

Association Intelligence.

TO THE HONORARY SECRETARIES OF THE BRANCHES.

THE General Secretary will feel particularly obliged if the Honorary Secretaries will inform him, with as little delay as possible, of any subscriptions for the current year received by them since their last lists were forwarded to Worcester.

December, 1857.

LIST OF MEMBERS: NOTICE.

IN accordance with Law 24, a list of members of the BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION will shortly be published. Gentlemen whose designations or addresses are incorrectly given in the last list, or on the wrappers of their Journals, will oblige by at once forwarding the necessary corrections to the Editor of the JOURNAL, 37, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.

BRANCH MEETINGS TO BE HELD.

NAME OF BRANCH.	PLACE OF MEETING.	DATE.
BIRMINGHAM AND MID- LAND COUNTIES. [Ordinary Meeting.]	Hen and Chickens Hotel, Birmingham.	Thursday, Dec. 10th, 6 o'clock.

SOUTH-EASTERN BRANCH:

SOCIAL AND SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS OF THE MEMBERS RESIDENT
IN ROCHESTER, MAIDSTONE, GRAVESEND, AND
THEIR VICINITIES.

THREE scientific and social meetings of members of the South-Eastern Branch resident in Rochester, Maidstone, Gravesend, and their vicinities, will be held on the under mentioned days:

Friday, December 11th, 1857, at 3.30 P.M., at the Guildhall, Rochester.

Friday, February 12th, 1858, at 4.30 P.M., at the Guildhall, Maidstone.

Friday, March 12th, 1858, at 3.30 P.M., at the Guildhall, Gravesend.

The members resident in this district will be gratified by the attendance and assistance of any of the members of the British Medical Association.

All members of the South-Eastern Branch may attend these meetings, and be at liberty to introduce any professional friends.

Any member of the profession may, by permission of the Chairman, attend one of these meetings, subject to the rules of the Parent Society.

JAMES DULVEY, *Local Sec. pro tem.*

Brompton, Chatham, December 1st, 1857.

Editor's Letter Box.

THE RESIGNATIONS AT ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL, MANCHESTER.

SIR,—The grievances existing at St. Mary's Hospital, which have led to the resignation of five of the medical officers, are so fully set forth in their statements as to render unnecessary any further explanation. It is worthy of remark, however, that, up to the present time, no answer, official or otherwise, has appeared; unless, indeed, the letter of Dr. Radford, in the JOURNAL of the 21st inst., be considered as such.

The question naturally arises, Who formed such objectionable rules? Probably they were drawn up while the five surgeons were in office, and doubtless by means of a committee. It is certain that these five officers had nothing to do with their formation; but, as it is impossible that they could have been framed without the aid of one or more medical men acting in conjunction with the Board, it becomes rather probable that some one or more of those still connected with the hospital gave their aid in the making of laws so objectionable to their colleagues. In proof of this, I need only refer to the general nature of the rules in question. It is perfectly impossible, also, that the affairs of a hospital like St. Mary's can be

carried on by any Board, without the presence and advice of some one well acquainted with the medical departments of the institution. Cases must arise at Board meetings in which the opinion of a medical man is alone of any service; and therefore I think that it must have been the custom at St. Mary's for some one or more of the medical officers to have been present at the Board. The five surgeons who have resigned were not allowed to give their advice; whether any of those now remaining at the hospital took part in the meetings, I do not know; but if they did, I am afraid that they cannot exculpate themselves from the charge of having had something to do with the resignation of their colleagues. I think I can trace in this hospital what I know sometimes obtains in others, that one medical man domineers over his colleagues by means of the Board. The sooner this is unmasked, the better; for it cannot fail to be the cause of endless disputes, and thereby hazard the well-being of the hospital, and the status of those connected with it. Either make all the medical officers *ex officio* members of the Board, or else none, and then let the Board see how matters will go on without them. But the admission of one or a few, to the exclusion of the rest, is as unjust as it is impolitic.

It is almost a pity that the medical officers say anything about students' fees; for, during the last three years, the number of students paying fees to the hospital has only been two, and the fee is only two or three pounds. To complain that this sum has not been given to them, instead of appropriated to the funds of the hospital, is making a mountain of a molehill; and it is a pity to have spoil their otherwise satisfactory explanation by a complaint like this.

The manner in which the medical officers were treated after their resignation was by no means creditable. Of course they attended as usual to their hospital duties, and expected to do so until their successors were appointed. Accordingly, one of them went as usual to see his out-patients: he was told that they were no longer his, that arrangements had been made to supply his place until his successor was appointed, and that he had nothing further to do with the treatment of his cases; and this was a few days after a vote of thanks had been given to him by the Board. They did not even send the surgeon a message; but gave him the trouble to come to the hospital to receive the message from the house-apothecary. Such treatment needs no comment, except that some people considered it incompatible with a vote of thanks.

With reference to Dr. Radford's letter, if intended in any way to answer either the protest of the surgeons or your remarks in a former JOURNAL, it singularly fails in so doing. He states that "although only two remained on the ordinary list [there is, in reality, only one], yet the others considered it right, both as a duty and as an act of humanity, to offer their services until other surgeons were appointed." In other words, the others considered it their duty to offer, or to be allowed to offer, a gratuitous insult to their colleagues, by suddenly, and without warning, taking their patients from them.

As for their "humanity", the effect of this is best illustrated by the manner in which the poor fared. A case which occurred a few days back is one in point. A woman was taken in labour; serious symptoms set in; and the surgeon wished to operate, but could not without a consultation (according to rule). For this he had to send a mile and a half; but, before the other arrived, the woman was beyond their skill, and shortly died. Had the other surgeons been allowed to act, a consultation might have taken place within a few minutes, and the woman's life saved. That this favourable result might have been attained, was rendered probable on a *post mortem* examination, and still more so by the fact that, at the termination, the husband received a sum of money from two of the gentlemen who attended the examination. Such giving of hush-money looks very awkward; and it would appear from it that the well-being of the poor is, at all events, not enhanced by the display of humanity. The above statement is correct, for I had it voluntarily from the recipient of the donation.

Dr. Radford says that "the Board are ready at any time to vindicate their conduct." Can they vindicate their conduct in treating the five surgeons so uncourteously? Can they vindicate their conduct in allowing five efficient officers to give up their posts because of a few ridiculous rules, which might easily have been rescinded, and ought never to have been made? And this when they must have known that it would be impossible (as has since been proved), under the present rules, to get others to fill their places; for, at the last vacancy, only two candidates appeared. Can the Board vindicate their conduct in the above case, where they reversed the order

of things, and pay instead of being paid? I think not; but, until they do, I affirm that they are not anxious for the prosperity of the institution, that they are not anxious for the advancement of medical science, and that they are certainly not anxious for the welfare of the poor.

I have forwarded to you by the same post a copy of the *Manchester Guardian*, in which are two letters in corroboration of my statements. The insertion of one or both in your JOURNAL, when space allows, might be of service.

I am, etc., A MANCHESTER STUDENT.

Manchester, November 24th, 1857.

P.S. I have omitted to state that the *post mortem* examination disclosed a ruptured uterus, without obstruction of any consequence.

MEDICAL STUDENTS AT ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S.

SIR,—Having the other day a little leisure time, I went to attend one of the chemical lectures at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. I was not little amazed to find some of the students conducting themselves in the most disgraceful and undignified manner. Some of them, who had organised themselves as a body on the back seats, created such noise and confusion by undergoing various absurd and ridiculous performances, that the lecturer was frequently obliged to stop; for those on the front seats could not understand what he said, nor could the lecturer himself connect his ideas among such disturbance and clamour. The lecturer, after repeated solicitations for quietness, was finally compelled to state that he would suspend the lecture if some of the gentlemen present would not desist from such ignominious proceedings. Their conduct was more worthy of schoolboys than of young men, whose age and education should teach them more civility and manners.

Such scene at lecture was quite astonishing to me. For I attended two courses of chemical lectures at another London school, but never saw a student forgetting himself so much as to make it his great effort to interrupt the lecturer. I hope that those few of the students of St. Bartholomew's to whom these remarks relate will not bring odium and shame upon that respectable school, and on medical students generally, by indulging in childish and impudent amusements during lecture time.

I am, etc.,

ONE WHO WISHES REFORMATION.

November, 1857.

[Our readers will be careful not to take such noisy youths as those to whom our correspondent alludes as a type of the present race of students: The frequenters of the back benches at St. Bartholomew's Hospital must be only a few specimens of a *genus* nearly extinct there and in all British schools. EDITOR.]

Medical News.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, DEATHS, AND APPOINTMENTS.

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

BIRTHS.

BRADY. On November 24th, at King's Road, Brighton, the wife of John Brady, Esq., Surgeon, M.P., prematurely, of a daughter, stillborn.

BROWN. On November 29th, at Streatham, Surrey, the wife of Alexander Brown, Esq., Surgeon, of a daughter, which survived but four days.

FASKEN. On November 17th, at Chatham, the wife of — Fasken, M.D., Royal Marines Light Infantry, of a son.

GARROD. On November 25th, at 84, Harley Street, the wife of Alfred Baring Garrod, M.D., of a son.

MACPHERSON. On November 27th, at Moville, Ireland, the wife of John Macpherson, M.D., Bengal Medical Establishment, of a son.

MARTIN. On November 26th, at Reigate, the wife of *Peter Martin, Esq., Surgeon, of a daughter.

SCOTT. On November 29th, at Portsea, the widow of the late E. J. Scott, M.D., of a posthumous son.

UNDERHILL. On November 25th, at Tipton, Staffordshire, the wife of *Thomas Underhill, Esq., Surgeon, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

BLACKETT—CUTLER. BLACKETT, Joseph Byron, Esq., Surgeon, of 28, Green Street, Grosvenor Square, to Caroline Mary, youngest daughter of — Cutler, Esq., of 8, Hanover Street, on November 25th.

CHRISTIAN—OGLE. CHRISTIAN, J. Stanley, M.D., of Ovington Terrace, Brompton, to Julia, daughter of Edward Lodge Ogle, Esq., of Gloucester Crescent, South Belgravia, on November 25th.

HARTLEY—VALE. HARTLEY, the Reverend Henry Robert, curate of St. Mary's Sowerby, Yorkshire, to Martha Catherine Mary, eldest daughter of *James Theodorice Vale, Esq., Surgeon, of Birkenhead, on November 11th.

HUBBARD—BIDDELL. HUBBARD, Henry W., Esq., Surgeon, of Queen's Road, Notting Hill, to Fanny, only daughter of George Biddell, Esq., of Bayswater, at Greensted, Essex, on December 1st.

YOUNG—EDWARDS. YOUNG, Christopher, M.D., of Yarm, Yorkshire, to Emma, youngest daughter of the late Thomas Edwards, Esq., of Denbigh, at Rhyl, on November 26th.

DEATHS.

JARVIS. On November 29th, Elizabeth, eldest daughter of John Jarvis, Esq., Surgeon, of Hart Street, Bloomsbury.

NOAD. On November 27th, at Wokingham, Berks, aged 3½ years, George Rowland Elliott, eldest son of George William Noad, Esq., Surgeon.

OLMSTED, John H., M.D., of Staten Island, New York, at Nice, aged 32, on November 24th.

PHILLIPS, James, Esq., Surgeon, of Bethnal House, Bethnal Green, aged 50, on November 27th.

PRICHARD, Octavius, M.D., late of Colchester, at Northampton, aged 72, on November 28th.

APPOINTMENTS.

*CLAY, Charles, M.D., appointed Surgeon to St. Mary's Hospital, Manchester.

*CROSSE, Thomas William, Esq., elected Assistant-Surgeon to the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital.

HOURTEN, James C., M.D., of the Morningside Asylum, elected Medical Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum, Montrose.

NESFIELD, S., Esq., appointed Surgeon to St. Mary's Hospital, Manchester.

PETTINGER, G. W., Esq., appointed Surgeon to St. Mary's Hospital, Manchester.

PASS LISTS.

APOTHECARIES' HALL. Members admitted on Thursday, November 12th, 1857:—

ELLIOT, John, Kingsbridge, Devon

GALLOWAY, James, Penrith, Cumberland

HARTLEY, John Henry, Thames Ditton, Surrey

MARRIOTT, Charles Hayes, Kibworth, Leicester

MARSHALL, John

NEAL, James, Birmingham

ORMEROD, Henry, Portland Square, Bristol

RENDLE, Charles Bainbridge, Plymouth, Devon

As an Assistant—

BRITTON, Thomas, Doncaster

Thursdays, November 19th and 26th:—

CRAMMER, Samuel Richard, Canonbury Middlesex

INMAN, Joseph Hayton, Yorkshire

JEPSON, George Theophilus, Hampton, Middlesex

MORGAN, James Lawrence, Pontrilas, Hereford

STACEY, George, Hornsey

WISE, Thomas, Plumstead, Kent

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON. M.B. Second Examination, 1857. Examination for Honours.

Physiology and Comparative Anatomy.

WALKER, T. J. (University Medical Scholarship and Gold Medal), University of Edinburgh

BOND, Francis Thomas, B.A. (Gold Medal), Queen's College, Birmingham

SADLER, Michael Thomas, B.A., St. Bartholomew's Hospital

LAWRENCE, George William, King's College

LAURENCE, John Zachariah, University College

ANSTIE, Francis Edmund, King's College

ORD, William Miller, St. Thomas's Hospital

EDWARDS, St. John, University College

GILES, Samuel, B.A., Guy's Hospital

Surgery.

BUZZARD, Thomas (University Medical Scholarship and Gold Medal), King's College
 ORD, William Miller (Gold Medal), St. Thomas's Hospital
 FAWCUS, James, University College
 BOND, Francis Thomas, B.A., Queen's College, }
 Birmingham } Equal.
 LAURENCE, John Zachariah, University College }
 LAWRENCE, George William, King's College }
 CRIBB, Arthur John, Middlesex Hospital }
 FOX, William Tilbury, University College }
 MEADOWS, Alfred, King's College }
 SADLER, Michael Thomas, B.A., St. Bartholomew's Hospital }
 WALKER, Thomas James, University of Edinburgh }
 WHITFORD, Antony, King's College }

Medicine.

FOX, W. Tilbury (University Medical Scholarship and Gold Medal), University College
 LAWRENCE, George William (Gold Medal), King's College
 EDWARDS, St. John, University College
 WALKER, Thomas James, University of Edinburgh
 FAWCUS, James, University College
 ANSTIE, Francis Edmund, King's College }
 PROPERT, John Lumsden, King's College }

Midwifery.

ORD, William Miller, (Gold Medal), St. Thomas's Hospital
 MEADOWS, Alfred, King's College
 CRIBB, Arthur John, Middlesex Hospital
 GILES, Samuel, B.A., Guy's Hospital }
 WALKER, Thomas James, University of Edinburgh } Equal.
 M.D. Examination, 1857.

First Division.

ANDREW, Edwyn, University College
 BLAKE, James Gibbs, B.A., University College
 BROWN, Thomas Edwin Burton, Guy's Hospital
 CLAPTON, Edward, St. Thomas's Hospital
 EVANS, David Conway, King's College
 FOOTMAN, John, University College
 MAUDSLEY, Henry, University College
 RYAN, William Burke, Jervis St. & Middlesex Hospital
 SCURRAH, John Dewherst, University College
 STEVENS, Henry, King's College
 THOROWGOOD, John Charles, University College
 TUNZELMANN, Julius Woldemar von, University College

HEALTH OF LONDON:—WEEK ENDING NOVEMBER 28TH, 1857.

[From the Registrar-General's Report.]

THE sickness which is now so generally diffused throughout the metropolitan population continues to develop itself in a high rate of mortality. The deaths registered in London, which rose in the previous week to 1382, were of nearly equal amount in the week that ended last Saturday (November 28th), the number having been 1373. In the ten years 1847-56, the average number of deaths in the weeks corresponding with last week was 1183. But the deaths of last week occurred in an increased population; and with the view of comparison the average must be raised in proportion to the increase, in which case it will become 1301. It appears, therefore, that the deaths now returned exceed by 72 the number which the average rate of mortality, as ascertained for the close of November, would have produced. At this period, in 1847, influenza began to be very prevalent, and in a population which was not so great as it is now, the deaths from all causes rose to 1677.

The births registered last week exceeded the deaths in the same period by 227.

In this return, the number of cases in which influenza is recorded under its specific designation, is only 13; in the previous week it was 9. The epidemic has certain distinguishing features; and in all cases where medical attendants observe it, either as the primary disease, or as supervening on pulmonary or other complaints, it is important that it should be specially mentioned by that name which is both popular and scientific. It deserves to be noticed that the deaths referred to diseases of the respiratory organs, which class does not include phthisis in the tables, were precisely the same numerically as those in the same class in the previous week—the number in each case having been 390. This number exceeds the corrected average of ten weeks corresponding with

last week by 102. Of the 390, by far the largest proportion arose from bronchitis, namely, 217 deaths, which are thus distributed according to the ages at which they occurred: seventy-five occurred in the period from birth to 20 years; only five between 20 and 40 years; thirty-three in the period 40-60; eighty-seven at 60-80; and seventeen at 80 years and upwards. But to correctly estimate the widely different degrees in which bronchitis is fatal in different stages of life, it is evident that these numbers must be compared with the numbers living at the several periods.

In the last four weeks the deaths from bronchitis increased or decreased in the following numbers:—116, 152, 227, and 217; pneumonia, 115, 108, 127, and 143; whooping-cough, 40, 45, 53, and 58; phthisis, 137, 151, 159, and 171.

The deaths of six nonagenarians and one centenarian are included in the returns. Amongst the former are two women, whose respective ages were 95 and 96 years. The most advanced in life was a man who died in Trafalgar Road, Greenwich, said to have been 100 years old.

Of 43 cases in which scarlatina was fatal, four occurred in the sub-district of St. John, Westminster, and also four in that of Lambeth Church (second part). A child died of starvation, a verdict of manslaughter having been recorded in this case; and a crossing-sweeper also perished from starvation. A man who had been employed by a farrier died from glanders.

Last week the births of 803 boys and 797 girls, in all 1600 children, were registered in London. In the ten corresponding weeks of the years 1847-56, the average number was 1487.

At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the mean height of the barometer in the week was 29.575 in. The instrument fell from 30.18 in. at the beginning of the week to 29.09 in., on Tuesday, the lowest point in the week. The mean temperature of the week was 41.6°, which is 0.4° above the average of the same week in 43 years (as determined by Mr. Glaisher). The highest reading of the thermometer was 55.3°, on Monday; and the lowest 30.5°, which occurred on Wednesday. The mean daily range of the week was 13.4°. The difference between the mean dew-point temperature and the mean air temperature was 1.9°. The mean temperature of the water of the Thames was 45.9°. The wind on the first three days was in the south and south-west; afterwards, it was mostly in the north-east. The amount of rain measured was 0.78 in., most of which fell on Tuesday. The first snow this winter fell on the morning of Thursday, in large flakes.

IMPORTANT TO POOR-LAW SURGEONS: SUCCESSFUL ACTION FOR RECOVERY OF FEES.

At the Belper County Court, on November 19th, 1857, an action was tried before Joseph S. Cantrell, Esq., Judge, brought by Mr. W. Cantrell, Surgeon of the Wirksworth District in the Belper Union, against the Board of Guardians, to recover the sum of £5, due for attendance upon a poor man named Henry Smith, who, on February 13th last, sustained a compound dislocation of the ankle, and fracture of the leg, by being thrown from a gig. Mr. Stone, solicitor, of Wirksworth, appeared for the plaintiff. The defendants were represented by Mr. Greaves, of Belper.

Mr. STONE, in stating the case, said that, on February 13th last, Mr. Cantrell was called by the assistant-overseer of Wirksworth to attend a poor man named Smith, who had met with a compound dislocation of the ankle, and fracture of one of the bones of the leg. By Article 206 of the General Consolidated Order, an overseer was entitled to give an order in case of sudden and urgent necessity; and by Article 177, the surgeon, upon giving the requisite attendance upon a case like that of Mr. Smith, was entitled to the fee of £5 over and above his regular salary. It happened that, at the time of the accident, Mr. Cantrell was from home; but Dr. Webb, his partner, attended at once, and reduced the dislocation. Mr. Cantrell saw the case in an hour afterwards, and attended daily, and sometimes several times in a day, to April 4th. The fee having been disallowed by the guardians, Mr. Cantrell appealed to the Poor-Law Board, who advised his obtaining the fee from Mr. Street, the overseer who had given the order; the Board considering that the guardians were not bound to adopt the overseer's order, as it was addressed to "Messrs. Cantrell and Webb". Mr. Cantrell took a different view of the matter; and hence the present action.

Mr. CANTRELL was examined, and cross-examined by Mr. Greaves at some length, as to his appointment, his attendance

and that of his partner upon the case, and his personal knowledge of the circumstances of Smith.

Mr. BENJAMIN STREET, Assistant-Overseer of Wirksworth, deposed that, on February 13th last, he went to the scene of an accident, and found that Henry Smith and two other persons were seriously injured. He knew Smith to be in destitute circumstances, and therefore directed the parish surgeon to attend him. He afterwards wrote the order produced, and sent it to the surgeon. Smith must have had parochial relief had not he (Mr. Street) raised a subscription for his family.

Mr. GREAVES, in reply, argued that Mr. Cantrell could not recover: first, because the man Smith was not in the indigent circumstances represented, but was able to pay the surgeon himself; secondly, because the order was addressed to "Messrs. Cantrell and Webb", and therefore the guardians were not bound to adopt it as an order upon the medical officer of the Union; and thirdly, because, although Mr. Cantrell had attended the case himself, on some occasions, when Mr. Cantrell could well have attended, his partner Dr. Webb had also officiated. He held that it was the duty of a substitute only to attend during the illness or absence of the appointed medical officer. The guardians of the Belper Union believed that Mr. Cantrell was entitled to his fee, but not from them; and, acting under the advice of the Poor-Law Board, they had opposed his demand.

Mr. GREAVES here read the following letters from the Poor-Law Board to Mr. Cantrell, in reply to communications from that gentleman.

"No. 18307 (B), 1857.

"Poor Law Board, Whitehall (S.W.), 13th June, 1857.

"SIR,—I am directed by the Poor-Law Board to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st ultimo, respecting your claim to be paid the sum of £5 for your services in the case of a poor person named Henry Smith.

"In reply, I am directed to state that the guardians of the Belper Union have forwarded to the Board the order for medical attendance given by Mr. Benjamin Street, the assistant-overseer of Wirksworth. The Board perceive that the order was addressed to 'Messrs. Cantrell and Webb'; and they do not, therefore, consider it can be regarded as an order upon the medical officer which the guardians are bound to adopt; and, as they decline to do so, the Board are of opinion that you have no legal ground for complaint against the guardians. They are not aware, however, of any reason why Mr. Street, the assistant-overseer, who called upon you and your partner to attend Henry Smith, should not be applied to, to pay a proper compensation for the services which you rendered in his case. It will be open to the assistant-overseer to charge the amount in his account, assuming that the case was one in which he was justified in providing medical attendance at the cost of the poor-rates. "I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"COURTENAY, Secretary.

"To William Cantrell, Esq., Medical Officer of the Wirksworth District, Wirksworth, Derbyshire."

"No. 22248 (B), 1857.

"Poor-Law Board, Whitehall (S.W.), 26th June, 1857.

"SIR,—I am directed by the Poor-Law Board to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, in reference to the fee which you have claimed for attendance in the case of Henry Smith.

"I am directed to state that the question at issue between you and the guardians of the Belper Union, in the case in question, is one of strict legal liability; and the Board see no reason to depart from the opinion which they expressed in the letter which they addressed to you on the subject on the 13th instant. "I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"COURTENAY, Secretary.

"To William Cantrell, Esq., Medical Officer, Wirksworth, Derbyshire."

His HONOUR inquired whether Mr. Greaves was prepared to adopt those letters.

Mr. GREAVES replied in the negative, but stated that he was extremely anxious to do the best he could for his clients, who believed that the overseer was the person liable for the claim.

In giving judgment, his HONOUR said it was perfectly clear that Mr. Cantrell had received a written order to attend the man Smith, within a reasonable time, from a competent authority; for the order bore the date of the day of the accident. The nature of the case was of such a serious character that it could hardly be expected that the overseer of Wirksworth would deliberately sit down, in the midst of such excitement as usually prevails after an accident of this kind, to write an order for the parish surgeon; nor would the surgeon, actuated by

common feelings of humanity, refuse to interfere in so desperate a case until such order had been given him; but the overseer, who knew the man's circumstances well, having promised the surgeon an order, on reaching his home he wrote it and sent it to him. With regard to the order being addressed to "Messrs. Cantrell and Webb", he held that, whatever it might be with reference to Dr. Webb, it was essentially an order for Mr. Cantrell, and could not affect his claim as medical officer of the Union. He considered it absurd to suppose that a surgeon in extensive practice, who necessarily had a great many cases to attend to, could not employ occasionally a qualified gentleman as his substitute; and in this case he certainly thought that the surgeon had given very great attention. The medical man had nothing to do with Smith's circumstances. He received the order, was bound to attend to it without inquiring about the man's condition in life, and was therefore most justly entitled to a verdict, with costs.

ALLEGED REMEDY FOR HYDROPHOBIA. At a recent meeting of the Academy of Sciences in Paris, M. Guérin-Méneville sent in a letter on the *Cetonia aurata*, or rose beetle, which for some time past has engrossed the attention of naturalists as a remedy for hydrophobia. M. Méneville stated, from personal experience, that in the governments of Voroneje and Koursk, in Russia, it is customary to give dogs half a beetle in powder from time to time, mixed with bread crumbs, as a preservative against that disease; and that the Russians affirm that there are persons who cure hydrophobia radically by means of the fresh juice of a certain plant. He further suggested that the want of freshness may be the reason why these juices preserved in chemists' shops do not produce the desired effect.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS. The President and Censors of the Royal College of Physicians having learned that in the manufacture of tinctures and some other preparations of the *Pharmacopœia*, it has latterly become the practice of certain druggists and manufacturers to use methylated in the place of pure spirit, hereby declare their disapproval of such an unauthorised departure from the instructions laid down in the *Pharmacopœia*.

DISPENSERS FOR THE ARMY. Major S. G. Bunbury, commanding the Medical Staff Corps at Chatham, has received an order directing him to hold in readiness thirty orderlies, ward-masters, and stewards of that corps, who are to proceed to India for the purpose of being employed as assistant dispensers in the military hospitals.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications have been received from:—Mr. R. H. LEACH; Mr. JOHN T. JONES; Mr. G. MITCHINSON; ONE WHO WISHES REFORMATION; THE REGISTRAR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON; Mr. J. S. GAMAGE; Mr. P. C. PRICE; Mr. I. B. BROWN; Mr. C. A. BARRETT; Mr. D. PHILLIPS; Dr. MARKHAM; Mr. HOLMES COOTE; A MANCHESTER STUDENT; Mr. JOHN BIRKETT; Mr. JAMES REID; Dr. WILLIAM WEBB; Mr. DELVES; Mr. T. HOLMES; Dr. BADER; Mr. H. DUNCALFE; Mr. I. HARRISON; Dr. ROUTH; Mr. BOOTH EDDISON; Mr. THOMAS UNDERHILL; Mr. T. F. EDWARDS; Mr. HUGH NEILL; Mr. JOHN CLARKE; Dr. R. P. COTTON; Mr. C. R. THOMPSON; Mr. PETER MARTIN; Mr. SKIDMORE; Mr. JAMES DULVEY; and Dr. R. C. R. JORDAN.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Great Reduction in the Prices of
NEW MEDICAL GLASS BOTTLES and PHIALS, at the Islington Glass Bottle Works, Islington Place, Park Road. WAREHOUSE—2, Upper Copenhagen Street, Barnsbury Road, Islington, London, N. E. & H. HARRIS beg to submit the following prices for quantities not less than Six Gross, assorted to suit the convenience of the purchaser.

6 and 8 oz., any shape, plain, or graduated . . .	8s. 0d. per gross.
3 and 4 oz. ditto . . .	7s. 6d. "
1 oz. White Moulded Phials . . .	4s. 6d. "
1 oz. ditto . . .	5s. 8d. "
1½ oz. ditto . . .	6s. 0d. "
2 oz. ditto . . .	7s. 0d. "

No remittance required until the Goods are received. Packages free. Delivered free within seven miles. Immediate attention to country orders. Post-office Orders made payable to E. & H. HARRIS, at the Chief Office, London Bankers—Union Bank of London.