pretensions. I would tell them, that whilst they continue such practices, they have as perverted an idea of respectability as Falstaff had of honour. A man with those proper principles of pride, which a cultivated understanding gives him, recoils from such unbecoming proceedings."

I remain, Sir, yours truly,

ANTI-HUMBUG.

REFUSAL TO ALLOW MR. EDWARDS TO
LECTURE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In to-day's Number of your Journal I perceive by the letter of "Diego Carlos," that the conduct of the physicians of the Westminster Hospital in requesting Mr. Edwards to discontinue his clinical remarks on the cases under their care, is impeached as illiberal.

"Diego Carlos" is evidently unacquainted with the *whole* truth, or disposed to supply only so much of it as shall form the groundwork of a charge,—permit me, therefore, as being in possession of all the facts of the case, to lay them shortly before you.

Previous to the delivery of those lectures, Mr. Edwards signified to the Physicians his intention to commence a course of clinical instruction on the 15th, and as no negative was given he proceeded accordingly. Three or four of those excellent lectures had been delivered, when the three Physicians who chanced to be together at the hospital on other business, spoke to Mr. Edwards on the subject of his lecturing, and appealed to him whether he considered it proper that in the absence of any physician's pupil, their patients should be selected for illustration to surgeons' pupils and strangers. For instance, it was said,—The surgeons derive the benefit of the fees for surgical attendance, and we do not see why we should give surgical and other pupils the opportunity of entering to the medical practice of any other hospital or dispensary to the profit of others, and come here to derive all their medical advantages. They also reminded him, that Dr. Roe had already delivered clinical lectures, and that it was his intention, as he felt it was his duty, to illustrate the physicians' cases on an accession of pupils, and thus they should also feel obliged to Mr. Edwards for his valuable assistance. Mr. Edwards assented to this, and immediately affixed the notice you have published in the surgery. On reconsideration a few hours after, he thought the sentence "not approving of the gratuitous communication of information" liable to misconception, and it was withdrawn.

Thus, Sir, I think I have shown that the insinuation of illiberality in this case is not just, inasmuch as the physicians have been, and always are, ready to communicate clinical instruction without fee to physicians' pupils. Their disinclination to labour and let others bear away the profit, is certainly but reasonable.

I may further state, that the physicians are at all times happy to see and expatiate on cases to occasional visitors, and they would not object to the proceeding in question, but that regular attendance is implied.

Upon the justice of paying at all for medical practice, you, I believe, entertain strong opinions, and most persons differ in some degree from their neighbours on this subject; but as that is a question which stands by itself, I trust you will argue it upon its own merits, and not be induced by a misunderstanding to involve the physicians of this hospital in a question with which, individually, they have nothing to do.

I remain your obedient servant,

GEO. F. KNOX.

14, George Street, Adelphi.

December 3, 1831.

WESTMINSTER MEDICAL SOCIETY.

Saturday, December 17th, 1831.

Mr. CHINNOCK, President.

THE CHOLERA.

THE preliminary business being dismissed, this subject was again introduced.

The CHAIRMAN begged permission to read to the Society a paper which had been drawn up partly at his (Mr. C.'s) request, by Dr. Wilson Philip. (Disapprobation was here expressed at what was considered a bad precedent, namely, the submitting of a paper not written by a member; but the reading was ultimately permitted.)

Mr. CHINNOCK accordingly proceeded: we shall not, however, attempt to follow the observations of Dr. Philip, now read. They afforded, we believe, no new point, nor did they place old ones in a new light, but reviewed in a clear manner the facts connected with the physiology and pathology of cholera. In introducing the subject, the writer thought it proper to premise, that in what followed he was not speaking from personal experience of the disease: he was only giving his opinions, formed from the accounts of others, and assisted by twenty years' study of the phenomena of animal life. For an enlarged view of the physiological data upon which he should start, he referred to his own works and to his papers