the Society’s diploma. This statement is not inserted by me, and I am not “the secretary of the Society.” I have, in fact, nothing to do with the examining functions of the Society except as their legal adviser. I venture, however, to think that the point raised by Mr. Victor Horsley is of a somewhat academic character. The Society have certainly never meant or intended to assert that their diploma without registration enables the holder to practice medicine, surgery, and midwifery, but they certainly do assert that it does so when registered. Registration is such a necessary complement of obtaining a diploma or diplomas that the distinction drawn by Mr. Victor Horsley would, I think, be of recognition by most persons, who would assume that the statement under discussion conveyed by implication the meaning which I have attached to it. If it is this statement to which Mr. Victor Horsley is referring, I may say that I have been entirely different to the degree felt an objection to it, and if the Society take my advice they will discontinue its insertion in its present form.

I have occupied so much of your space that I will not deal with the relations of the Society of Apothecaries and the Medical Defence Union, to which Mr. Victor Horsley refers (page 173 of this week’s British Medical Journal), but were I to do so it would be found that they reflect no discredit on the Society. I should not have troubled you at all had I not thought that I had not been treated by you at all had I not been referred to by name, and I am still somewhat at a loss to know on what grounds my name has been mentioned. Any letters I have addressed to the Medical Council or otherwise have been official ones on behalf of the Society and not written by me as an individual.

In conclusion, sufficient allowance is not made for the exceptional position of the Society. Whatever they have done has been done without assistance and often in spite of opposition. They do not and cannot possess the power and influence of the Royal Colleges. Notwithstanding, their record past and present is excellent, and those who know most about their work will not disparage or depreciate what they have done for the medical profession.

I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

James Richard Upton.

Society of Apothecaries, Jan. 15th, 1898.

THE PREVENTION OF LARGE MAMMARY ABSCESSES BY EXPRESSION OF MILK.

To the Editors of The Lancet.

Sirs,—In your review of a recent paper of mine on the value of Modified Cow’s Milk in Infant Feeding, contained in The Lancet of Dec. 18th, 1897, I feel I have been misrepresented in one or two points. The reviewer states that in his opinion “some of the details given in this paper are too strongly suggestive of an effort to improve upon nature or even to do away with the ‘homely nurse’ altogether.” Again, he speaks of my “wholesale distrust of the provision made by nature for the needs of infancy.” One of the first sentences of the paper in question reads as follows: “Maternal milk is the best food for infants and there is but little doubt that no food will ever be found which will fully supply its deficiency.” In giving percentages I have only dealt in the most general way with averages. As a general rule I find that low passages give the best results in this country. There is nothing of feeding that is in use in England have never proved successful in this country, but now hope to have our method proved successful over the other side of the water” with our own. Methods of infant feeding that are in use in England have never proved successful in this country, but now hope to have our method proved successful over the other side of the water.”

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Dorchester-street, Montreal, Jan. 4th, 1898.

David J. Evans.

THE PREVENTION OF HOSPITAL ABUSE.

To the Editors of The Lancet.

Sirs,—Would any of your readers oblige me with information as to what institutions employ a paid inspector with a view to preventing out-patient abuse and also what institutions enjoy the services of honorary insominers for the same purpose?

I remain, Sirs, your obedient servant,

Grosvenor-street, W., Jan. 17th, 1898.

C. B. Kretley.

MODIFIED COW’S MILK.

To the Editors of The Lancet.

Sirs,—In your review of a recent paper of mine on the value of Modified Cow’s Milk in Infant Feeding, contained in The Lancet of Dec. 18th, 1897, I feel I have been misrepresented in one or two points. The reviewer states that in his opinion “some of the details given in this paper are too strongly suggestive of an effort to improve upon nature or even to do away with the ‘homely nurse’ altogether.” Again, he speaks of my “wholesale distrust of the provision made by nature for the needs of infancy.” One of the first sentences of the paper in question reads as follows: “Maternal milk is the best food for infants and there is but little doubt that no food will ever be found which will fully supply its deficiency.” In giving percentages I have only dealt in the most general way with averages. As a general rule I find that low passages give the best results in this country. There is nothing of feeding that is in use in England have never proved successful in this country, but now hope to have our method proved successful over the other side of the water.”

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Dorchester-street, Montreal, Jan. 4th, 1898.

David J. Evans.
patient with a broken breast and she believed it was entirely the nurse's fault when it occurred, and under my directions she worked at this breast four or five times a day, rubbing it gently but with all the force of the nipple for twenty minutes at a time and keeping on hot fomentations between the rubbings. The result was that the contents of the breast escaped through the nipple and the whole gradually subsided. These hard masses generally occur in the pendant portion of the breast, and I always, and particularly during the rubbing, enjoined the patient to lie on the opposite side so as to give the hardened portion of the breast more facility for relieving itself.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM FAIRBANK
Surgeon to the Windsor Infirmary, Surgeon to Her Majesty's House- hold at Windsor, and Surgeon to the Hospital for Women.

SOUTH-WEST LONDON MEDICAL SOCIETY.

To the Editors of The Lancet.

Sirs,—In the British Medical Journal of Jan. 15th is an account of the meeting of the South-West London Medical Society at which Mr. Carter read a paper on Legislation as a Remedy for Medical Grievances. As chairman of the meeting I am reported to have assured Mr. Carter that there was nothing discourteous in the remarks which Mr. Horsley made on Dec. 8th. It has been represented to me that my published remarks do not do justice to Mr. Horsley. I should be much obliged therefore, as I believe I stated in the most earnest manner that Mr. Horsley had not made a personal attack on Mr. Carter, if you will kindly emphasise this point in your report. If you should publish Mr. Carter's address in full, as I hope you will, I think it only right that this should be made clear.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

T. A. I. HOWELL.
West-hill, Wandsworth, S.W., Jan. 18th, 1898.

DELAY IN THE PAYMENT OF MEDICAL FEES AT CORONERS' INQUESTS.

To the Editors of The Lancet.

Sirs,—As I find the coroner of my district invariably keeps me waiting for the payment of fees for evidence and post-mortem examinations, excusing himself from responsibility on the grounds that he has to wait before he gets them from the authorities, may I ask if (1) I could refuse to give evidence until paid; or (2) refuse subpoena; or (3) to whom should I complain in case of his persistent refusal? He has, I presume, to pay other witnesses at the time and evidence until paid. He can do this in a court of law, where the funds are at the disposal of the presiding officer, but a wrong to refuse subpcena for a case to come because of non-payment in the past. (3) The Lord Chancellor.—ED. L.

THE UNQUALIFIED ASSISTANT AND THE GENERAL MEDICAL COUNCIL.

To the Editors of The Lancet.

Sirs,—In reference to the important resolution of the General Medical Council on the above subject I should like to ask why there should be any cutity against the removal of the unqualified assistant. No other profession allows itself to be represented by shams; who ever heard of unqualified people representing the Church, the army, or the law? Why should the medical profession be the only one to encourage fraud and deception?

We all know why the majority of these men are not qualified; we all know well what they did with their time at university or college—they are failures, and as a rule deservedly so; as they have sown so should they reap.

I believe also that unqualified assistance is one of the chief causes of the discontent of the profession, and I think it is a matter of much about. Here in the West Riding of Yorkshire within two miles of my house are five medical men; each of these employs an unqualified assistant; each of these assistants does the work of a medical man, they are called doctors, who are persons worthy of our consideration by the public, and are believed by the majority to be such; they act as " locum tenens" during the holidays of their principals, and, in fact, take the places which qualified men ought to hold. Their principle is to employ these assistants to do work to which they have been trained to do and to get through unaided.

In conclusion, I think that all qualified men should rejoice that the time has at last arrived for imposition to be removed from within the ranks of the profession and should applaud and encourage the Council in their resolution.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Jan. 17th, 1898.

ANOTHER M.B.

MANCHESTER.

(The From our own Correspondent.)

The Treatment of Tubercles and Epileptics.

In August last Dr. J. M. Rhodes, chairman of the Chorlton Union Guardians, and Alderman A. McDougall were appointed by the Chorlton and Manchester Joint Asylum Committee to visit a number of asylums in Germany, France, and Belgium for the care and treatment of imbeciles and epileptics to collect information with regard to their treatment and management. The importance of this question to Manchester is evident when we remember that the area of the Chorlton Union and of the old Manchester township is 13.345 acres, that the population of the area is 444,965, and that in the workhouses of Chorlton and Manchester there are close on 650 of these unfortunate people. In addition to these there is a number of cases well known to me in the county asylums by the two boards which would be provided for in any new building the joint committee should decide to erect. In the workhouses no proper and thorough classification of these patients is possible. Moreover, there are cases unsuitable for either the county asylum or the workhouse but for which the "various advantages of a special institution" would be desirable.

Having in their report described the salient features and administrative methods of a number of the institutions visited the following recommendations are made by Dr. Rhodes and Mr. McDougall: (1) That of the epileptics and imbeciles, the mental and bodily sick—say 20 per cent.—should be provided for in a special hospital; (2) that the epileptics and imbeciles, the mental and bodily sick—say 20 per cent.—should be provided for in a special hospital; (3) that the Royal Williamina Augusta Pavilions at Alt-Scherbitz; (2) that those not physically incapable—say 80 per cent.—should be provided for on the colony plan, and that not more than thirty persons should be placed in each house, and that the provision should be made for those able to pay a proportionate sum towards their maintenance. In 1889 the International Congress on Public Assistance held at Paris, passed a resolution in favour of the colony system, and Le Congrès International de Médecine Mentale, passed a similar resolution. The reasons given for the recommendation of this system are (1) that under it the health, physical and mental, is improved, and (2) that the cost is less than that of the alternative system. At Alt-Scherbitz, there are 960 persons in the asylum and the authorities have wisely bought enough land, 760 acres. The whole cost per bed comes to £142, "a very moderate sum compared with the cost of the huge block asylums with which we are so well acquainted." The importance of buying sufficient land is strongly urged in the report. Small wards of ten or twelve beds as at Alt-Scherbitz and Uchtenhagen are recommended. For those physically well though mentally weak and harmless the cottage home system is advised. At Alt-Scherbitz the cottages for twenty or thirty cases each have three day-rooms on the ground floor besides a small room for those who are actually suffering from an epileptic attack. This is strongly recommended as—unto quote again from the report—"although the colony system allows for good classification, yet the three rooms enable the patients to still further classify themselves, and we are strongly of opinion that such provision is conducive to the quiet and contentment which we found to prevail among the patients."