prophylactic power of venesection in obviating the tendency to inflammatory action, or in arresting its progress, or in removing its effects when present. In reference to treatment, he recom-mended the removal of foreign substances, and all other causes of irritation, when practicable, from the wound. When the wound was small, and especially if there should be two openings, the closing of the anterior was to be attempted; and, if there were no sign of effusion, both might be closed. In all cases, absolute rest, cooling beverages, and moderate nourishment was called for, avoiding over-stimulation. Bleeding, mercurialisation, narcotism, and antimony, the old elements of treatment, might, under the direction of sound skill, and under special circumstances, become advisable; but their routine application is second only in mischief to the injury itself.

The following summary closed the paper:-

1. When a weapon or bullet enters a pleural cavity, the external air passes inwards.

2. If the wound be small, there seems to be little, if any, alteration in the movement of the lungs; as the respiratory murmur may be heard, more or less distinctly, on auscultation.

3. It follows from No. 2, and has been otherwise proved, that when a wound is formed in a pleural cavity, of a size equal to, if not larger than the opening at the glottis, collapse of lung is not a necessary consequence. That, under such circumstances, the lung of the injured side may inflate, and that such inflation occurs during expiration, and not, as might have been anticipated, during inspiration.

4. That the thorax may be pierced by a cutting instrument or a bullet, obliquely or transversely, without wounding the lung-ergo, the existence of two apertures is no proof that the lung has been wounded.

5. That mechanical congestion of the lung is often mistaken

for the effects of inflammatory action. 6. That simple opening of the pleural cavity in animals seems to be productive of little or no risk, and only very That in the human subject, as well as in animals, an

actual wound of the substance of the lung is always, sooner or later, mortal; but not from the effects of inflammatory action, but from the cessation of proper aeration, in either a whole or portions, of one or two lungs.

Editor's Letter Box.

NARCOTIC INJECTION IN NEURALGIA. LETTER FROM ALEXANDER WOOD, M.D.

Sin,-Since I explained at the Association meeting here my method of treating neuralgia, and more especially since the publication of my address in the Burnsh Medical Journal, I have been overwhelmed with letters on the subject. Most of these inquire where the instrument can be procured; and others request information in regard to the class of cases in which it is likely to be successful.

As a general answer to the first class of querists, I refer to the advertisement of Mr. Young in the current number of the JOURNAL.

In regard to the second, I have found the narcotic injection useful in all cases of pain seated in or following the course of a nerve—including of course sciatica. In the treatment of these cases, the tender point must be ascertained, and the in-jection applied in it. I have never seen it of the least service

jection applied in it. I have never seen it of the least section in rheumatic pains affecting fascise, or muscular fibre. I yesterday sent home, perfectly free from pain after two applications, a man, in whom one of our most eminent sur-geons divided the affected nerve in one operation, and two years afterwards (the first operation having failed to give re-lief), removed the bone down to the infra-orbital foramen. This second operation having been unsuccessful, he applied to me. He had been twenty four hours free from pain after the second puncture. I would have kept him under observation longer, but he was anxious to get home, but he intends to apply again if the pain returns.

I hope the gentlemen who have written to me will kindly excuse a separate answer to each.

I am, eto., ALEX. WOOD.

10, St. Colme Street, Edinburgh, Sept. 1st, 1858.

THE MEDICAL ACT.

SIR,-If unqualified practitioners continue to give "certificates of the cause of death", as heretofore (and I do not see anything to prevent them), then the new Act will fail in " enabling the public to distinguish between qualified and unquali-fied practitioners in medicine." I, for one, should not be benefited in the least.

It is true, the people have an idea that these irregular pracpossess almost the same power as duly qualified men (that is, in the way of granting certificates, etc.), they maintain a position otherwise untenable, whilst at the same time a manifest injustice and insult is done to the legitimate surgeon.

I do not refer to certificates of illness granted to members of clubs, etc.; but I do think every "registrar" in the kingdom ought to be cautioned against receiving "certificates of the cause of death" from unqualified persons. If they are capable of certifying the cause of death, why not admit them to give evidence at coroners' inquests, etc.

I know, full well, that the fact of their being able to certify the cause of death, gives them power and influence with the working classes; and I think it is a privilege they ought no I am, etc., longer to enjoy.

FAIR PLAY.

August 31st, 1858.

Medical Rews.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, DEATHS, AND APPOINTMENTS.

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

BIRTHS.

BLOMFIELD. On August 30th, at 19, Grove Terrace, Peckham, the wife of Josiah Blomfield, M.D., of a daughter. DEMPSTER. On August 10th, at Oundle, Northamptonshire, the wife of J. Carroll Dempster, M.D., Staff-Surgeon, Her Majesty's Forces, of a daughter.

Humphry, Da August 28th, at 2, Ovington Terrace, Brompton, the wife of Frederick J. Genet, Esq., Surgeon, of a son. Humphry. On August 20th, at the Bucks County Asylum, Stone, near Aylesbury, the wife of John Humphry, Esq., Medical Superintendent, of a son.

LAURENCE. On August 30th, at 30, Devonshire Street, the

HAGREAGE. On August John, at 30, Devonshire Street, the wife of *J. Zachariah Laurence, M.B., of a daughter. MACKENZIE. On August 24th, in Dublin, the wife of William Ord Mackenzie, M.D., 3rd Light Dragoons, of a son. SCHULHOF. On August 23rd, at 14, Brook Street, the wife of Maurice Schulhof M D. of a son.

Maurice Schulhor, M.D., of a son. TYACKE. On August 25th, at Chichester, the wife of *Nicholas

Tyacke, M.D., of a daughter. IILLIAMS. On August 16th, at Brecon, the wife of John

WILLIAMS. James Williams, M.D., of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

- Cockshott MURIEL. Cockshott, the Rev. John William, vicar of Burwell, Cambridgeshire, to Harriet Georgina, third daughter of John Muriel, Esq., Surgeon, Ely, on Aug. 31st. EMERSON—WEBB. Emerson, W., Esq., Surgeon, of Kentish Town, London, to Mary, only daughter of the late James Webb, Esq., of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, at St. Pancras Church, on August 31st.
- VOOLLEY-DYCE. Woolley, George, M.D., of Kentish Town, London, to Frederika Maria Meredith, daughter of the late Dr. Dyce, of Aberdeen, at Hillhead, Dunkeld, Perthshire, on August 26th. WOOLLEY-DYCE.
- YOUNG—LATTEY. Young, Lake, Esq., Surgeon, of Kettering, to Sarah Frances, only daughter of Abraham H. H. Lattey, Esq., Surgeon, of Daventry, on August 31st.

DEATHS.

DAVIS. On August 23rd, at Wrekenton House, near Gateshead, Mary, widow of the late Robert Davis, Esq., Surgeon. DUNN, Henry, Esq., Surgeon to the House of Correction, Wake-

- field, aged 55, on August 18th.
- MacCulloch. On August 22nd, at Brighton, Louisa Mar-garetta, widow of the late John MacCulloch, M.D., F.R.S.

MUIR, John, M.D., late of Johnstone, Renfrewshire, at Innellan, Argyleshire, suddenly, on August 20th.

- Magnessine, Suddenly, on August 2001.
 SNOOK. On August 22nd, at Colyton, Devon, of diphtheritis, aged 10, John Clement, son of *Jno.S.Snook, Esq., Surgeon.
 WATSON, John William, M.D., F.R.S.E., Deputy Inspector-General of Hospitals, at Bath, aged 66, on August 30th.

PASS LISTS.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH. The following gentlemen obtained the degree of M.D. at the graduation on August 2nd. To the three to whose names triple asterisks are prefixed, the gold medals for the best dissertations were presented by the Principal. Those deemed worthy of competing for the prizes are indicated by two stars; while those commended for their dissertations, are denoted by one star. The titles of the re-spective theses are given with the names.

Scotland :

- AITKEN, Thomas-On the General Paralysis of the Insane **ALLAN, Alexander, M.A.Aberdeen-Notes of Surgical Cases in the Edinburgh Hospital
 - ALLAN, Donald, M.A.Aberdeen-On Diarrhœa considered
- as a Symptom of Disease *BELL, Thomas Vernon—On the Construction of the Stethoscope in accordance with the Principles of Acoustics
- BLAIR, Harry Ritchie-On Typhus and Typhoid Fevers
- *CARRUTHERS, James Bell-On Cannabis Indica
- CROSBIE, Alexander-On Hereditary Influence
- DAVIE, George Scott-On Scorbutus, its Pathology and Treatment
- DEWAR, William-On Excision of Joints
- *DUBUC, Emilius William-On Uræmic Convulsions
- EDIE, Charles-Observations on Medical Practice
- FARQUHARSON, Robert-On the Parasitic Diseases of the Skin
- FETTES, Charles William-On Habitual Constipation
- GREEN, George-On Icterus and its Causes
- HARDIE, Thomas—On Typhoid Fever Holle, Edmund—On Retained Placenta
- JAMESON, Thomas—On the Liver and its Diseases LITTLE, James—On Insanity

- LORIMER, John—On Syphilisation MACARTNEY, Samuel Halliday—On the Pathology of Phthisis, and its Relation to Fatty Liver
- *McNAB, John-Pathological Commentary on a Case of Clinical Medicine
- **MAXWELL, James Laidlaw, M.A.Edinburgh-On the Chemistry and Physiology of the Spleen **MESSER, Adam Brunton—Description of an Abnormal
- Fœtus
- MILLER, Andrew-On Diseases of Nutrition in Relation to the Periods of Life at which they appear **Moxey, David Anderson—On the Mechanism of Partu-
- rition
- *ORPHOOT, John-On Surgical Meteorology
- PEARSON, David Ritchie-On the Maturation of the Seed SCOTT, Stephen-On Teratology
- STEWART, Thomas Grainger-On some Diseases of the Reflex Functions
- STIRTON, James—On the Disorders of Digestion in Infancy *** Thomson, Murray—On the District of Digeston in Indiaty WALKER, Robert—On the Ergot of Wheat **WHITEFORD, James, B.A.Edin.—On the Chemistry and

 - Physiology of the Pancreas

WILSON, Robert—On the Vascular System viewed Normally Wood, Thomas—On Pericarditis

*Yule, John Alexander—On Dystocia

From England : ADAMSON, Edward—On Some Points connected with the Physiology and Pathology of Fibrine

- Cookson, John Fowler—On Pneumonia CRUMPE, Hammerton—On Rachitis

GRAHAM, Adolphus Frederick-On Tolerance of Remedies in Disease

- LANGSTAFF, Charles-On the Minor Agencies now employed in the Diagnosis of Chest-Disease
- LOCKIE, Stewart-On Some of the Secondary Consequences of Bright's Disease of the Kidneys
- *** MAINGAY, Alexander Carroll-Monograph on the British Parmeliaceæ
 - MEDD, John-On Traumatic Tetanus
 - METCALFE, Robert Ives-On Puerperal Fever

- RAYNER, Thomas-On the Skin as a Therapeutic Medium RUMNEY, Oswald George-On Medical Jurisprudence in Relation to Political Economy and Mortality
- SCHMITZ, Charles Theodore-On the Alteration of the External Configuration of the Chest in Disease STEPHENSON, William Henry—On Atonic Uterine Hæ-
- morrhage From Wales :
- Morgan, William Taylor-On Syphilis

From the Cape of Good Hope :

- MORKEL, William-On the Different Modes of Dying
- *MyBurgh, Francis Gerhard—On Placenta Prævia

From the Mauritius :

*BARRAUT, Adolphus Rodrigues-On the Presumption of Survivorships

From Australia :

MURRAY, John Ross-On Wounds of Arteries and their Treatment, Special and General

From North America :

HUNTER, James Dickson-On Psoriasis and Lepra

From Jamaica :

- DAVIES, Bartholomew Watson-On Plural Births From the Brazils :
- *** WILSON, Henry Season-Observations on the Nervous System of the Asterias

From Costa Rica :

Quinoz, Rafael Leandro-On Syphilis

HEALTH OF LONDON :- WEEK ENDING AUGUST 28TH, 1858.

[From the Registrar-General's Report.]

THE deaths registered in London, which in the first week of August rose to 1200, have continuously decreased to 1147, to 1112, and last week, ending Saturday, August 28th, to 1108. In the ten years 1848-57, the average number of deaths in the weeks corresponding with last week was 1261; for comparison, this average, if raised in proportion to increase of population, would become 1387, and omitting from the com-parison the epidemic years of 1849 and 1854, it will present the state of the public health in a still more favourable light. The deaths last week were considerably below the number that would have occurred if the average rate of mortality had prevailed.

The mortality from diseases of the zymotic order was last week 419; in the previous week the number was 379. Small-pox was fatal in six cases. Measles, which was the cause of 22 deaths in the former week, last week caused 36. Scarlatina in the previous six weeks averaged 81 deaths weekly, the number last week was 92, but shows a slight tendency to decrease, the preceding week being 105. Whooping-cough was fatal to 34 children. Thirty-nine deaths were registered from typhus and continued fever, which is much less than the average. The disease most fatal at the present time is diarrhea, the deaths from which in the last two weeks were 113 and 146, although these numbers are below the weekly average of the season; the deaths from cholera decreased from ten in the previous week to six, and five of these six were those of children under two years of age; the fifth case was that of a girl, aged 8 years, who died at Poplar after two days illness. Diarrhœa was most prevalent in the districts of Marylebone, St. Pancras, St. Luke, East London, Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, Poplar, and Greenwich.

The deaths caused by diseases of the tubercular order, which in the former week were 169, receded last week to 163; from the respiratory organs the deaths last week were 80, the previous week 81; of the digestive organs 45, the previous week 47; of the urinary organs 22, the previous week 16. Nine children are returned as having died from inanition and the want of breast-milk. Thirty-five persons, whose deaths are recorded, attained the age of 80 or more years; two widows were aged respectively 91 and 92 years.

Last week the births of 852 boys and 844 girls, in all 1606 children, were registered in London. In the ten corresponding weeks of the years 1848-57, the average number, corrected for increase of population, was 1635.

At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the mean height of the barometer in the week was 29.842 in. The highest reading was 29.988 in., and occurred on Tuesday. The lowest occurred on Saturday, and was 29.627 in.; the extreme varia-tion was rather more than three-tenths of an inch. The mean temperature of the week was 59.2° , which is very near the average of the last forty-three years, but is much lower than at the same period last year, when the mean air temperature was 66.9° or 7.7° warner. The air temperature last week, compared with the week preceding, was 4.1° cooler; the extreme range during the week was 29.3° . The difference between the dew-point temperature and air temperature was 10.4° . The average temperature of the water of the Thames was 65.4° or 6.2° higher than the temperature of the air. The direction of the wind was chiefly from the north-west. The sky was for the most part during the week free from cloud. On Friday and Saturday the sky was overcast till about noon, and rain for a short time fell on Saturday morning.

COMMISSION OF LUNACY:-CASE OF MR. RUCK.

ON Monday, August 23rd, a commission of lunacy was opened by Mr. Commissioner Winslow and a special jury, in the hall of St. Clement's Inn, Strand, for the purpose of ascertaining the state of mind of Lawrence Ruck, Esq., of Sittingbourne, Kent, and Montgomeryshire. Mr. Montague Chambers, Q.C., Mr. Serjeant Ballantine, and Mr. Vaughan appeared for the petitioner (the wife of the alleged lunatic); and Mr. Edwin James, Q.C., Mr. Serjeant Petersdorff, and Mr. Gordon Allan for the alleged lunatic, who was present from the commencement.

Mr. MONTAGUE CHAMBERS, Q.C., opened the case on behalf of the wife of the alleged lunatic, who was the petitioner. The duty of the jury was to inquire into the state of mind of a gentleman named Lawrence Ruck. Mr. Ruck was possessed of property in Kent and at Pantlludw, Montgomeryshire, of the annual value of about £1,500, and seventeen years ago he was married to the daughter of Mrs. Matthews, of Pantlludw, in Montgomeryshire, where he went to live. He took the lease of a house and grounds there, which, being in a dilapidated condition, needed repairs, but he never had those repairs effected. He lived with his wife in the greatest possible happiness and contentment, regarding her and his children with every affection, until at last there appeared to be certain delusions taking place in his mind, which had the effect of entirely changing his nature. It was noticed by various members of the family, and by the domestics and the neighbours, that he was most peculiar and eccentric in his manner in 1855 and 1856, when it would seem he had rather given way to habits of intemperance. He should lay evidence before them to show that in 1855 Mr. Ruck exhibited unmistakable indications of a disordered mind. He was excessively restless; would get up at all hours of the night and wander about; would call up his servants, and order the horses to be put to the carriage, and be driven over the most desolate part of the country (Wales) in the dead of the night, without any apparent object. On one occasion he made the coachman drive him through the river, and on several nights he would make his wife get up and go out with him. Another erroneous impression under which he laboured was, that his estates abounded with copper and tin mines, and other valuable means of production ; but there was no reason at all for the impression. When walking he would pick up a stone and declare that it contained some most valuable mineral. Things went on in this way till October, 1857, when the unfortunate gentleman had been to see the Manchester Exhibition, and on his return so behaved himself, that it was found necessary to call in a neighbouring surgeon. He laboured under the delusion that everybody wanted to poison him. On one occasion he went to a neighbouring inn, and with a loaded gun and pistol intimidated every one who came in his way. He ordered dinner and a bottle of wine. He did not eat anything, but picked it with his fingers, and poured the wine into the chamber utensil. A most extraordinary circumstance occurred about this time. A girl, named Mary Jones, a niece of Mrs. Ruck, was always supposed to be a virtuous girl, until the change in the mind of Mr. Ruck took place, when it was found she had had two illegitimate children by him. Without any foundation whatever he swore she had murdered these children. Another delusion was that his wife was untrue to him; and in every quarter he would charge her with being a common street-walker and everything else that was bad. He even said that the very navigators on the rail-way knew his wife better than he did. The learned counsel then proceeded to describe the various actions of the alleged

lunatic, and said he should bring evidence to prove that the unfortunate gentleman was not capable of conducting his own affairs. Mr. Ruck was placed under the care of Dr. Stillwell, at Hillingdon, on the 5th of November, 1857. He had been seen by several eminent medical gentlemen. This was an inquiry of most painful interest to his wife, because if he was sane these charges, if true, would be her complete destruction. It, however, would turn out that she was a most exemplary and unexceptionable wife. The jury would hear the evidence, and would say; first, whether he was in a state capable of governing his own actions; and secondly, whether it would be safe for his wife and friends that he should be placed under restraint.

Several witnesses gave evidence in support of the statements of Mr. Chambers, regarding the extraordinary acts committed by Mr. Ruck, and his allegations against his wife.

Mr. HUGH LLOVD, a surgeon, practised near where Mr. Ruck lived, in Montgomeryshire. He had attended the family for years. During the early part of the time the greatest affection existed between them. On the 25th of October he was summoned to see Mr. Ruck at Pantlludw, when he noticed that he was excited, and there was a strange appearance about the eyes. He behaved very strangely. Witness did not order him to have any medicine. He saw him a few days afterwards, when he appeared very sullen.

days afterwards, when he appeared very sullen. Cross-examined by Mr. JAMES. He did not sign the order for Mr. Ruck's confinement. It was unfortunately notorious that Mr. Ruck drank. Witness had known Mr. Ruck seventeen years; and during that time had not seen him twice in the state of excitement he had referred to.

Mrs. MARY ANN RUCK said she was the wife of Mr. Lawrence Ruck, and had been married to him for about seventeen years. She was the mother of six children by him. He was occasionally in the habit of drinking considerably, but up to April 1856, it did not appear to affect him at all. In that year they resided at Pantlludw, and from April of that year he was in a very excited state at times. He used to hire flys and drive about the country in the night as well as in the day, and apparently without any object. He took witness with him on those occasions, by her own wish. The year before last she went to the seaside alone, and when there she was sent for to come home. On reaching home she found him excited, restless, and nervous. Candles were lighted in several of the rooms, though only he and Mr. Lloyd, the surgeon, were in the house besides the servants. From April 1856, down to the end of that year, there were intervals when he was in an excited state. He used to be very much haunted by voices or tunes which he had heard, and, in order to banish these from his mind, a friend of witness would play lively airs in his presence. She went to reside at Aberdovey, taking the children with her, because her husband was going to alter the house at Pantlludw. He used to come to Aberdovey every day at first and sleep there, but latterly he came less frequently. When he visited there it was on terms of affection towards witness and the children. In October last she was visiting some relatives of Mr. Ruck's in Kent. When there she received a letter from her mother, in consequence of which she proceeded homeward, and arrived at Machynlleth on October 25th. She learned there that her husband had left by the mail-coach, and she immediately hired a conveyance and overtook the coach about fifteen miles from Machynlleth. He appeared excited, and did not like to see her. She went with him in the mail coach. On the road he imagined he saw people rushing into each other's arms. There was nothing of the kind to be seen. On arriving at Newtown, a gentleman, whom witness had never before seen, got into the mail. They left the gentleman in the coach at Welshpool. Nothing of an improper kind took place between that gentleman and witness. He never spoke to her at all. On getting out of the mail. Mr. Ruck said angrily witness was not to go with him, adding that "the boots" would do for her. She tried to persuade him to let her go with him, and having failed to do that, he her by her mother. He took it, and ordered a fly, not know. ing where he wanted to go. Witness countermanded the fly, and sent for the best medical man in the place. The assist ant of Mr. Harrison came first, and afterwards Mr. Harrison himself came. Witness wanted Mr. Harrison to accompany her to London to consult Dr. Conolly, but his engagewas then telegraphed for. There had never been any improper intimacy between Mr. Barnett and witness. She did not go to bed that night. She did not see him again till the next

morning (Saturday). He told her she ought to ask his forgiveness. He charged her with impropriety. He used very disagreeable language, applicable only to the lowest characters. She was obliged to leave the room. He dined with witness that day. He was quiet and dreamy during dinner. Mr. with him that evening for Reading. During the Friday night, at Welshpool, nothing of an immoral character occurred between myself and any one. [Mr. Serjeant Ballantine again and again expressed the pain he felt at being obliged to ask the witness questions of that kind.] At Birmingham, where they stopped over the Saturday night, wheness slept in the same room with her husband. When witness was in the room he locked the door, and went several times back and forward to his portmanteau. They arrived at Reading on the Sunday, and remained there until the following Thursday. On the Sunday Mr. Ruck ran away at Reading, having done so twice previously-once at Welshpool-and was absent about an hour. When he came back witness found that he had given Mr. Barnett, who had followed him, in charge to a policeman. He shook hands with Mr. Barnett, begged his pardon, and Witness slept in the same said he would not do so again. room with her husband that night. He was in the habit of saying much that was most dreadful to her, and accused her of improper conduct with all sorts of persons. He said the electric telegraphs were going east, west, north, and south about her; talked of the disgrace she had brought on her children, and that there were people waiting to get hold of her. That continued during the whole time they were at Reading. After he had returned on the Sunday, he imagined he had forgiven her. He petted her and said he would give her a large bonnet and shawl, and take her to some vile place in London. He said he would give her a large bonnet, so that it should hide her face, as otherwise everybody would recognise her cha-racter at once. That continued all the Sunday. He slept soundly on the Sunday night, but awoke the next morning in much the same state in which he was on the previous day. He told witness he would take her where she could walk out at night with people of her class. Mary Jones occasionally visited at witness's house. She was not aware until October last of any connection subsisting between Mr. Ruck and her. He said he had had two children by her, and that they were murdered. At Reading again he talked about Mary Jones and about the children being murdered. When at Reading witness saw him look over his portmanteau, and it contained all manner of things, such as oatmeal, flour, walnuts, cocoa, sugar, candles, nails, and bits of paper. Witness and her husband did not occupy different rooms, except when she was nursing her children, all of whom she nursed herself.

Cross-examined by Mr. JAMES. Mr. Ruck used to drink oc-casionally. He carried stimulants about with him in a flask. Witness did not think this habit increased early in 1857. Tt was worst in April, 1856. He had taken nothing for three months before they went in August, 1857, to the Manchester Exhibition. I signed the order authorising the reception of Mr. Ruck into the asylum. In the order she signed, the sup-posed cause of insanity was stated to be, "Probably partly he-reditary and partly from intemperance." She had always heard there was great eccentricity in her husband's family, and she said so on that occasion. She had seen his father, and there was eccentricity in him. Witness last saw my husband in Ja-He said he was perfectly well, and ought to be renuary. leased. She did not remember directing Dr. Stillwell not to allow any one to see him. In May, she instructed him not to allow Mr. Wainwright to see him. She did not refuse to allow her husband to have any funds to try this matter. She asked Dr. Stillwell not to allow her busband to sign any money order whatever for Mr. Wainwright. Witness did not remember telling Dr. Stillwell to refuse the application of anybody to see Mr. Ruck, or to interdict him from writing to any person. She had paid Dr. Stillwell £109. The charge for residence in the asylum was £400 a year. Witness had no income herself. She had kept £500 to conduct this case. She had refused to allow Mr. Wainwright to have any money order whatever.

Mr. E. C. HARRISON, a surgeon at Welshpool, examined by Mr. VAUGHAN, deposed to being sent for to the Oak Inn on the 29th of October. He saw Mr. Ruck, who was walking in the passage of the hotel, and seemed fidgety and somewhat excited. He learnt that a fly had been ordered by Mr. Ruck. The fly was in the yard, but there were no horses to it. Mr. Ruck was sitting in the fly, and witness tried to prevail on him to come out and go into the house. He refused; but eventually got out of the fly, and afterwards witness found him again in another fly, in a shed where a number of empty carriages were, and in that he remained for some hours. Witness thought his manner was very extraordinary, and having heard from Mrs. Ruck, who was in great distress of mind, what had taken place on the journey, he recommended him to be watched. He saw Mr. Ruck from time to time until he left Welshpool, and he was convinced that he was labouring under delusions. He dwelt on horrible scenes of immorality on the part of Mrs. Ruck with persons in and about the hotel, which witness knew could not possibly be true. Mrs. Ruck's demeanour at Welshpool was most proper and becoming, and such as he might expect in the most virtuous woman. Mrs. Ruck told witness he had been leading a very irregular life, taking stimulants in excess at one time, and abstaining altogether at others, and from that witness concluded his delusions were not the result of drinking, but of an unsound state of mind.

Mr. RICHARD BARNETT, a surgeon at Reading, had known Mrs. Ruck twenty years and Mr. Ruck since 1851. In October last, he was telegraphed to go to Welshpool. He saw Mr. Ruck, who received him very cordially. He said, "I am very glad you have come, as there are two fellows placed over me to watch me, and I want to get away." Witness asked where was Mrs. Ruck, and he said, "Mrs. Ruck is nothing to me; she is as bad as any woman can be." He then walked out of the room in a most abrupt manner. In going to Reading, Mr. Ruck told witness that he had painful evidence of his wife having committed acts of immorality with other men. When at Reading, he gave witness into custody for drugging his wine. Some of the alleged-to-be-drugged wine was sent for and tasted, and the whole charge was found to be frivolous. On the Tuesday, Dr. Conolly was sent for and arrived. Mr. Ruck had a strange collection in his trunk, consisting of candles, string, paper, chisels, bread, stones, flour, and so on. He was at times very kind to his wife, but the next moment he would accuse Witness had no her of the most fearful acts of immorality. question but that he was of unsound mind. He said he had slate mines worth £30,000 a year, and his copper mines were of untold value. While at Reading, he never charged witness with any improper intimacy with his wife. Nothing of the sort ever took place between him and Mrs. Ruck. Witness never put any corrosive sublimate on Mr. Ruck's bread. Witness had seen him at the asylum at Moorcroft House several times, and still found him under the same delusions.

Cross-examined by MR. JAMES. The statement in witness's affidavit that he had retired from practice was erroneous; he was still in actual practice. Mrs. Ruck's order for her husband's confinement was in witness's handwriting. The cause of insanity he ascribed to "hereditary insanity and intemperance." He did not make the inquiry as to whether the hereditary in-sanity was true. She said that her husband's father and person who is eccentric. Witness did not think that every person who is eccentric should be confined like Mr. Ruck had been. He thought the hereditary eccentricity and intemperance were the cause. Dr. Conolly and the witness were together when Mr. Ruck was examined. He did not know that the Act of Parliament says the examinations should be made separately. He did say in the order he signed that Mr. Ruck was profligate in his expenditure. He had a share in a piece of land which he supposed to hold a rich mine. It was not a fact known to witness that he was profligate in his expenditure. Mr. Ruck told witness he had exceeded his income. He would not sign a certificate to lock up everybody who exceeded his income. Dr. Conolly recommended Moorcroft House. Witness had said in the order, as a fact known to himself, that Mr. Ruck was addicted to intemperance. He never noticed it but when in the train from Shrewsbury, when he had a bottle of stout at Shrewsbury, and two glasses of ale at Stafford.

Mrs. BARNETT corroborated the evidence of her husband with regard to the altered conduct of Mr. Ruck towards his wife, and his delusions as to her infamy.

When and his defusions as to her hinany. Dr. Conolly went to see Mr. Ruck on the 3rd of November, while he was at Reading. When he saw him, he said his wife had been guilty of great infidelity with a number of persons. Witness had seen him at Moororoft House; but he felt satisfied of his condition without speaking to him. He generally avoided referring in these cases to the leading delusions. His opinion was that Mr. Ruck entertained insane delusions of a dangerous kind, and required restraint. His delusions would be likely to lead to danger towards himself, his wife, and her supposed paramours. The witness had heard him declare, as lately as the 18th of June, that he heard his wife go into an adjoining room at Welshpool, and there commit adultery. He also said that her conduct was notorious, and that it was even known to the drovers on the road. Dr. Conolly had known those that have lost their delusions express surprise that they ever entertained them. Speaking from what he had seen of Mr. Ruck, he could not help saying it would be insecure to himself and to his friends to allow him to go at large

Cross-examined by Mr. EDWIN JAMES. Mr. Ruck might recover, but it would be at the term of a year or a year and a half. He would not say his case is one of acute mania, but he would designate his case as maniacal. The witness was consulting physician to Moorcroft House Asylum, and was paid by fees. He did not remember receiving a letter from Mr. Stillwell, stating that Mr. Ruck was well, and should not be detained; nor did he receive any verbal message of that sort. He never heard of Mr. Ruck having committed any sort of violence towards his wife or any one else.

By the Commissioner. He should expect that, on the departure of the delusion, it would be marked by a desire to return to his wife, and express his regret for the accusations to which she had been subjected by him.

Dr. STILLWELL, proprietor of Moorcroft House Lunatic Asylum, deposed that Mr. Ruck was received there on the 5th of November last, and was there still. When admitted, he exhibited delusions respecting the fidelity of his wife; and also accused Mr. Barnett, a friend of his, Mrs. Matthews, his mother-in-law, and Mrs. Ruck, of a conspiracy against him. Witness's opinion was that he was at that time insane, and labouring under various delusions. Since this commission had been issued, he had declined to speak to witness, except in the presence of his solicitor. Witness's opinion of him now was that his delusions were not cured, and he was still insane. On Sunday evening last, he wished to take his portmanteau and his pistol and gun-case to town with him. Witness objected, when Mr. Ruck said, "Aye, it is that confounded Barnett again with my wife." He (witness) was now in his twenty-seventh year.

In cross-examination by Mr. JAMES, witness said he could not form an opinion how long it would be necessary to keep Mr. Ruck at Moorcroft. He had kept Moorcroft Asylum for two years. Before that he had acted some little time for the principal superintendent of the Derby County Lunatic Asylum. and he had also studied at the Morningside Asylum, Edin-The Commissioners in Lunacy had seen Mr. Ruck at burgh. Moorcroft on November 14th, February 2nd, and May 13th; and reported him each time as still labouring under delusions. On the 19th of the present month, the commissioners visited the asylum again, and, on leaving, they reported, "We have had a separate interview with Mr. Ruck, who declined to enter into any conversation, as his case would be the subject of an inquisition on Monday next," Witness believed Mr. Ruck took due and proper care of his money. When he signed the certificate in November, his opinion was that Mr. Ruck was suffering under excitement from the abuse of intoxicating liquors; but, since he had heard a more correct history of the case, he had altered that opinion. Witness, on receiving Mr. Ruck into the asylum, acted on the certificate written by Mr. Barnett, and signed by Mrs. Ruck. He had never seen Mr. Ruck under the influence of intoxicating liquors, except on his return to the asylum a few evenings ago, after Mr. Fisher had taken him out to dinner. He could not state exactly when he had reason to change his opinion with respect to Mr. Ruck's malady. Mrs. Fisher, Mr. Ruck's sister, on one of her visits to Moorcroft, informed him that Mr. Ruck had suffered from delirium tremens.

By Mr. Serjeant BALLANTINE. If there was any difficulty in respect to any patient, he invariably consulted Dr. Conolly. Besides, the surgeon of the establishment visited the patients every day. Mr. Ruck had been allowed the ordinary stimulants of the house during his stay. He was permitted to take two glasses of wine at dinner, and beer at night. The reason why he thought Mr. Ruck was still labouring under delusions was that, if he was sane, he would come forward and say that what he had stated about his wife he had found to be untrue; but, instead of that, he would not enter into the subject, and had declined speaking to witness. By a Juryman. When delusions arose from *delirium tre*-

by a Juryman. When delusions arose from delirium tremens, they were generally of a ludicrous character.

Mr. Ruck was next called, and, in answer to questions put by the commissioner, said he was in a confused and agitated state of mind when he entertained the suspicions about his wife. He was put into the asylum at Moorcroft without having had any opportunity of investigating the circumstances. He merely wished for inquiry, and as soon as he had been satisfied that there were no grounds for suspicion he would have abandoned them. He had been drinking about the time he had these delusions. He was very happy to see his wife looking so well; and his mind was quite disabused of all those impressions he had respecting her. His solicitor had taken ample means to investigate the facts, at Mr. Ruck's request; and the investigation he made had satisfied him that his (Mr. Ruck's) suspicions were purely imaginary. He had not seen Mary Jones since he left her at his own house. He did not know where the children were that he had by her. He had never seen them. He supposed they were living; but she refused to give him any information about them. He was induced by one circumstance to think that his wife had been unfaithful to him, and that was when she told one of the girls in the house that she would do the same by him as he had done by her. He wished to see her more than he did at Moorcroft, but the doctors would not allow her to see him, on the ground that he was not well enough to receive her, and he thought it useless any longer to ask to see her. Besides, after he left Reading, he requested her to remain there, but instead of doing that she went off about a fortnight afterward. She also unpacked his luggage, although he had written to her not to pry into his private affairs. He suspected his wife on insuffi-cient grounds, and now that his suspicions were removed he was satisfied. There was no foundation whatever for his suspicions that she was criminal with other men. He made those charges under excitement arising from drink. He had for some years lived unhappily with his wife, owing to her refusing his having intercourse with her. He desired to be separated from her.

Dr. SUTHERLAND had an interview with Mr. Ruck first on the 19th of May last, and again on the 9th of June. He had been previously informed of the nature and history of the delusions under which he laboured. At the first meeting Mr. Ruck refused to enter into conversation with a stranger. He had been introduced to Mr. Ruck by Dr. Stillwell as Dr. Sutherland. On the 9th of June, Mr. Ruck said witness should hear his story, and proceeded to relate it. Witness had no doubt at that time he was of unsound mind, and he thought, with Dr. Conolly, that it would be now dangerous for Mr. Ruck to be liberated and allowed to mix with the people with regard to whom he entertained these suspicions. Persons labouring under delusions, if they still retained them, would sometimes advert to them; but they would sometimes deny that they had ever entertained them. He had heard Mr. Ruck state that he had lived unhappily with his wife, and the contrary evidence of the witnesses as to their living on terms of affection for many years. He thought Mr. Ruck was under a mistake on that subject, except in so far as he might have been irritated by her instituting these proceedings. Witness thought Mr. Ruck was now very much better than he was in June, but that it would not be very long safe to allow him to go at large.

Cross-examined by Mr. JAMES. It was one of the oldest symptoms of acute mania to tear up clothes. It was possible for a same man to tear up his clothes. He had not seen Mr. Ruck since the 0th of June. He thought intemperance had something to do with his mania. That kind of mania was the most easy of cure, but the most liable to relapse. At St. Luke's a larger number of the patients of that character were sent out cured in two months, but the time varied very much. Mr. Ruck had not satisfied him altogether that he was free from the delusion as to his wife's infidelity. Moral treatment was very essential to a cure in cases of this kind. He did not enter into the treatment Mr. Ruck had received at Moorcroft.

Dr. FORBES WINSLOW saw Mr. Ruck on the 9th of May last at Moorcroft. He had had some previous information about his malady. It was the best part of an hour before Mr. Ruck would touch upon the delusions under which he laboured, and then he said he would make a clean breast of it. He said his wife's conduct had been so infamous that he could not forget it. Witness suggested that he might possibly be under a mistake. He replied, that the facts were such as he could never overlook, and that he never could live with her again. Witness added, that after due inquiry he could come to no other conclusion than that his delusions arose from his own distempered fancy, and he did not now think that they had entirely passed from his mind. Besides, they were of a nature likely to relapse if Mr. Ruck ever again gave way to intemperance. He (witness) had a gentleman once under his care who ad-

passed from his mind. Besides, they were of a nature likely to relapse if Mr. Ruck ever again gave way to intemperance. He (witness) had a gentleman once under his care who admitted to him that all his delusions had vanished, and expressed great regret that he had ever entertained them. That gentleman was liberated by witness's desire, and in less than three days he was found with a carving knife secreted in his sleeve, and in the act of going into a lonely part of the country. He would suggest a different mode of treatment of Mr. Ruck, coupled with a little gentle supervision. He could not take upon himself to recommend his liberation, but by a little modification of treatment it was probable he might recover.

Cross-examined by Mr. JAMES. He thought patients in an asylum ought to have frequent communication with their friends, and that every facility should be afforded for investigation into their mental condition whenever it was desired.

Dr. CONOLLY was recalled, and stated that, after hearing the evidence of Mr. Ruck, his previous opinion of his mind was modified, but not removed. He thought that he was better, but he had expected, after what he (witness) had stated yesterday, that he would have entirely denied that he still entertained his delusions.

Mr. Serjeant BAILANTINE then summed up the case on the part of Mrs. Ruck. The question the jury had to try was not now what was Mr. Ruck's state in October or November last, but what it was now, and whether he had attained a condition of health which enabled him again fully to manage his own affairs. The learned serjeant contended that the extraordinary restlessness he had shown at intervals for several years was the commencing stage of a brain disease operating on a mind weakened by drinking and by other excesses, and the active exhibition of which was delayed until October last. He submitted that the taint of insanity was still upon him; and that, however he had tried to evade the subject, Mr. Ruck believed a kind, affectionate, and virtuous wife to be the cause of that with which, in point of fact, she had nothing on earth to do.

Mr. EDWIN JAMES, Q.C., stated the case of Mr. Ruck in answer to that which had been stated on the other side. He told the jury that the private lunatic asylum interest was on its trial that day, and it behoved them most essentially to see that the safeguards to the liberty of the subject are maintained in a proper spirit. In the origin of the case, the opinion of those conducting the commission was that Mr. Ruck was suffering from aberration of intellect, arising from the abuse of intoxi-He (Mr. James) had the testimony of most cating drink. eminent men that such disease was curable in various periods, say from three to six or eight weeks. He started with this proposition, that Mr. Ruck was confined for a temporary cause, and that the delusions had not appeared since June last. He had the testimony of great writers on the subject, that intemperance was the cause of the greater portion of the unsoundness of mind. The other side had studiously tried to conceal from the jury the fact that the cause of the excitement and delusions was excessive drinking; no doubt with the inten. tion of concealing that the malady was perfectly curable, as he should prove it was. There was no doubt that Mr. Ruck would rush into excesses and then abstain from them suddenly, and when he took to drink brandy again he would go home to that not very well regulated establishment, in fact, nothing much more or less than a furious madman. When they looked at the state of the establishment they could not wonder at the excitement of Mr. Ruck; for the intercourse had taken place between Mr. Ruck, a married man, and Mary Jones, a relation of his wife's, and he (Mr. James) supposed that Miss Jones, finding she had two children by him, was as irascible in her temper as any other Welsh girl would be. Had it ever been shown that Mr. Ruck had committed any violence in his wildest excitement, or that he had ever raised his hand against his wife, notwithstanding the uncalled for opinion of Dr. Winslow, that he should not like to be re-sponsible for the results if Mr. Ruck were discharged? And And was it because Dr. Winslow would not take on himself the responsibility that Mr. Ruck was to be sent to perpetual imprisonment? There was no doubt whatever that Mr. Ruck was at first confined from the result of the abuse of drinks. and so Dr. Stillwell expressed his opinion on his certificate at the time; but when examined he told the jury he had since altered his opinion, he did not know when, why, or any reason at all about it. The fact was, Mr. Ruck was confined for a temporary and curative purpose. But he should prove to them that such a course had never been tried since his confinement. Mr. Barnett in his certificate said he was out of practice, which was against the lunacy law; and he also stated a wrong cause for the confinement, viz., that it was partly from hereditary unsoundness of mind, when he only arrived at that opinion by being told that Mr. Ruck's father was eccentric. He condemned the conduct of Mr. Barnett, and expressed an opinion that Mr. Ruck was hurried unnecessarily to the private asylum by Dr. Conolly, who was the physician to that establish-ment. The conduct of those parties was highly censurable,

but he did not blame Mrs. Ruck, for she had placed herself beyond her own control by allowing herself to be guided by Barnett. As to the delusions about his wife, any man would be excited if he imagined attentions were paid to and received by his wife, and he felt therefore that everything should have been done to explain them away, instead of hurrying him to a private asylum, where he would have remained until now, and perhaps for ever, had it not been for the exertions of Mr. Wainwright, against whom aspersions had been cast. He contended that the proper object of the private asylum was to effect a cure, and not to make it a moral prison; but the evi-dence would show that the conduct was more to turn him out a lunatic than a man cured of a temporary ailment. Drs. Winslow and Conolly were friends of his own, and he had great respect for them; but private lunatic asylums were not hotels out of which great profits should be made. The Commissioners of Lunacy only visited four times a year, when the keeper had an interest in keeping the alleged lunatic; the supervision should be of the most strict nature. Up to June Mr. Ruck had expressed a desire to have the matter investigated, but was not allowed to see his friends or his solicitor. But when the commission was thought of, four doctors were set at him to test his mind to try to prove him insane, without any one to express an impartial opinion or to soothe him in any way whatever. It was enough to drive a man mad. And again, there was no one to corroborate the statements made to the doctors, and he trusted that those conversations would be looked upon most carefully and guardedly. He condemned the system, and not individual private asylums; but he felt that there was a great struggle going on between medical men and keepers of private asylums, and there was no doubt the result of the day would be to shake the system to its foundation, and bring about a more vigorous system of supervision. The theories on which the medical gentlemen had based their opinions were most ridiculous, and there was no pretence whatever for the allegations which had been made. He should leave the question not to the opinion of medical men and keepers of private asylums, but rather to the common sense of the jury, who held the liberty of the subject. He charged Dr. Stillwell with having kept Mr. Ruck's friends from him, as he should prove in evidence.

Mr. FISHER, a barrister, who had married a sister of Mr. Ruck, deposed that he had on several occasions visited and stayed with Mr. Ruck, and had had no reason to believe him to be insane. He had seen Mr. Ruck in the asylum, but observed no indications of mental disorder. Mr. Ruck had stated to witness that he was satisfied that the suspicions he had entertained must be unfounded.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT had acted as solicitor for Mr. Ruck in these proceedings. He had found that two of the supposed delusions were facts; namely, Mr. Ruck's statement that a governess had had two children by him, and his opinions regarding his slate quarries. Witness had, at the request of Mr. Ruck, made inquiries in Montgomeryshire into the subject of his suspicions regarding his wife; and had ascertained that Mr. Ruck had been very drunk, and that there was not the slightest foundation for the suspicion. Mr. Ruck had appeared perfectly satisfied with the explanation. The witness believed Mr. Ruck to be perfectly sane.

Dr. TUKE had been eleven years proprietor of a lunatic asylum at Chiswick, and had had great experience in the treatment of lunatics. He had seen Mr. Ruck upon three occasions, and he believed he was now perfectly sane. In his opinion, he had been suffering from mania occasioned by drinking. A man in such a condition was subject to delusions, and the best way to remove these delusions would be to give him an opportunity for investigation to satisfy his mind. In the case of madness arising from drink, he was of opinion that it was not an advisable course to place the patient in an asylum.

Cross-examined.—He had three interviews with Mr. Ruck, on the 9th, 14th, and 21st of August. One of them lasted for two hours.

Dr. SEYMOUR, formerly a Commissioner of Lunacy, saw Mr. Ruck first on the 21st of April, and he visited him also upon two other occasions. He had no doubt that Mr. Ruck's was a case of drunken madness; and it appeared to him that the proper way to have treated him was by gentle care at home, and that he ought never to have been sent to a lunatic asylum. He was aware of the nature of the delusions he entertained; and at the two last interviews, he conversed with him for a long time upon the subject, and he was satisfied that they had now entirely passed away, and that he was in a perfectly sound state of mind, and that it would be worse than a hardship to send him back to the asylum.

Cross-examined .--- If Mr. Ruck were again to addict himself to intemperate habits, the malady would doubtless return; but if he abstained from drink, it was very probable that he would enjoy better health than he had ever done in his life.

Mr. Skey gave similar evidence; and expressed a positive opinion that it was a case of madness from drink ; and that the delusions under which Mr. Ruck's mind had been labouring had now entirely passed away.

Mr. LAWRENCE, surgeon at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, gave the same evidence; and stated, that in his opinion Mr. Ruck was of perfectly sound mind at the present moment. He could hardly express an opinion that it would be advisable at once to set Mr. Ruck at liberty, and make him an entirely free agent; because, if he were to drink to any extent, his malady would no doubt return, and dangerous consequences might result.

Dr. COPLAND, Mr. GAY, and Dr. GEORGE JOHNSON, gave simi-r evidence. There were cases where a patient had the cunlar evidence. ning to conceal his delusions, and to make it appear that they no longer existed; but they expressed a positive opinion that this was not the case with Mr. Ruck, and that his mind was now completely restored.

Mr. Serjeant l'ETERSDORFF summed up the case on behalf of Mr. Ruck; and Mr. MONTAGUE CHAMBERS replied upon the whole case in support of the Commission.

The learned Commissioner then proceeded to sum up the evidence, and he said that the only question the jury had to consider was whether at this moment Mr. Ruck was of sound mind, and competent to manage his own affairs, and to protect his own interests, or whether he was of unsound mind and incompetent to do so. He would observe that they ought not to allow any prejudices of a popular kind to interfere in any manner with their decision; and he felt assured that they would give their verdict upon the evidence that had been laid before them, and upon that alone. They had nothing whatever to do with the question whether Mr. Ruck had been confined legally or illegally; and all they were called upon to do was to say by their verdict whether, at this moment. Mr. Ruck was or was not of sound mind. The present was, undoubtedly, a very painful case, and no one could help feeling commiseration for the unhappy lady who had been compelled to institute these proceedings; and it was impossible to doubt that she had been actuated by kind and affectionate feelings, and that it was solely under the advice of Dr. Conolly that her husband was sent to this asylum, which, from all he had heard, appeared to have been a very well-regulated one. He then said that he considered it quite unnecessary to read the evidence that had been given, because he was quite sure that it must be fresh in their recollection, and he should, therefore, at once leave the matter in their hands and ask them to return their verdict.

The jury returned a verdict "that Mr. Ruck was of sound mind, and competent to manage his affairs." The numbers in favour of this verdict were twelve ; against, six.

The investigation lasted five days.

MEDICAL REGISTRATION.

At a numerously attended meeting of the medical practitioners of South Cheshire, held in the Board Room of the Chester Infirmary-Dr. Phillips Jones, of Chester, in the Chair-on August 30th, 1858, the following resolutions were passed unanimously :

1. That it is expedient for the medical practitioners of the southern district of Cheshire to form themselves into a society, for the purpose of assisting the registrars, under the new Medical Act, in excluding from his register the names of persons practising in the district without any qualification.

2. That, in accordance with the preceding resolution, a society be now formed, to consist of *legally qualified* medical practitioners in South Cheshire, for the purpose of aiding the registrar in carrying out the above objects of the new Medical Act.

3. That a Committee be formed for holding occasional meetings, and also for correspondence; that Dr. Phillips Jones, Dr. Watson, Mr. Weaver, Dr. Davies, and Mr. Brittain, constitute the Committee; and that Mr. H. Rees, assistant house-

surgeon of the Chester Infirmary, do act as secretary.4. That the society be called "The Society to assist Regis-

tration under the new Medical Act"; and that each member pay an annual subscription of two shillings and sixpence. 5. Thanks to the Chairman, Dr. Phillips Jones, were cordially voted.

LIMERICK UNION: INCREASE OF THE MEDICAL OFFCERS' SALARIES. A numerous meeting of the dispensary committee of the city of Limerick district was lately held, the High Sheriff in the chair, to consider the inadequate remuneration of the medical officers. In 1853, the salaries of the four medical officers were raised from £50 to £75 each, in consequence of an increase in the duties, the total number then relieved by tickets being 0,817; whereas in September 1857, that number increased to 16,762, being an average for each officer of 4,100 cases. On the proposition of Mr. Daniel Cullen, seconded by Mr. Richard Russell, it was moved, that £100 a year each be awarded; but after considerable discussion it was allowed to stand at £35, an appeal being made to the board of guardians to increase it. At the dispensary committee, Mr. Cullen and Mr. Russell made, for the medical men and the poor, the most forcible and eloquent appeals. They stated that to serve the poor and save the rates, the proper plan is to pay the medical officers well, so as to satisfy and interest them in their work, and secure competent educated gentlemen for the duties. Last Wednesday week the board of guardians, by a majority of thirty to ten, increased Dr. Brodie's salary to £110 a year for the Clarina Dispensary; Dr. Heffernan's, for the Murroe Dispensary, £100; and Dr. Seward's, for Cahirconlish Dispensary, £100. Upon these occ ions, Lord Clarina and Mr. Cullen so upheld the claims of profession, that an immense majority ruled the above increase. To the gentlemen who advocated their claims, and those who supported them, the profession and the poor alike owe a lasting debt of gratitude, and so does the country.

CURIOUS CUSTOMS IN HAARLEM. In Haarlem I observed, in one or two streets, a curious Dutch custom, peculiar to the town, which may be interesting to accoucheurs. When a birth takes place here, a handsome pin-cushion, profusely ornamented with lace, is affixed to the outside of the street-door of the house, to notify the occurrence of the event to the public. If a boy has been born, the pin-cushion is of a red, and if a girl, it is of a white colour. A flag of truce is not more respected than this little ensign of millinery-work, for so long as it hangs on the door the house is held sacred, and is protected from the approach of duns, bailiffs, or tircsome acquaintances; and even troops, in marching past, must cease beating their drums or blowing their bugles, lest "mother and child" should be hindered from "doing well." It is also a common custom throughout Holland, in cases of sickness, to append a daily bulletin of the patient's progress, signed by the doctor, to the outside of the street-door, so that inquiring friends may read the intelligence without occasioning annoyance to the patient by knocking or ringing. This is a very sensible custom, but I fear that, in England, we should shrink from giving any such publicity to our domestic afflictions. (Dr. Mercer Adam, in Edinburgh Medical Journal, September 1858.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

POSTAGE OF MANUSCRIPT AND PRINTED MATTER.

Any amount of manuscript or printed matter, singly or together, provided t contains nothing in the form of a written letter, is transmitted through the post, in packets open at the ends, at the following rates: not exceeding 4 ounces, one penny; above 4 and not exceeding 8 ounces, twopence; above 8 ounces and not exceeding 1 pound, fourpence; for every additional halfpound or under, twopence.

ANONYMOUS CORRESPONDENTS should always enclose their names to the Editor; not for publication, but in token of good faith. No attention can be paid to communications not thus authenticated.

Communications have been received from: -- MR. HUGH REES; DR. JOHN WATSON; MR. M. SHURLOCK; MR. DAYMAN; MR. TAPLIN; DR. COATES; MR. G. B. IRVING; DR. MACKINDER; MR. W. NEWNHAM; DR. P. H. WILLIAMS; DR. BURT; DR. FAISHAW; MR. G. STILWELL; MR. HOLT-HOUSE; MR. T. HOLMES; DR. DAVID NELSON; MR. A. W. DUNVILLE; MR. W. MARTIN; MR. GEORGE POUND; DR. A. WOOD; MR. J. R. HUM-PHEEYS; and MR. J. S. SNOOK.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

[* An Asterisk is prefixed to the names of Members of the Association.]

 A Dictionary of Practical Medicine. By James Copland, M.D., F.R.S. Parts x1X and xx; completing the Work. Loudou: Longmans. 1858.
 Anatomy: Descriptive and Surgical. By Henry Gray, F.R.S.; the Drawings by H. V. Carter, M.D. London: John W. Parker & Son. 1858. 1858.



. . . .

ķ

THE IMPROVED SUSPENSORY BANDAGE.

762

Worcester, January 7th, 1858.