of Victoria." It creates a Council of Medical Education and Registration, provides for registration, and prohibits unregistered persons from holding public offices, or signing certificates required by any public Act, in the same manner as the Medical Act of Great Britain. The offence of wilfully procuring registration by fraudulent representation is punishable by fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months. The most important difference is in the 24th Clause, which provides a fine not exceeding £20, not only for falsely pretending to be a registered person, but for "practising medicine or surgery for lucre or gain without being registered under the Act." This puts an end to the rogueries of all the "non-registered surgeons," "Members of the Reformed College of Surgeons, America," and "Fellows of the Imperial African Medical Institute." It abolishes summarily free trade in medicine, and protects the registered diploma. In Victoria this may be more necessary than in Great Britain.

ANNUITANTS OF THE NAVAL MEDICAL FUND.

THE report which we lately published, recommending the abolition of the Naval Medical Supplemental Fund, now engages a considerable share of the attention of the medical officers of the Navy. It is particularly felt that this step strongly affects the interests of the two hundred widows—annuitants of the Society—whose incomes have been reduced by one-third during the last fifteen years, but who had the hope of a reversion to the annuity of £40 insured for them by their husbands. The reduction was effected by Act of Parliament, and would extend over nine years. Those personally interested felt that it would not be equitable to treat this as a reduction for a lifetime, and that their claims would not be satisfied by life annuities at the present rate of £26 13s. 4d.; but, rather, ask for annuities of this amount over the next ten years to increase to £40 for the survivors. In order to wind-up the Society, as the report suggests, an Act of Parliament will be necessary, and the opposition of the two hundred widows would not facilitate legislation. We recommend their case to the prior consideration of the committee of inquiry.

PLAY AND PRISON.

THE public has been naturally and grievously shocked by the statement that some scores of children are annually committed to prison for playing in the public streets. Hundreds are charged before the metropolitan magistrates with this offence. Imprisonment would seem to be an unnatural sentence, weighing cruelly upon an inborn necessity of childish development. Yet it may be admitted that the consequences of boyish games pursued in public thoroughfares are often so serious and always so inconvenient, that public repression is called for. It is impossible to ignore the mischief of prohibiting children from recreation in the open air; but it were wrong to encourage them in amusements dangerous to the life and limb of passers-by: such are "tip-cat, marbles, rounders," and the like childish games. It remains to use all possible exertion to provide them with places of public, open-air recreation. Above all, it is right that we should be jealous of any encroachment upon the few yards of open space which are still left here and there in the heart of the metropolis. We cordially echo the protest of Lord Ebury and Lord Shaftesbury uttered in the House of Lords recently against the compromise between the Government and the Corporation of the City by which it is proposed to build over a great part of Smithfield. Forty boys of tender age were committed to Westminster Bridewell last year for attempting to play in the streets; and the paternal Government which consigned these young culprits to the tender mercies of the jailer, at the same time proceed to close up the only piece of open ground available to a dense and unhealthy population of thousands. Near the site are St. Bartholomew's Hospital, Christ's Hospital (with its

1000 boys), and the two great prisons. It is surrounded by thousands of children of the poor, to whom no other exercising ground is contiguous. We hope that the indignant protest of Lords Ebury and Shaftesbury may be of some avail for its preservation.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE CORONERS' CLAUSE IN THE NEW POOR-LAW MEDICAL RELIEF BILL.

[LETTER FROM MR. GRIFFIN.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I did not reply to the note you appended to my letter of the 5th instant, as I felt that we were under considerable obligation to you for assisting in the movement, and, therefore, I ought to allow you to have the last word in your own journal in reference to the Coroner's clause; but now that you have again taken up the subject in a leader of considerable length, I can no longer remain silent. You state that "a great opportunity has been lost through the injudicious attempt to make the Bill carry provisions totally foreign to its professed and only legitimate objects." Excuse me, the Bill was not lost for the cause you assign; indeed, Clauses 37 and 38 had nothing to do with the withdrawal of the Bill. The fact is, that advice was tendered, which I repeated to Mr. Pigott, and he immediately communicated with the party named, and a certain understanding being come to, the Bill was withdrawn. You may possibly not be aware that the Cambridge Board of Guardians, who took the lead in the opposition to the Bill, issued a report, which, I believe, they sent to every member of Parliament; certain it is, that Mr. Pigott had a copy sent to him, which he gave to me. Their grounds of opposition to the Bill were not founded on these sections; indeed they treat them as clauses almost beneath their notice, which undoubtedly display their utter ignorance of a subject on which they were endeavouring to enlighten the Legislature.*

I will not trespass further on your valuable columns than to state, that on the 9th inst. I had an interview with Mr. Pigott, who was confined to his house with a severe cold, and that I left in his hands an amended Bill, which he promised to forward immediately to ——— for his opinion. A conference will, doubtless, ensue; and in a short time I hope to see a Bill in the House that will meet with the support of Government.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

12, Royal-terrace, Weymouth,
May 12th, 1860.

RICHARD GRIFFIN.

PIROGOFF'S OPERATION.

[LETTER FROM DR. EBEN WATSON.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—After some unavoidable delay, I have to-day obtained a copy of Prof. Pirrie's "Principles and Practice of Surgery," on which you say your remarks regarding the performance of Pirogoff's operation without disarticulating at the ankle were founded; and on referring to it, I find that *the name* of the Russian surgeon does *not once occur* in the whole of that work! Why, Sir, Prof. Pirrie's book was published more than a year prior to the date of the paper in which Pirogoff first described his operation. How, then, could Prof. Pirrie modify an operation which had never been proposed?

I have indeed to-day, *for the first time*, discovered that Prof. Pirrie has recommended *Syme's operation* to be performed without disarticulating the foot. I think this anything but an improvement of that operation. If, however, I had known of it before I wrote my paper for your journal, I should have referred to it then. But with his modification of Syme's operation I have nothing whatever to do at present; for surely his having suggested such a modification of *Syme's operation* does

* At this point Mr. Griffin has inserted two paragraphs explanatory of the views of the guardians; and then he has added an enormously long extract from a letter of a medical gentleman, who writes from London, showing the opinions the writer entertains relative to the operation of Clause 38. It is impossible to find space for the nonsense this extract contains.—ED. L.