themselves 'surgeon-dentists.' *We do not see our way to make such recommendation.*" It is not generally realised that the curriculum for the licence in dental surgery is three-fifths medical and surgical and two-fifths specially dental. This fact alone would justify the use of the term dental "surgeon," did it need justification.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Brook-street, March 10th, 1883. S. J. HUTCHINSON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Mr. Hamilton Cartwright's remarks under this heading in THE LANCET of to-day are based upon an error, an error inexcusable in one who sets himself up as an instructor in dental politics; for it has been exposed over and over again in your columns, and must be known to everyone duly acquainted with the Dentists Act. Of the actual provisions of this Act, of which he confidently speaks, and which he tries to discredit, Mr. Cartwright shows himself ignorant. The Act did not, as he alleges, confer upon the inferior practitioners, of whom he complains, the right to assume the title "surgeon," or "surgeon-dentist." These men have no more right now to that title, or to any other medical title they may choose to assume, than they had before the passing of the Act. All that the Act did in this regard was to compel every individual in practice as a dentist to register; and it provided that in future no one should be allowed to enter the profession of dentistry unless he possessed at least a recognised diploma in dental surgery.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Wimpole-street, March 10th, 1883. HENRY SEWILL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—When a "professor" presumes to disparage a witness in a civil trial, and implies an illegal assumption of the title "dental surgeon," it is expected that he has at least ascertained all the facts of the case. It was, of course, beneath the dignity of a "professor" to examine the Dental Register, or an authorised list of licentiates in dental surgery, to learn, if possible, the name and qualification of the said witness. It was quite enough for this learned dignitary that the witness travelled third-class. To a professional "saloon" passenger it would never occur that there might be exceptional circumstances deciding even an L.D.S. to travel third-class, not as an emigrant, but as a passenger. Allow me, as the witness referred to, to state that I deposed I was a "dental surgeon" simply because I held the diploma of Licentiate in Dental Surgery, Eng. Had my claim to the title "dental surgeon" been questioned, I should have stated the ground of my claim. But I must flatly contradict the scornful assertion of Mr. Cartwright, that "I presumed to offer myself as a medical witness." I was subpoenaed to give evidence in support of a protest signed within four hours by 111 male steerage and third-class passengers on board the *Chimborazo*. Mr. Justice Field narrowed the complaint to the question, "Was the meat served to the third-class passengers putrid, and did the supply of rice and sugar fail?" In the course of my reply to this inquiry, I referred to the fact that on one occasion nearly all the said passengers suffered an acute attack of diarrhoea, caused, I believed, by tainted meat. Mr. Justice Field ruled that this circumstance lay outside the inquiry in hand, and counsel for the defendant chaffingly observed, "A dental surgeon is not a judge of that." That Judge Field refused my evidence on the ground that I was a dental surgeon is an insinuation I had not heard or met with until I read Mr. Cartwright's letter in your issue of the 10th. Permit me to regret the spirit of that letter, and to add that I was, and am, as much disgusted with the admission of an indiscriminate host to the Dental Register as the "professor" himself; and also, that I am equally disgusted with the pharisaic pride of those who assume pre-eminence in the domain of dental surgery, solely on the ground that they are "medically qualified," and call themselves, "We who are surgeons!"

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWIN COX,
Licentiate in Dental Surgery of the Royal
College of Surgeons, Eng.

Birmingham, March 10th, 1883.

"REMARKS QUESTIONING THE PROPRIETY OF INVERTING THE PATIENT IN THE CHLOROFORM SYNCOPE."

[A CORRECTION.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I beg to apologise to your readers for a very stupid mistake which I find I have made in writing the above short paper. I there recommend the patient to be placed in "the prone position," when I meant in reality that he should be laid quite flat. In almost every such case the patient is already in the supine position, and I should object on many grounds to his being turned on his face. Perhaps, therefore, your readers will kindly read *horizontal* instead of *prone* in the paper referred to, though *supine* and *horizontal* would still more accurately express what was intended.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
EBEN. WATSON, M.D.

LIVERPOOL.

(From an occasional Correspondent.)

THE donations received or promised towards the rebuilding of the Royal Infirmary now exceed the substantial sum of £80,000, nearly all of which has been raised since the appeal made at the annual meeting in January last. It is certain, therefore, that the total sum required—viz., £100,000, will soon be reached, and that in the course of a few years this city will possess, in addition to its other attractions, the first hospital in the provinces. The present building was erected sixty years ago on a site which was then almost suburban, and in a style of architecture which was then considered the model. But now the site is surrounded on all sides by buildings, and the infirmary itself has been so added to and altered that it is difficult to realise what its original appearance must have been. There could hardly be a greater contrast than between the old wards and those of more recent erection, especially the Thornton wards, completed in 1865. An idea of the enormous strides which sanitary science and architecture have made, as shown in the erection of hospitals, is afforded by visits to the Royal Infirmary and to the Royal Southern Hospital completed in 1872. The lofty, light, and well-ventilated wards of these days are so totally different from those of sixty years ago, that it would appear as if we had reached the perfection of hospital building; and yet so continuous is the march of improvement that it may be safely asserted, and without any invidious comparisons, that some recent modern improvements over this most recent hospital erection will be apparent in the new Royal Infirmary. Additional beds are needed for medical cases, many applicants having to be refused weekly, indeed almost daily; and the resident medical and nursing staff require much better accommodation than they have at present. It is to be hoped that every advantage will be taken of the present opportunity to erect a building which shall be in all respects a model for future hospitals and infirmaries.

The controversy respecting the notification of infectious diseases still continues, and threatens to become a burning question. Perhaps the best solution of the difficulty would be for the public to take up the matter and discuss it, with a view to settling the question which lies at the bottom of all the difficulty—viz., Are the general public willing that their private medical attendants shall divulge the fact of any of their patients being infected with infectious diseases? If it is an advantage to the medical officer of health to be informed of the foci of disease, it must apply everywhere—to merchant prince as well as to pauper, to the flourishing tradesman as well as to the mechanic. Are all householders agreed on this point?

The weather here has been intensely cold, the thermometer showing a tendency to remain at the freezing-point, and even below this. Whether it has caused an increased mortality or not remains to be seen.

The sad and fatal accident to Dr. A. C. Hughes is another instance of the dangers incurred by medical practitioners whilst driving through crowded streets. In this case a child's hoop ran against the horse's hind legs, and caused the accident which was fatal to Dr. Hughes, his servant narrowly