for all this, still to be an M.R.C.S. is no criterion of capabilities to practise as a dentist; and there are many who (like myself) entered the profession first with the intention of being members of the Royal College, and to practise in that vocation, but who, when circumstances pointed out reasons for changing their profession, regretted that the College of Surgeons is no college for dentists.

The College of Surgeons is no college for dentists; but why can it not become so? The profession of the dentist is too far advanced, and too widely separated, ever again to become incorporated with the practice of the general practitioner: this is proved by the confidence which the professors of scientific diplomas have all over the country in the practice of the respectable dentist, who has nothing but his own abilities and experience to back him. But why, whilst now on the eve of the college legislation, cannot the profession of the dentist be collaterally allied with the College of Surgeons, and a school founded for the purpose? The dentists can support a school of their own; and surely the pen of *THE LANCET* will not be slow in aiding that which must so greatly benefit the general weal, and guide in a path where I have no greater abilities than to hint "there is a way."

With every apology which you may think that it is necessary I should make for begging so much room,

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

C. SPENCE BATE,

Practising as a surgeon-dentist without being M.R.C.S.

ON THE DIVISION OF FEES IN THE PRACTICE OF MIDWIFERY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Lately there have been several communications in your journal advocating the general adoption by the profession of a division of the midwifery fee in those cases where the gentleman engaged to attend happens to be absent at the birth of the child, and where another, being called in, is present. As I firmly believe that the adoption of such a regulation would be a positive injustice, and reflect great discredit on the profession, perhaps you will be good enough to find a place for a few reasons why it ought not to become general; why, indeed, such a practice ought to be at once discontinued; and why another mode of action, to my thinking much more just and honourable, ought to be substituted. In the first place, it must be recollected, that it is only in cases of great emergency that a stranger's attendance is required. Most of us have friends in our own neighbourhood generally ready and willing to lend a helping hand in time of need; and if there are any not so fortunate, or if friends are engaged, and a stranger must be sent for, how stands the case generally? Why, that the child is born, and the stranger liberated in half an hour. It very rarely falls to the lot of such men even as your suburban correspondent, to be under the necessity of remaining all night with a stranger's case. Moreover, midwifery fees are by no means uniform in amount; and they are often intended to include, not only the actual attendance at the labour, whether it be long or short, but visits made both before and after. Could a conscientious man, then, quietly pocket half his professional brother's fee, when he must well know how small a portion of the trouble of the case fell to his share? It might be, as often happens, that the practitioner in attendance had been watching the case for days, and just at the critical moment he is unavoidably absent; another practitioner is called in, and the portion of the duty considered so important may be finished in ten minutes; and then, according to this new-fashioned, cormorant-like doctrine, he is to be rewarded with half the other's hard-earned fee, whatever may be its amount. Would this be justice? Would the acceptance of such proffered bounty be proper professional conduct? On the other hand, if a gentleman, not the usual attendant, were called to such a case of emergency as this, or, indeed, to any other case of emergency—for I would not limit the application of this principle to attendance on midwifery cases—and to claim of the friends a fee, in amount according to the circumstances of the case, would he not be doing his duty, and acting as a professional man ought? He would charge what he considered his due; he would not take from his professional brother what was fairly his; and the friends of the patient could not complain at having to pay an additional fee for the services they required under such circumstances any more than they could in paying the fee of a consulting physician or surgeon. It may be said, there are many cases where the people are too

poor to pay a second fee of any kind. In such cases, supposing the medical stranger added this good and gratuitous deed to the many others he is now called on to perform, would he not be more satisfied with such conduct than if he had taken the expected rights of another? I would not have it thought that I encourage the additional working of our ill-remunerated body without their just and proper remuneration; indeed, in my opinion, the plan now suggested would tend to teach people what at present they appear very ignorant of—that in calling in the services of a medical man they contract a debt as much as if they sent for a pound of tea without the money; and I think a patient may as reasonably expect a general practitioner to pay the fees of a consultation out of his own pocket as to expect him to give up half his midwifery fee because certain circumstances have happened, over which he could have no control. If the friends of the patient thought the engaged attendant had neglected his duty, the proper punishment would lie in their hands, and they would not fail to inflict it; but I see neither justice nor honourable feeling in the wish to mulct a brother practitioner of half his fee when he has done all in his power to perform the contract for which it was agreed to be paid. Not wishing to conceal a name, however humble, I beg to subscribe myself,

Sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM ROBINS.

Upper Southwick-street, Hyde-park, January, 1846.

THE PREPARATION OF MEDICINES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I shall feel obliged if you will enlighten me on the following point:—

The last proposition in the heads of Mr. Wakley's proposed Medical Bill runs thus: "The separation of the practice of physic and surgery from the sale of drugs and medicines."

Am I to understand from this that general practitioners are to be precluded from compounding their own medicines, or from keeping medicines in their houses? Is it intended or meant that whatever medicines they may prescribe shall, of necessity, be compounded by a licensed chemist and druggist? These gentry are most baneful to legally-qualified medical men. We have sixteen of them in this town, quacking away without the slightest hesitation or hindrance; indeed, they seem to laugh all qualified men to scorn.

I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,

FREDERICK S. GARLICK.

5, Cheapside, Halifax, Feb. 1846.

* * It never can, in any Medical Bill, be seriously proposed to "preclude general practitioners from compounding medicines, or keeping medicines in their houses," nor "compel them to have their prescriptions compounded by licensed chemists and druggists." It would be a strong measure to prevent medical practitioners from recovering at law, charges for medicines which they may supply to their patients. Such an interdict even as this could not be sustained except on urgent grounds of professional and public necessity.—Ed. L.

MERCURY AND IODINE IN SECONDARY SYPHILIS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—From my experience in this country and in Paris, I am fully convinced of the truth of the four propositions enunciated by Mr. Acton on this question, at page 119 of your journal. I think the principle of alternation the only one to be relied upon—that is, if the primary symptoms have been mercurially treated, the secondary will require iodine, and a relapse of these, or tertiary if they occur, must again be visited with some form, generally a mild one, of mercury, and *vice versa*.

I have lately had three cases of secondary symptoms under my care, where the primary affection had been treated with mercury, and in all these cases this mineral had failed to procure any relief in the constitutional symptoms, though exhibited in every form, from that of mercury and chalk to that of the bichloride. All these cases yielded at once to the iodide of potassium.

With reference to the dose of this salt, I find six or eight grains in combination with half that weight of carbonate of potass, more effectual than twelve grains without that alkali.

Though M. Ricord's favourite, the protoiodide, acts well in France, in this country I have always found it produce distressing tenesmic symptoms, unless combined pretty largely with an opiate, and even then I know of no advantage it possesses above other mercurials.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
W. A. LEWIS.

Snow Hill House, Wolverhampton, Feb. 1846.

THE COUNCIL OF THE COLLEGE OF SURGEONS AND THEIR ORATOR.

WE entirely agree with those of our correspondents who consider that the Council of the College of Surgeons must openly and publicly repudiate the conduct of the "insulting" LAWRENCE, or that the Council itself must be denounced by the profession, and its immediate dissolution, as a governing body, be demanded as the result of a Parliamentary enactment. If the Council afford the slightest countenance or protection to a man who acted as did Mr. LAWRENCE in the theatre of the College of Surgeons, on Saturday last, medical reformers cannot hold any communication with such a body. The honour, the independence, the scientific character, the respectability, of the profession, peremptorily and imperiously forbid that any further "negotiation" should take place between the ASSOCIATED COMMITTEE OF SURGEONS and the COUNCIL, while the members of the last named body remain in the odious position in which they have been placed by the recent conduct of their ORATOR. The members of the Council, by their own acts, can alone extricate themselves from that position. The profession must not, for a moment, at such a juncture, be unmindful of the duty which a sense of honour calls upon them to discharge. Most grievously and scandalously have they been insulted by a man who was, and is, sworn to protect their interests. The dissensions which have hitherto existed amongst the MEDICAL REFORMERS must now cease. All past causes of quarrel or dispute sink into utter insignificance when we reflect on the insult which has been officially offered to the profession in the theatre of the College of Surgeons of England. If all past causes of dispute be now forgotten, and the many thousands of MEMBERS of the profession co-operate, in a friendly and determined spirit, to obtain a just system of government, that profession, at no distant day, will be united into a FACULTY OF MEDICINE, amongst the members of which there will not exist those contemptible distinctions, at law, that elevate into rank and station a few individuals, at the sacrifice of the scientific character and respectability of the great majority of their body.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

LONDON FEVER HOSPITAL.—The annual meeting of the supporters of this hospital was lately held at the Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen Street—the Earl of Devon, the president, in the chair. From the report, read by Dr. Southwood Smith, one of the medical officers, it appears that the number of patients remaining under treatment on the 31st of December, 1844, was 51, since which time 559 had been admitted, making a total of 610. Of that number, 451 had been discharged, and 77 had died. The total admitted since the establishment of the institution was 17,949. The subscriptions &c. in support of the hospital amounted during the year to £1264, and the expenses to £1610. The report having been adopted, and the Earl of Devon re-elected president, the meeting separated.—*Morning Chronicle*.

SIR,—An advertisement having appeared to the effect that the performances of a somnambulist would take

place at the house of a medical gentleman, in Bentinck-street, Manchester-square, I write to observe that the announcement contains a falsehood; no mesmerising parties reside at the address given in the advertisement.—Sir, your obedient Servant, A READER.

London, Feb. 17, 1846.

APOTHECARIES' HALL, LONDON.

Names of gentlemen who obtained Certificates of Qualification to practise as Apothecaries, on Thursday, 12th February, 1846:—William Home Popham, Cork; Thomas Atchison, Aylesbury; Charles John Farr, Saxmundham; William Bainbridge, Lincoln; Hector Helsham, London; Charles Shepherd Lenton, 33, Leicester-square.

CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications continue to crowd upon us from a great variety of places, complaining of the "disgusting mode" in which certain practitioners are puffed in some of the London weekly newspapers. We agree with our correspondents in all that they have said in condemnation of this odious practice. The quacks deny that they are the authors of the puffs. The editors of the papers assert that their recommendations are given from purely benevolent motives. Where the truth lies we cannot tell; but the practice is an infamous one, and the profession ought to combine heart and soul as one man, and determine to put down the nuisance by using their utmost influence, in all parts of the kingdom, against that of the newspapers in question. Such a just and virtuous combination amongst the profession would bring the *proprietors* of the obnoxious newspapers to their senses in less than twelve months.

A Surgeon Subscriber (Haverfordwest) has written to us as follows:—"Will you have the kindness to let me know, in the next number of THE LANCET, whether there are any Asylums for poor lunatics, not actually paupers, but who could only afford to pay a small sum, about 2s. or 2s. 6d. per week; and if there are, what means are to be adopted so as to gain admittance thereto." Probably some of our readers are acquainted with an institution of the kind. We are not aware that any such establishment exists.

One of the Old School.—When masters or mistresses employ medical men to attend servants, they are bound by law to pay legal charges for such attendance.

The Hunterian Oration and the "disgraceful conduct" of the Orator.—We find it to be impossible to publish a twentieth part of the letters we have received on these subjects. Extracts from several of them shall appear in THE LANCET of next week. We would remind our correspondents that on such questions we ought not to be addressed *anonymously*.

Lithos.—The views of Mr. LISTON on Lithotomy shall be published next week. Two or three extracts from his Lectures and Surgical Works will exhibit them correctly. Mr. LISTON has shown that the operation in its former state was dangerous and difficult, in consequence of the *then* defective condition of the instruments employed. His condemnation referred to that period in consequence of the *then* imperfect state of the apparatus.

J. B. (Dorset).—He would not.

O.P.—It is *illegal* for such a person to practise as an apothecary. We advise our correspondent to address his questions (carefully framed) to the Society of Apothecaries, and if he should not obtain a satisfactory answer, to write to us again.

Mr. Harvey (Castle Hedingham).—Both communications were received, and both are worthy of attention. We apologize for the non-appearance of a previous acknowledgment.

A Country Subscriber is informed that such persons can "recover at law" charges made as "surgeons," but not as apothecaries. A good "Country Medical Directory" would be very valuable. There is one in preparation by the editor of the London Medical Directory.

The letter of *Mr. Prichard* (Bristol) next week.

Communications have been received from—William Bird Herepath, M.B., (Bristol,) H. Beil, M.D., A General Practitioner fond of his Order, A. M. C., Mr. S. J. Clarke, Mr. Alfred Bower, Curtain-road; M. D., (London University,) Mr. Samuel Beecroft, and Mr. Thomas C. Leah, (Hyde,) Edward Augustus Cory, M.D., T. L., Dr. J. Johnston, (Kelso, Lisburn,) J. L. M., (Strand,) Mr. Joseph Maclise, (Russell-place, Fitzroy-square,) Medicus, (Bristol, Leeds, Southwark,) Dr. Martin Sinclair, (Manchester,) Mr. J. G. Baston, Chirurgus, Mr. T. Stokes, (Nailsworth,) Mr. Stokes, (Bristol,) A Constant Reader, Manchester,) Dr. H. J. Hinxman, (Bury,) Mr. R. Hindle, (Sadden, near Blackburn,) Scotus, Mr. L. Martin, Mr. H. Eden, One of the Old School, Argus, Dr. S. Price, Mr. Kirby, (accidentally omitted in the three previous numbers, for which we trust he will accept our apology,) Mr. G. L. Hutchinson, Mr. Thomas Mokip, Dr. Cheldon, Mr. J. Walker, T. B. B., and Mr. Eccles.

ERRATUM.—In the last number, page 198, line 12, read "special sense" instead of "spinal sense."