recognised in the election of Poor-law Medical Officers. From this list the name of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, recognised as giving a surgical licence, has been omitted. This must have occurred *per incuriam*, as the original official documents, received by me this day, contain the name of this College in its proper position. As this omission in your widely circulated periodical will be productive of injury to the interests of the College and its numerous licentiates in England, I have to request that you will correct it in your next number in such a manner that the correction may be as readily observable as the error in THE LANCET of the 14th instant.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
DOUGLAS MACLAGAN,
President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh.
The Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh, Jan. 16th, 1860.

* * The omission was purely accidental.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The General Order just issued by the Poor-law Board, on the qualifications of their medical officers, is an interesting one at the present crisis in medical politics. It is observable, however, that gentlemen possessing the very first qualification enumerated in the list are practically disqualified from holding office under boards of guardians, for the obvious reason that they are prohibited by their College from practising pharmacy, while their contract with the guardians would bind them to "supply the requisite medicines" to their union patients. While, therefore, the L.R.C.P. Lond. is admitted to office by the Poor-law Board, he is prohibited from such office by his own College; so there is an end of him, at any rate. But what have the Universities of Dublin, Durham, and St. Andrews—"Universities of the United Kingdom," all of them—done that they should be left out of the list? They are legalized by the Medical Act, the provisions of which are referred to by the Board as calling for the General Order, and they may, if they choose, "supply the requisite medicines" to their patients.

"The Poor-law Board have," they say, "at present no adequate information as to the nature" of their degrees and licences; so they reject them or admit them only on the degrading condition of a special petition or application under a generalizing clause, and that while they admit the L.R.C.P. Lond., of the nature of whose qualification their "information" cannot be very "adequate," assuming, as they clearly do by allowing the contract, that he can "supply the requisite medicines to his patients!"

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
January, 1860. M.D. ST. AND. & L.R.C.P. EDIN.

* * Members of the London College of Physicians are not excluded. The qualification is not incompatible with holding a workhouse appointment; indeed, there is at least one example of this.

FATAL HÆMORRHAGE FROM VARICOSE VEINS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—About five years since, I attended the wife of a milkman in Northampton with a varicose ulcer of the leg, which yielded to the ordinary treatment of rest and bandaging, and the wound healed up. I gave her strict injunction to wear the bandage for life, and pointed out the danger of leaving it off; notwithstanding which, about twelve months afterwards she discontinued its use, and on her return homewards from the town hæmorrhage occurred, and when she arrived at home she became faint, fell down on the floor, and expired. I was sent for, and found her lying in a pool of blood.

JAMES MASH,
Senior Surgeon to the General Hospital,
Northampton.
January, 1860.

MEDICAL TRIALS.

WINGHAM PETTY SESSIONS.

CONVICTION FOR ILLEGAL PRACTICE.

THURSDAY, JAN. 12TH.

CHARLES HOVELL, son of the late Charles Hovell, surgeon, of Canterbury, was charged with practising as a surgeon without proper qualification. There were two informations against the defendant—one for using the term surgeon, as applied to

himself; and the other for practising. Both informations were laid under an Act of Parliament passed in 1858, and quoted as "The Medical Registration Act," and the proceedings had been taken in accordance with instructions from the East Kent Medical Registration Association. The defendant pleaded "Not guilty."

Mr. Fielding, of Canterbury, appeared in support of the information.

The defendant denied the charge of falsely using the name of surgeon, implying thereby, or with a view of making the public believe, that he was registered under the new Medical Act, or that he had a diploma.

Mr. FIELDING referred to the Act, and briefly described its various provisions. Section 27 was a rather important one, bearing on the case then before the Bench. It provided for the publication, under the supervision of the General Council in London, of an official Register, which should be taken as evidence in a court of justice. The absence of the name of any party practising as a physician must be taken as *prima facie* evidence of his not being qualified, and the onus of proving legal qualification would, in such a case, rest upon the defendant. He would hand in the Register, which did not contain the name of any Charles Hovell residing in the county of Kent. He would now proceed to the circumstances of the charge against the defendant Hovell. He should be able to show to the Bench that the defendant resided in Wingham, and that on the day mentioned in the summons he had a plate on his door containing the words "Hovell, surgeon." If, as he should be able to show, the defendant resided in the house, it must be taken to apply to him, unless he could prove to the satisfaction of the Bench that it applied to some other party there. He should prove that the defendant paid the rates for the house.

CLEMENT HARRIS, overseer, proved there was a brass plate on the street-door, engraved "Hovell, surgeon." The plate was on the door up to this week, but was removed on Monday night. It had been there two years or more.

Mr. FIELDING.—That is the case, your worship.

The defendant, in reply to the charge, said he had acted as assistant to his late father ever since he had been home from sea. In the first instance he resided at Ash, where the plate upon the door was used by his father, who practised there as a surgeon until the defendant removed to Wingham. It was then removed, by his father's orders, to the house at Wingham, which was taken by his father, and where he (defendant) resided and acted as his father's assistant. Up to the time of his death, his father used to come to Wingham to see patients, and the business was always carried on in his name. When his father was not there, the patients were, of course, introduced to him (defendant); but it was well understood that he acted as his father's assistant, and that he was not qualified to practise on his own account. When his father died, he received no instructions from the executors to remove the plate from the door, and the necessity for doing so never occurred to his mind. But by the keeping it on the door he never intended to deceive the public, as all his late father's patients were fully aware that he did not hold a diploma from any of the halls of medicine or surgery. The plate was removed from the door on the Monday night previously by some of his many friends in the parish, who thought by so doing they would be rendering him a service, but it appeared they were mistaken. He did not give any order for its removal, nor was he aware by whom it was removed.

Mr. Fielding then proceeded with the second case, the charge being for practising as a surgeon in the parish of Ash, without being duly qualified. He then called

Mr. J. L. LASS, who deposed—I reside at Sandwich, and am Registrar of Births and Deaths. I produce the certificate of the death of John Wall, which was received by me on the 27th of October.

The certificate produced by the witness was one of those which the defendant stated he was authorized, as assistant to his father, to fill up. It stated that the deceased had been attended during his illness by the defendant, as assistant to "Charles Hovell, surgeon, late R.N."

Mr. Fielding then put in evidence a certified copy of the registry of the death of Chas. Hovell, Surgeon, of Canterbury, which took place in July last.

This was the case for the prosecution.

The defendant explained how he came to give the certificate. His father used to supply him with a number of forms properly signed, which only required filling up. At his father's death he had a number of those forms by him, and that produced by the witness Lass was one of them. There was no intention,