experience in the use of it, we are not com-
petent, on this point, to question either his
base or his judgment; but we may tell him,
\textit{passant}, that ridicule is a rare weapon for
this, and the press the best medium for its
application.

Of the introduction, by our opponent, of
Dr. Armstrong's name into this contro-
versy we formerly expressed ourselves as: "We should have thought that the
state of Dr. Armstrong's health might have
prevented Mr. Earle from dragging the
name of that eminent physician into the
affair, if he could have been re-
strained by no other consideration. He
well knew that Dr. Armstrong had been
suffering during many months under a
more severe and painful indisposition; and
this, although his health has improved, yet
his nerves are not sufficiently strong to
withstand, without much suffering, any thing
in the shape of literary controversy. The
mention of Dr. Armstrong's name by
Mr. Earle, in this affair, all circumstances
considered, appears to us to have been an
act of cold-blooded cruelty." Such was our
language on Saturday, Dec. 5th, and to day,
Saturday, the 19th, we have to announce
melancholy fact, that Dr. John Arm-
strong, the spirited, the scientific, the
brave, John Armstrong, has discharged
the last debt of nature. Peace to his manes
think Heaven, we can place our hand upon
our hearts, and say most truly, that the sad
catastrophe was not precipitated by any
treach of private confidence, or by any want
of feeling, on our parts. On the Monday
after the publication of Mr. Earle's
communication, had not Dr. Arm-
strong, after the lapse of probably half an
hour, introduced the subject by saying, "I
have been shocked, Mr. Wakley, beyond
measure, at the manner in which Mr. Earle
has used my name in his letter; this prac-
tice of publishing private conversations is
new to me; I never heard of such a thing
before, besides I know nothing of the mat-
ter; I told Mr. Earle so on Saturday. I told
him that I had not the least recollection of
such conversation—I \textit{could not} have said that
you were satisfied with his public conduct,
when his public conduct was all that you had
reprobated. It has very much altered my
opinion of Mr. Earle's character." Had we
not seen Dr. Armstrong, and published his
disavowal of the conversation attributed to
him by Mr. Earle, before the sad event,
what would not have been said by the gang
of Bats? Of course, every word published
by Mr. Earle would have been received as
gospel truth. Retributive justice, inscru-
table are thy ways!

Of the peculiar merits and qualities of
Mr. Earle's "independence" and "con-
sistency," and of the pure and honourable
labours of the \textit{impostor}, we must speak
on another occasion. We have not space
for the discussion of such interesting topics.

\textbf{COMMISSIONERS OF STAMPS
VERSUS DRUGGISTS.}

\textit{To the Editor of The Lancet.}

\textbf{Sir,—In your remarks in last week's
Lancet, on the proceedings of the Commissi-
zers of Stamps, you state that I (fearing
a sufficient number of the trade could not
be consulted within the time prescribed)
had submitted to the hard terms prescribed
by the Commissioners. I beg to inform you
I have not submitted, but that I have pre-
sented a second petition, requesting to be
informed what the penalty said to be incurred
by me is for. Three weeks having elapsed
since the petition was presented, without
receiving an answer, I am induced to thiuli
the Commissioners intend remitting the pro-
cedings altogether; if they do not, I beg to
suggest to all those whose cases are similar
to mine, that we unite them into one gene-
ral petition, and lay it before the Lords of
the Treasury. I am,

\textbf{Sir, your obedient servant,}

\textbf{THOMAS BINGE.}

76, York St. Westminster.

Dec. 17th, 1829.}