling or desire to resist either the rules of the hospital, or the proper, just, and legitimate authority of the governors. He was himself a governor, and the only motive which actuated him in taking the part he did, was a warm desire to promote the interests of the institution. His colleagues and himself believed the practice proposed was unnecessary; that the rules which previously existed were sufficient both for their protection and the true interests of that institution; and upon that ground they declined to comply with the clause imposing a duty upon them which did not form any part of their original agreement. They had taken that view of the question upon professional grounds—personal grounds they altogether disclaimed. He hoped and trusted that every one would dismiss all such feelings, and that they would simply discuss the subject with a view to the benefit of the hospital and the patients who came there for relief. [*Applause.*] He had deemed it requisite, as far as possible, to ascertain the feeling of the profession on the subject throughout the kingdom; and on the 22nd of December last he addressed a letter, a copy of which he produced, to the medical staff of every hospital in the country, amounting altogether to seventy-nine. Although that appeal was made under disadvantageous circumstances, inasmuch as it was not signed by the whole of the staff, they had received replies from all but fourteen institutions. In his hand he held a table arranged according to counties alphabetically, of every one of the seventy-nine hospitals, against the names of which he had written an extract from the letter received therefrom, embodying, as far as could be in a brief space, the contents, spirit, and tone of the letter. In a great proportion of cases, the gentlemen applied to had sent copies of the rules of their hospitals, and the medical staffs had formally passed a resolution specifying their opinion. The number of hospitals out of the seventy-nine in which no such rule had ever existed or been proposed was fifty-four; the number in which it had been attempted to carry such a rule without success was four; the number in which such a rule had existed for a time, and then been rescinded, two; the number in which some such rule was in operation was five; and the number from which replies had not been received was fourteen; making a total of seventy-nine hospitals. He would first read a few of the replies from hospitals in which no such rule existed, nor had been proposed. Dr. Woodforde read replies from the medical officers of the Radcliffe Infirmary, Oxford; the Addenbrooke Hospital, Cambridge; and the Bristol General Hospital; in all of which it was strongly stated that such a rule as the one in question would be offensive, and would not be by them complied with. The tone of all the fifty-four letters was the same. All the writers were quite unanimous in declaring the regulation derogatory. Dr. Christison of Edinburgh expressed his belief that such a rule did not prevail anywhere in Scotland. He had now done with the fifty-four replies and the fourteen not received, and would proceed to deal with the remaining eleven. In four institutions such a rule had been attempted to be introduced, but had never been carried. The Leeds Infirmary was one of these; and the medical officers stated that, on their declaring they would rather resign than accede to the proposition, it was not urged. At the Sheffield General Infirmary, on two occasions, the committee had threatened to introduce the practice, but had never brought it before the general board of governors. There were two institutions in which such a law had for a time existed, and had been rescinded. One was the Worcester Infirmary, where the proposition was carried because one of the surgeons did not attend. Sir Charles Hastings had told him that, when the rule was in operation, it was productive of no good result, was found to be inconvenient, and, at the quarterly meeting of the governors on the day preceding the date of his letter, it was rescinded. In the Essex and Colchester Hospital, the rule was rescinded on the medical officers protesting against it. He was quite willing to place the whole of the letters in the hands of the committee, or to show them to any governor. He had now to direct the attention of the

meeting to the institutions where the rule existed. The first was Queen's Hospital, Birmingham, where he was informed by Mr. Gamgee that the regulation in question was strictly adhered to. This hospital formed one of those exceptions which proved the rule. Like the London hospitals, it was connected with a large medical school, and the staff of the hospital was in receipt of considerable emoluments in the shape of fees from the students. On this account, the record was kept very properly and justly. The whole staff of the Birmingham General Hospital had signed a letter declaring such a rule offensive and derogatory. In the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Infirmary, the regulation was carried out: that institution was connected with a large medical school. At the Stafford General Infirmary the rule had passed; but Dr. Knight informed him that it was never enforced; that it was intended to protect the medical officers from false charges sometimes made by discontented and unreasonable patients; and that he (Dr. Knight) had never signed his name in the book, and did not expect to do so, although he had been in continuous attendance on the patients for upwards of half a century. The only two hospitals similar to the Taunton and Somerset were those of Canterbury and of Devon and Exeter. In the latter, the law required that surgeons should sign the book, and that physicians should not. The rule was there strongly objected to; and one of the surgeons had never signed his name. At the Canterbury Hospital, the medical staff now acting had been elected long after the establishment of the rule, and therefore had no ground whatever to oppose it. He thought the governors must see that their medical officers had the unanimous opinion of the profession with them on this question; and that there was a very strong feeling that they ought not to be subjected to any such protective rule, even assuming protection to be the only ground on which the rule was imposed upon them. He submitted whether it would not be more calculated to restore the harmony which ought to subsist between the medical officers of the hospital and the hospital authorities, if the new rule were rescinded. He asked them, as an act of generosity and justice to him and his colleagues, and as an act of justice to the patients, either to move, or to support him in moving, the rescinding of the rule. [Applause.]

Dr. METFORD proposed—

"That the clause added to Rule 6 of the regulations for the medical department at the last annual meeting be rescinded." He observed that, in their report for 1857, the committee said, "On the occasion of the forty-seventh anniversary of this institution, we have pleasure in congratulating you upon its prosperity and continued usefulness;" and at the end of the report it is printed, "Your committee wish to bear their sincere testimony to the kindness and attention manifested towards the patients of the institution by your medical and surgical officers, and most gratefully acknowledge those services." Now, after that report of their committee, he did not think it at all proper that any rule inimical to the medical staff should be enforced. [Hear, hear.]

Dr. BURRIDGE seconded the resolution.

Mr. JOHN WOOD would endeavour to confine himself to two or three remarks in a most peaceful and amicable spirit. He was ignorant of the proceeding which led to the adoption of the additional rule by the governors. He would assume that they had cogent reasons for wishing to amend the rule; and as they had done so, it seemed to him they would be stultifying themselves if they did not carry out that alteration. He had heard in Dr. Woodforde's statement no reason of such a cogent character as to induce the governors to relax and to turn back. It seemed to him to be a most extraordinary proceeding, that when a matter of that kind was brought before the board of governors, and the issue appeared to be whether the etiquette of professional men should prevail against the decision of a body of governors, they should be met by a heap of correspondence, in which they heard only the medical officers of the institutions referred to. What would be said if the governors, who were anxious that this rule should be carried out, had sent a circular to the governors of every hospital throughout the land, and then come there with an answer to every letter? Dr. Woodforde seemed to think that there was something uncourteous in the rule, and that it was inexpedient that medical men should be so coerced. They seemed to think that, rendering gratuitous services to the hospital, for which he and the other governors were much thankful, they ought not to be subjected to this rule. They came to the hospital: how could the record of that fact at all militate against their professional status? He was very glad that the motion had taken the form it had—that the resolution should be rescinded.

That seemed to be a plain and simple issue. What the governors had done was known not only in Taunton, but throughout the county of Somerset; and there being a strong wish to support them, it would be absolutely impossible for the governors to recede. [Hear, hear.] If he had the pleasure of the personal acquaintance of Dr. Woodforde and the other gentlemen, he would beg and entreat them, and it would be looked upon as an act of grace, favour, and manly dignity, to yield to the wish of the governors.

Mr. SANDFORD said he could not support the resolution before the meeting, because only a very short time ago he voted for the annexation to the rule, and he had heard nothing that day from Dr. Woodforde to induce him to alter his opinion. He would merely add his personal entreaty to Mr. Wood's, that the medical gentlemen would acquiesce in the wishes of so large a body of their fellow governors.

The Rev. W. A. JONES observed that, by enforcing this rule, it was intended to establish a means of ascertaining whether the medical officers had fully and properly carried out the objects of the charity. His own conviction was, that under the rule, the governors were as dependent upon the honour of their medical officers for the full and faithful discharge of their duties as they were before the clause was appended to Rule 6. What was the extent of the record to which they attached so much importance? It simply amounted to this; that the medical officer, at some time, was in that room, and recorded his name in the book. The official might have under his care twenty or thirty patients; but the record did not tell that he had visited one of those patients, or what time he had devoted to them, or what care he had bestowed upon them. [Hear, hear.] It was infinitely better that they should openly place themselves, so to speak, at the mercy of their medical officers for the faithful discharge of their duty, than to require compliance with a formula exceedingly distasteful to the members of the profession, and useless for the purposes for which it was intended. [Hear, hear.] The rule was represented as a means of protecting their officers against any imputation of blame. But the medical officers did not choose to avail themselves of that protection; they said to the governors, "We are obliged to you for your consideration, but we do not require that protection." If they did not require it, why should it be enforced upon them? Then, was it required to protect the patients? As he had shown, they could not, by its agency, protect the patients to the full extent which would be necessary, if they had not perfect confidence in their medical officers. He considered the regulation as ineffective; and if it was ineffective, or if there was any doubt whether the regulation would accomplish its object, it became a serious question whether they were justified in disturbing the affairs of the hospital for an uncertain good. He knew, many of the poor out-patients looked forward with very great dismay to the possibility of a severance of the relation they sustained to the medical officers of that charity. [Hear, hear.] There was respect likewise due to professional feeling. The feeling of the officers of the hospital was almost universally shared by the medical profession throughout the kingdom. There was an *esprit de corps*, which members of a profession know how to rightly appreciate. [Hear, hear.] The reverend gentleman ended by submitting that a case was clearly made out, which would fully justify the governors in rescinding the rule. [Applause.]

Mr. C. A. MOODY said that, if they were to adopt the suggestion which the Rev. Mr. Jones had made—though it hardly amounted to a suggestion—if they were to require the insertion in the book of the names of the persons visited, that would be exceedingly derogatory. They had not the slightest suspicion of their medical officers doing their duty amply, ably, and most conscientiously. The rule, or addition thereto, did not rest on any suspicion towards them, but had been made on other grounds. He would earnestly wish that the medical officers would do what they had been requested to do, for he could not see that it would be in the least derogatory. [Hear.]

Mr. R. BADCOCK said that it was not his intention to vote for the rescinding of the resolution. He felt a warm sympathy with the medical officers. He could not agree with what had fallen from Mr. Moody, that there had been no want of confidence in the medical gentlemen. It had been rumoured about, that some of the officers of that institution had neglected their duty, and it was the opinion of many that on that account the rule under discussion had been passed. This might have been disclaimed, but he had never heard it disclaimed. If any of the medical officers had neglected their duty, the charge should have been brought home to them, and they should have had an opportunity of meeting that charge. He did not wish to



shirk his duty in this matter; he wished to do justice to the medical officers, and to himself as a governor. He thought, seeing the feeling of the profession at large, seeing also the length of time which their medical officers had served the hospital faithfully and diligently, they might make the disputed alteration prospective instead of retrospective, viz., that the officers who had been appointed when no such rule existed, and who objected to conform thereto, might be excused, and that it might have effect only with their successors. [*Hear, hear.*]

Mr. W. MOODY said that the rule was made to protect the committee as well as the medical officers. Complaints were constantly carried from hospitals by patients that they had not been properly attended to. The committee asked the medical men to enter their attendances, so that the imputations of neglect could be at once disproved by reference to the book.

Dr. WOODFORDE observed that the letters he had brought forward contained the opinions, not only of the profession, but also of the boards of governors of all the hospitals who made the rules thereof. It was not a fair statement to say it was only the opinion of the profession. As Mr. Jones had very ably pointed out, the signature in the book did not at all protect them from the insinuations thrown out against them. How could the committee say when he had signed his name in the book that he had seen the patients? Whenever a complaint against the medical officers was made, let there be strict investigation. It was surely not a more invidious thing to investigate the truth of a complaint than to impose a law upon them, which might expel from their hospital officers, the junior of whom had served the institution faithfully for twelve years. He should be satisfied with the adoption of the suggestion Mr. Badcock had thrown out.

Dr. BURRIDGE thought Mr. Badcock's suggestion was the best. The governors had created a penal enactment, and had constituted themselves legislators, judge, jury, and witnesses, and to-day they had come to inflict the punishment. For what? For nothing at all! If he had transgressed in any way in the performance of his duty towards the poor people committed to his charge, he was ready to meet anything in the shape of a sensible charge, anything that could be brought to bear upon his conduct with regard to the hospital during twenty-two years. Let them make a charge substantially, and not subject him to a penal enactment before proving anything. Was that English? He was at a loss how to characterise such proceedings.

Mr. CORNISH said if the rule were derogatory to them it would be equally derogatory to their successors.

Mr. R. BADCOCK proposed as an amendment—

"That the clause appended to Rule 6 at the last annual meeting of the governors, requiring the medical staff to record their visits to the hospital, be not enforced on those medical officers whose appointments date anterior to the adoption of the clause."

Mr. H. TRENCHARD seconded the amendment.

Mr. ALFORD would have seconded the amendment if Mr. Trenchard had not. He had inserted a letter in the papers recommending the same course, believing that that was the right manner to settle the matter without injury to the charity. His own practice shewed that he did not think the rule derogatory to the profession. [*Hear, hear.*]

Mr. C. A. MOODY would vote for the amendment. He hoped that by such a resolution the medical men who had refused to sign their names on compulsion would be induced to do so voluntarily.

The mover and seconder of the original resolution withdrew it in favour of Mr. Badcock's amendment.

After a discussion in which Messrs. Dickenson, W. Moody, Sandford, J. Wood, and Badcock, and Drs. Woodforde and Burridge took part,

The CHAIRMAN then put Mr. Badcock's motion to the meeting, 22 hands being held up for it, and 25 against it. The motion was declared to be lost.

Mr. W. MOODY suggested an adjournment; but this being objected to, he moved—

"That the offices of physician and surgeon to this hospital, now held by Dr. Woodforde, Dr. Burridge, and Mr. Welch, on each and all of them having refused to comply with one of the standing regulations of this hospital relating to their offices, be declared vacant, and that the committee be authorised to take the requisite steps for filling up the said offices respectively, and for providing for the medical care of the patients in the meantime."

Mr. J. R. ALLEN seconded the motion.

The Rev. Mr. LAWSON observed that many governors felt strongly that if the law could be made prospective in its operation it would meet with the approval of the profession and meet the wish of the governors. It would also smooth the way exceedingly, and take away all cause of difficulty, if the gentlemen who objected would resign their offices and offer themselves for re-election according to the new terms.

Mr. DICKINSON did not think it fair, on a matter of etiquette like this, to ask gentlemen to place themselves in such a situation. He moved that the question be adjourned.

Capt. PATTON seconded Mr. Dickinson's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN put Mr. Dickinson's amendment, when nineteen voted for it, and nineteen against it. Mr. King asked that his vote might be taken as two, as representing the Taunton Union, and on the show of hands being retaken, the amendment was lost, eighteen voting for it, and twenty-two against it.

On a division being taken on the original resolution, 23 hands were held up for it, and 6 against it. It was therefore carried. The medical officers at once left the room.

Mr. R. K. M. KING proposed—

"That the Chairman be requested to communicate the resolution just passed to Dr. Burridge, Dr. Woodforde, and Mr. Welch, accompanied by an expression of sincere regret that the alteration of the rule in question—having for its object the advancement of the general benefits of the hospital, and without, as they believe, imposing any new duty which may be considered irksome on the medical or surgical officers, or derogatory to their professional status—has resulted in the loss of their services, to whom, nevertheless, the warmest thanks of the governors and the public generally are due for the zealous, assiduous, and able manner in which they have discharged their duties since their connection with the hospital."

Mr. SANFORD seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

On the motion of Mr. DICKINSON a vote of thanks was accorded the Chairman for his impartial conduct in the chair on that trying occasion.

The meeting then separated, having lasted two hours and a half.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications have been received from:—Dr. WOODFORDE; Dr. MO WILLIAM; Mr. T. T. BLAKE; Dr. W. H. COLBORNE; Mr. C. S. JONES; Mr. J. KNAGGS; Mr. S. SMITH; Mr. C. ANDERTON; Dr. RANKING; Mr. J. JARMAN; Mr. S. BARTON; Mr. J. H. GRAMSHAW; Dr. HENRY HARE; Mr. C. C. WALLIS; Dr. HERAPATH; Dr. D. KNOX; Dr. F. HAWKINS; Mr. H. W. T. ELLIS; Dr. J. G. DAVEY; Mr. WILLIAM MARTIN; Dr. W. B. MUSSETT; Mr. T. HOLMES; Dr. MACKINDER; Dr. J. BULLAR; Mr. E. CROSSMAN; Mr. GRIFFIN; Dr. JOHN HUGHES; Mr. R. S. STEDMAN; and Mr. STONE.

#### ADVERTISEMENTS.

### Elastic Spiral Supporters.

"VOULLION'S PATENT"—"FIRST QUALITY"—SILK.

For Swelled Legs, Varicose Veins, Weak Knees, Ankles or Wrists, as Abdominal Supports for both sexes.

Recommended by upwards of 200 first-class Medical Men.

Durable, porous, light, and inexpensive, these appliances stand unequalled.

Illustrated and Priced Catalogues post free. A liberal Discount to the Profession.

MEACHER, Operative Chemist, &c., Proprietor and sole Manufacturer, 105, Crawford Street, Baker Street. Established 1814.

### WINE AT HALF DUTY.

### Quality and Economy combined.—

SOUTH AFRICAN PORT and SHERRY. .20s. and 24s. per doz.

SOUTH AFRICAN MADEIRA and AMONTILLADO. .24s. per doz.

Pure, full body, with fine aroma.

"After giving them a very close scrutiny, we can with the greatest confidence recommend these wines to our friends."—*Vide Morning Herald*, Nov. 6, 1858.

"We have great pleasure in bearing our testimony to the superior quality of wines of Messrs. Brown and Brough."—*Vide Morning Advertiser*, Nov. 8, 1858.

"Some samples which we have selected from the extensive and superior stock of Messrs. Brown and Brough, prove, upon trial, that these wines are richer and finer flavoured than much of the foreign wines."—*Vide John Bull*, Nov. 13, 1858.

"Chemical analysis has proved Messrs. Brown and Brough's wines to be free from all adulteration, and experience attests them to be both salutary and agreeable to the palate."—*Vide Medical Circular*, November 17, 1858.

Delivered free to any London Railway Terminus.

Terms, Cash. Country Orders must contain a remittance.

BROWN AND BROUGH, WINE AND SPIRIT IMPORTERS, 29, STRAND, and 24, CRUTCHER FRIARS, LONDON.

