not the first time that the propriety of meeting Mr. Coombs in consultation has been commented upon by the medical men of this town and neighbourhood.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

H. W. SHARPIN, F.R.C.S.,

Bedford, Jan. 1863.

Surgeon to the Bedford General Infirmary.

The following are extracts from the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council of Medical Education and Registration of the 22nd of August, 1860:—

Present—Joseph Henry Green, Esq., President, in the chair; Dr. Burrows, Mr. Nussey. Dr. Francis Hawkins, Registrar.

The following opinion of the Attorney-General and the Hon. G. Denman was read, which had been taken, in pursuance of an order of the General Council (*vide* Minutes of the General Council, No. 23, Sect. 1), respecting the claims of certain persons to have their degrees, obtained from homœopathic colleges, registered:—

"We are of opinion that the General Medical Council are not bound to register persons possessing the diplomas described in the case.

"We think that the Council, before registering any such persons, are bound to inquire whether they have practised as physicians before the 1st of October, 1858, and also whether the examination they have passed was a regular examination, that is to say, an examination in those branches of Medical Science with which it is essential that physicians should be acquainted.

"We are of opinion that an examination in homœopathic medicine is not a regular examination within the meaning of the Act, and that the Council would be perfectly justified in holding examinations, such as those described in the case, not to be regular examinations within the meaning of Clause 11 of Schedule A of the Act; and, if they do so hold, in refusing to register persons who have obtained diplomas upon such examinations.

(Signed) "RICHARD BETHELL.
"GEORGE DENMAN.

"Lincoln's Inn, August 15th, 1860."

* * In many respects the letter of Dr. Burrows is satisfactory. The gist of it is, that he had forgotten the names of the three gentlemen whose claims to register homœopathic degrees were considered by the Medical Council on three separate occasions at which he was present, and that he had met the homœopathic *M.D.* unintentionally—that is to say, without knowing or remembering that his claim to the title of Doctor was homœopathic.

The tone which Dr. Burrows assumes towards the practitioners who have elicited his explanation is, however, by no means becoming, under the circumstances of the case. He enumerates the public trusts which guarantee his principles; but this has been a question of practice and of facts. Here the president of an Association of medical men and an officer of the Medical Council, and so forth, goes down to Bedford and consults with a medical practitioner whom several of the surgeons of the place decline to meet, on the ground of his homœopathic proclivities,—who has vainly endeavoured to register a homœopathic title, but who still blazons it on the Medical Directory, and styles himself Doctor on the strength of it. Dr. Burrows speaks of having known "Dr. Coombs" for some years; is he aware that when that gentleman was practising prior to 1859 he had no medical diploma whatever? Dr. Burrows's name appears in the local journals as attending a patient conjointly with "Dr. Coombs," and bolsters up the claims of that gentleman to public confidence. When appealed to on the subject, Dr. Burrows informed the profession, through the columns which we opened to him for explanation, that his consultant was a former pupil of his hospital, "who for some years past had been in the habit of bringing or sending to his house patients for his opinion and treatment;" and added, that he could perceive nothing in the position or antecedents of Mr. James Coombs, so far as they were known to him, which "in the slightest degree savoured of homœopathy."

In the following week the servile print which disgraces the honourable Association of which he is president bent itself in adulation; and declared naïvely that it had "determined, if possible, to avoid all public allusion to the matter," and that the charge "was made under an utter misunderstanding of the facts of the case."

It appears, however, that all the facts of the case have been from the first very accurately stated, and Dr. Burrows admits them all, but pleads that cogent maxim of the law: *Actus non facit reum, nisi mens sit rea*—"The act does not make the crime unless the intention is criminal." Dr. Burrows ought to have, and shall have, the full benefit of that maxim. But in deed, although not in intent, he sinned grievously against the code which he is bound by so many reasons to uphold, and expresses the sincere wish to observe. By the peculiar facilities which he had for knowing all about the professional antecedents of his oft-times consultant he might be expected to have availed himself of some of them. It would have been better if between the 2nd and 17th of January, in which interval his attention had more than once been called to the subject, he had obtained some of that information which he had previously neglected to acquire, and if his former letter to us had been an apologetic acknowledgment that this gentleman was homœopathic, instead of a somewhat laboured defence, in which his antecedents were spoken of as of the most honourable kind, and the fact of his homœopathic tendencies studiously omitted, and by implication denied; better, especially, if in his present letter he had omitted discourteous allusion to those gentlemen who have acted rightly in a matter in which he unwittingly acted very wrongly. Undoubtedly he owed some reparation at least to the practitioners at Bedford; he owed an ample and full explanation to the profession in which he held offices of trust; and it had better have been given courteously, and with the expression of due regret, than extorted bit by bit. Dr. Burrows had much to explain, and was bound to offer that explanation. When he talks of anonymous attacks, he should remember that no communications receive attention from us unless they are properly authenticated by the names of known and respectable writers.

Finally, it is evident that, however hastily a physician may be called away to consult, it is as well that he should look into the Medical Directory to ascertain who and what his consultant may be; and if he be a member of the Medical Council, it will be as well that he should note the names of homœopaths who seek to be registered, whether they be frequent consultants, old pupils, or perfect strangers.—ED. L.

OXYURIS VERMICULARIS IN THE HUMAN BODY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The denial given a fortnight ago to the statement quoted by Dr. Cobbold from the *Dublin Medical Press* was intended to be final. But circumstances now oblige us to notice his conduct more decidedly.

Your readers were, perhaps, surprised that Dr. Cobbold should have involved either of us in a statement which he characterizes as a "gross" "astounding" "absurdity," and as implying professional ignorance. They were probably still more surprised if they considered that Dr. Cobbold was fully aware that the whole of this statement was anonymous, and a chief part of it absolutely untrue. But they will, we think, be yet more astonished to learn that, before he published his remarks, he had been given positively to understand by one of us that neither of us had ever held such an opinion, or authorized such a statement.

We should hardly have ventured to repeat this protest, but for a letter from Dr. Cobbold which is now before us, and

which, so far as we can understand it, scarcely accepts our lenial, much less offers us the apology we were entitled to expect.

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

WILLIAM BRINTON.
LIONEL S. BEALE.

Brook-street, Grosvenor-square, January 26th, 1863.

* * We have received a letter from Dr. S. Cobbold, in which he states that his reason for not consulting Dr. Brinton was that he had not the pleasure of his personal acquaintance.—
ED. L.

GIBBON VERSUS BUDD.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you allow me to correct a slight inaccuracy in the report of this trial as it appears in your journal? (*Vide THE LANCET* of the 24th inst., p. 105.) It is stated that the late Mr. Budd consulted me about an accident to his foot. The fact is that *four months afterwards*, when the wound on the foot had quite healed, he directed his medical attendant—Mr. William Cross, of Spring-gardens—to write and arrange a consultation with me in reference to the debility and head symptoms from which he was suffering. It might be inferred from the report that I had undertaken a purely surgical case. Had this been so, it would assuredly have been pleaded against me. The defendant left no stone unturned, and spared no expense, to upset my case. The report is unfair in other respects, especially in not giving the evidence adduced in my behalf. As to the plea that I had attended him as a friend, the only pretext was that I was slightly acquainted with Mr. Budd; indeed, I showed that he had paid me previously for professional services. Unfortunately, my attendance was abruptly terminated by an attack of typhoid fever, which prostrated and obliged me to leave London in November, 1861, for more than two months, when other medical men took charge of the patient up to the time of his death.

My legal title to recover will be decided in a few days in the Exchequer Court, as it was stipulated that the matter should not be carried to a "Court of Error," on account of the heavy expense it would entail on the parties. It is to be hoped that the College of Physicians will assist me in establishing the legality of their bye-law.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Finsbury-square, Jan. 1863. SEPTIMUS GIBBON, M.B. Cantab.

PREVENTION OF SCARLET FEVER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have for some years now, in the prosecution of my practice, paid special attention to scarlatina; and as I have been very successful in its treatment, and in the means I have adopted to prevent infection among the other members of the families in which it has existed, I consider it my duty to draw the attention of my medical brethren, through THE LANCET, to the means employed, and the results achieved.

After a good deal of thought and observation, I have been led to the conclusion that if we, in treating a case of scarlet fever, induce diaphoresis and sustain it for some time, we shall be able to eliminate from the blood the organic poison peculiar to it. Acting on this belief, I have for the last few years pursued the treatment just indicated with the best and happiest results, almost all my patients so affected becoming rapidly convalescent.

For the last three years, when called to a case of scarlatina, I have been in the habit of administering to those children of the family not affected with the fever a gentle diaphoretic, in the belief that by so doing the poison will be eliminated as it is absorbed. Whether the theory be correct or not, let me call special attention to the result.

During the period above indicated, I have attended more than twenty-five cases of scarlet fever. In the dwellings in which the cases occurred, more than seventy persons, who never had the disease, were exposed to the poison, and not one was affected who took a teaspoonful, thrice daily, of the following mixture:—Antimony wine, two drachms; sulphate of magnesia, half an ounce; camphor mixture, to four ounces.

Dr. Gregory, in his "Lectures on Eruptive Fevers," states, on the authority of Dr. Binns, that 184 out of 216 scholars at Ackworth, were affected, or 85 per cent. Perhaps this is an unusually large proportion; but few can doubt that at least 60 per cent. are seized with scarlatina after exposure.

The object I have in bringing this subject before your readers is to solicit a trial of this preventive treatment from such as may have large hospitals or schools under their charge, in which many children reside. I would suggest to such as feel inclined to try it, to see that the medicine is actually taken; for it is only natural that children who feel quite well should resist taking it, and it often happens that even parents are slow to adopt preventive means be they ever so simple.

I hope, however, to see the day when the mortality from scarlatina will be much diminished by greater attention being paid to the health of those who, unaffected by it, are still exposed to its poison.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Edinburgh, Jan. 1863.

R. C. FURLEY, L.R.C.S.

ON THE TREATMENT OF ORCHITIS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Seeing in the last number of your journal a letter from Mr. Moore on the Treatment of Orchitis by Compression, and having myself lately adopted a very simple and, I think, entirely new plan of treatment with great success, I thought that perhaps you would be kind enough to give publication to the following case:—

Mr. B— came under my care for gonorrhoeal orchitis, having been treated by a chemist in the first place for the gonorrhoea. The right testis was much swollen and very painful—in fact, in the acute stage of inflammation. I at once painted the whole of that side of the scrotum with a strong tincture of iodine, at the same time administering an aperient and ordering rest, support being given to the testis by means of the ordinary suspensory bandage. I continued to apply the iodine every day, and by the fifth day he was quite well and able to resume his employment.

This is only one out of many cases, in most of which I have found, as above, that three or four applications were sufficient. The tincture that I always employ is a simple solution of iodine in spirits of wine, in the proportion of one drachm to three ounces.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Wallingford, Berks, Jan. 1863.

WM. PAYNE, M.R.C.S.

LARGE CALCULUS FROM A CHILD.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As a case of lithotomy, under the care of Mr. Ferguson, where the stone was of unusual size, in a boy nine years old, was reported in THE LANCET a few weeks ago, perhaps the following notice of a case operated on successfully by me, the patient a boy of five years old, may not be uninteresting.

The calculus was extracted by the lateral operation, chloroform being fully administered, and the dilatation of the prostate being effected mainly by the finger.

The composition of the calculus was chiefly phosphate of lime; its weight, 6½ drachms (the average weight of 400 calculi—extracted from persons of all ages—in the Norwich Museum being 6.13 drachms); and it measured in length an inch and a half, in width an inch and one-fifth, and in thickness nine-tenths of an inch.

The recovery was very rapid, the urine passing per urethram in four days, and the wound being completely closed in three weeks, at which time the little fellow was playing about.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

Llanstffraid, Oswestry, Jan. 1863.

THOS. EDWARDES.

THE ST. ANDREWS DEGREE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Your correspondent, "Harlequin," in your number of the 17th, having reflected severely on the University of St. Andrews, its last examination, and on the 336 gentlemen who then graduated, I venture to ask you to permit me, as one of the 336, to offer a few remarks in reply.

Having been nearly ten years in practice, I "coveted the distinction" of the title of M.D., and for reasons of convenience applied to the University of London. In reply I was referred to the regulations, which I found absolutely required me to begin again my professional studies, which was impossible. Accordingly nothing remained for me but to visit St. Andrews.

The Examination-papers will, I hope, be printed, and will speak for themselves.

The candidates were divided into batches, and were occu-