

surgical diploma is fully entitled, by education and examination, to exercise the duties of his profession in their fullest sense, and that he is much more highly qualified for a "general practitioner" than one who is merely possessed of a licence from the Apothecaries' Company. And yet, as the law is at present constituted, the apothecary is in a safer position to practise every branch of the medical profession than a person holding the double qualification of physician and surgeon. The public are not capable of judging of the great injustice to which the most learned in the profession are at present exposed; surely, if they were, they would go heart and soul in placing the physician and surgeon in a position to practise (unmolested) every branch of a profession in the obtaining of which he has spent years of toil, anxiety, and expense. The introduction of a Medical Bill into Parliament has been long spoken of, which, if carried into effect, would (I hope) afford protection to every branch of the profession. Year after year have passed over, and session after session gone by, and yet nothing has been done. Still the old law is in full operation, to oppress and shackle the practitioner who ventures beyond the strict letter thereof. I do not think the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries ought to be allowed to suffer in any way by the opening of their privileges; no, far from it; I consider they ought to be remunerated by every one whose qualifications may hereafter be deemed full and sufficient for practising the medical profession in its several branches; and yet who will not have undergone the examination for the Apothecaries' licence. Many, very many, indeed, are this moment looking forward to the next session of Parliament, in the full hope and confidence that the injustice to which the profession is at present exposed will be removed, so that security will be insured to the highly qualified practitioner, and enable him to perform the duties of his profession with advantage to himself, and benefit to those committed to his charge; and as the next session of Parliament is now fast approaching, it becomes a matter of serious consideration to the parties most interested, how far it is in their power to give a helping hand to carry on the good work, and how such power is to be called into action and made to move in the right direction. If any exertion is to be made to forward the proposed Bill, and to give a stamp of importance to the measure, surely now is the time to prepare for action; not when the recess is over, and Parliament, having again assembled, has become loaded with business, much of it of minor importance when compared with the Bill which has been so long in embryo for the regulation of the medical profession throughout her Majesty's dominions. I am not aware of what has been done, or what has not been done, for the furtherance of the measure, but I think there has been much procrastination in introducing it to the notice of the legislature, and I feel that it is now time for the profession to exert themselves to a man for the attainment of privileges to which they are so justly entitled, and from which they have been so long and unfairly deprived. Prosecutions for illegal practice are of daily occurrence, it being considered illegal for a physician and surgeon to compound and dispense his own medicine. The members of the "Medical Protection Society," as it is named, have taken upon themselves the unenviable task of prosecuting their brother practitioners, and creating discord and dissension wherever the blighting influence of their power alights; a society bearing such a name ought to have for its object the creating of harmony and peace amongst the members of a profession which, in the present day, unhappily holds but a second-rate reputation in public opinion; and how is it that such a reputation has been called into existence, and that the art and science of medicine is daily losing caste in the catalogue of the vulgar mind. Such a state of things has had its origin, and now thrives and flourishes on a base of dissension: "if a house be divided against a house, that house cannot stand." As long as separate interests occupy the several branches of the profession, as long as member pulls against member, prosperity cannot follow in the footsteps of medical science. Many valuable discoveries have been made during the last few years, in physiology, chemistry, and medicine, most of which are calculated to remove or relieve the sufferings of humanity, and yet the character of the profession has rather had a tendency to retrograde instead of to advance: this, I am convinced, would not be the case if the elevation of one qualification by the crushing of another was totally and entirely put an end to. I am convinced the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries would in no wise oppose the progress of a Bill through Parliament which, if carried into effect, would add largely to their funds, and unite in the bond of good fellowship the several branches of a profession, which, at the present time, are unhappily at

variance with each other. Let the promoters of the proposed alteration act vigorously and energetically; if funds are wanting to defray the necessary expenses, let them call on their medical brethren for subscriptions; if a memorial is requisite, if anything is wanting to ensure success, let it be made known to the profession at large, through the medium of the medical journals. Every hour brings us nearer to the next meeting of Parliament; time flies fast, and let it not hurry us over another session without the long-wished-for Medical Bill becoming a law of the land.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
J. R., A PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.

## THE ANATOMY OF THE UTERINE CAVITIES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the report of the discussion on the use of chloroform in midwifery, at the Westminster Medical Society, published in the last number of your journal, I am erroneously made to say, "that chloroform seems to act directly on the ganglionic system of nerves." The word *cerebro-spinal*, which I used, should have been inserted for *ganglionic*. May I beg of you to insert this correction.

I take advantage of the opportunity to answer the remarks made by Dr. Tyler Smith, in his paper on Fallopian obstructions, (August 4,) respecting my description of the uterine cavities in the recent edition of my work on uterine inflammation. The woodcut which he criticises in reality gives a less proportionate depth to the cavity of the uterus than was intended, as would have appeared had Dr. Tyler Smith quoted the measurement of the uterine cavities, which occurs as follows, at p. 46:—"The uterine sound, when passed into the uterus, is concealed to the extent of two inches and a half, of which one inch and a half occupies the cavity of the cervix, whilst one inch only is in the uterus." Thus Dr. Tyler Smith may be said to have partly founded his criticism of the engraving on my own text—a circumstance which he might as well have mentioned.

Dr. Tyler Smith, however, is certainly in error when he places the natural coarctation or sphincter, which I described an inch and a quarter or an inch and a half from the fundus of the uterus. The observation of above seven hundred females has proved to me that this natural coarctation during life is found with the uterine sound at from one inch and a half to one inch and three quarters from the os externum. This leaves only one inch or three quarters of an inch for the uterine cavities, the total depth of the uterine cavities being normally two inches and a half from the os externum to the fundus. I can only explain Dr. Tyler Smith's doubting this fact by the supposition that his researches have been principally limited to sterile or nulliparous females, as he terms them, in whom the cervical canal is often found contracted in nearly all its length, the contraction generally becoming very evident about an inch from the cervix or os externum.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY BENNET, M.D.

Cambridge-square, Hyde-park, Nov. 16, 1849.

## MEDICAL ETIQUETTE IN MARKET DRAYTON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I beg to acknowledge your courtesy in forwarding me a copy of your journal for Saturday last; your object, doubtless, was to draw my attention to a letter it contained from Mr. Saxton, of this town, reflecting upon my character as a physician and gentleman. Had Mr. Saxton confined himself to a correct and honest statement of facts as they occurred, I should not have taken the trouble to reply to his letter; as it is, I must give my version of the affair.

When the messenger came, in great haste, to request me immediately to visit Mr. L——, I inquired who was the medical gentleman in attendance, and was informed, Mr. Saxton, but that he was at church. On arriving at the house, I found the patient just recovering from a state of syncope, and was informed it was the second fainting fit he had had within an hour, arising from the sting of a bee. When I had written my prescription, I told them, that in case of another attack they must get the medicine prepared somewhere, but that should he remain comfortable they could await Mr. Saxton's return from church. The wife followed my directions, and immediately on the termination of service called upon Mr. Saxton with the prescription; the result of her visit we shall see by and by. Between five and six o'clock I called upon Mr. Saxton, for the purpose of speaking to him respecting L——, and on my observing to him—"L—— sent for me an hour or two ago, on

the recurrence of his fainting; have you seen him?" "No," was the reply; "they came here with your prescription, and I told them they may take it elsewhere; I shall not go to see him again, and I will not meet you any more unless things are carried on in a different manner." "Why," I said, "what is the matter now?" "Matter! they ought to have known better than to have sent for you, and you ought to have known better than to have gone to see him."

I did not wait to experience any more of Mr. Saxton's rudeness, but immediately prepared to leave his house; before doing so, I addressed him as follows:—"Sir, this is the second time within a month that you have addressed me in this insolent manner—it is behaviour I will not permit; your conduct clearly shows you are a stranger to the duties of a physician, and ignorant of professional etiquette. Had I not visited the patient under such circumstances I ought to have been scouted out of the profession; and, as far as I am individually concerned, it is a matter of perfect indifference whether I ever meet you again or not."

After my return home, I thought that, as Mr. Saxton declined calling upon the patient again, I would walk down, and see what was become of him. I must observe, that though L— is in humble circumstances, being gardener to a gentleman in the town, he is both a respectable and intelligent man. On seeing Mrs. L—, she said, "Sir, I took your prescription to Mr. Saxton, immediately on his return from church, but he threw it away in a great rage, and I never was so abused by any one in all my life as I was by Mr. Saxton." I then stated the result of my interview with Mr. Saxton. The husband observed—"Sir, I am very sorry for having exposed you to Mr. Saxton's rudeness; I have paid him a good deal of money since he has attended my family, but he shall never enter my doors again."

As far as I can make out, Mr. Saxton brings three accusations against me.

First, that I prescribed for the patient without taking the slightest notice of his being in attendance.

Secondly, that I did not give him the earliest intimation of what was going on.

Thirdly, that I did not send the prescription to his surgery.

When Mr. Saxton wrote these three sentences he could not but have been well aware that each accusation conveyed an untruth. I called upon him within three hours after seeing the patient, and the prescription was taken to his surgery immediately on his return from church; it would have been useless to take it sooner, as Mr. Saxton has neither assistant nor apprentice.

I have stated above, that this was the second time Mr. Saxton had behaved in so strange a manner towards me. About a month prior to this occurrence, on my calling upon him one morning, he very rudely accosted me, and said, he must have an explanation from me for having, through my influence, prevented his being called in as medical attendant to a gentleman in the neighbourhood, and he would never meet me again till I had explained the circumstance. Now, Sir, there was not an atom of truth in this accusation, the gentleman alluded to had been occasionally in the habit of consulting me for years, and on my advising him to have a surgeon, he at once gave me a *carte blanche* to introduce whomsoever I pleased. I did not send for Mr. Saxton; and here is the *fons et origo* of all his animosity towards me; since then he has shown a determination to quarrel with me, *coute que coute*; after having brought this unfounded charge against me, I had a right to expect that Mr. Saxton would make the *amende honorable*—nothing of the sort, Sir.

I now take my leave of Mr. Saxton; but as I am not the first of his medical brethren with whom he has sought a quarrel, I will venture this parting admonition. Let him in future try to check his envious and quarrelsome disposition; let him be cautious how he brings forward accusations which cannot be substantiated; nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice; not suppress such parts of evidence as tell against himself, but state the truth—and nothing but the truth.

The daily proofs of regard and esteem I receive from both rich and poor, prove that I have not spent upwards of twenty years in the neighbourhood, without securing to myself a character that may bid defiance to the shafts of envy, hatred, or malice. Henceforth, Mr. Saxton may write or whisper what he pleases; nothing shall call forth a reply from me. I shall treat all with the same cool indifference that I do the petulance of my neighbour's little poodle, which occasionally barks at my heels as I pass along the street.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Market-Drayton, Sept. 18, 1849.

W. Wood, M.D.

## REWARDS TO THE CHOLERA DOCTORS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In answer to your correspondent's inquiry, "What have been the rewards to the cholera doctors?" I will simply state my own case. I was solicited early in July by the Board of Guardians of Lambeth, through their secretary, to assist the medical gentleman who for many years had held the charge of this portion of the parish, and a sum of ten pounds per month was named as compensation; finding, however, that in the first ten days I had registered no less than upwards of one hundred and twenty patients, including twenty-one cases of cholera, I addressed a letter to the "Board" stating the very inadequate remuneration offered for my services. To this letter no written answer was returned, but in the course of the week I was waited upon by one of the guardians (a medical man), who urged upon my family, being myself absent, that I should not resign, as the guardians were disposed to behave liberally, and I should be **AMPLE REMUNERATED**. I therefore continued to hold office, and during the three months of my engagement registered and attended upwards of fifteen hundred cases of the late epidemic diarrhoea, including a very large number of cases of cholera, I believe nearly one hundred and fifty, and my reward has been sixty-eight pounds five shillings.\* I will not make any comment at present, as that will perhaps be the subject of another communication. Twice during the time I was, from over-exertion, thrown upon a bed of sickness, and when I attempted to address the board of guardians, was refused a hearing.

I remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

Eldon-place, Vauxhall.

J. W. JONES.

## THE BUILDER'S LIFE-ASSURANCE COMPANY.

[NOTE FROM SIR JAMES EYRE, M.D.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Before I had seen the letter of Mr. Solly, which appeared in your journal of last week, I had suggested to the manager of the company of which I am the medical adviser, that he would write and request you to add "The Architect's, Builder's, and General Insurance Office," to the list of those institutions which give a fee to the physician or surgeon of any one on his becoming an applicant for the benefit of life insurance in London. The gentleman to whom I have alluded declined addressing you himself, but saw no objection to my doing so, which I am unfeignedly happy to do, as, from my long professional connexion with insurance societies, it is known that I have always been an advocate for feeing the medical attendant of the individual who may desire to insure his life, the best way, I believe, of obtaining a valuable opinion, though often full of risk to the honest man who gives it.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES EYRE, M.D.

Physician to the Architect's, Builder's,  
and General Insurance Company.

Nov. 1849.

## Medical News.

APOTHECARIES' HALL.—Names of gentlemen who passed their examination in the science and practice of medicine, and received certificates to practise, on

Wednesday, Nov. 14th, 1849.

BEALE, LIONEL SMITH.

GASKELL, RICHARD ALLANSON, St. Helen's, Lincolnshire.

KING, PHILIP HENRY, Grantham, Lincolnshire.

MACLEAN, DAVID BURDIE, Burton, Westmoreland.

SAUNDERS, JAMES WARNES, Aylsham, Norfolk.

SHEPPARD, GEORGE ALFRED, Worcester.

WELSH, WILLIAM HENRY, Eccles, Lancashire.

THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE OF PARIS.—The session begun on the 5th inst. with the usual opening speeches, and the distribution of prizes to pupils of the Ecole Pratique, (Dissecting School.) One of the introductory discourses, delivered by Professor Denonvilliers, was entirely devoted to the panegyric of the late Blandin. The Dean of the Faculty, Dr. Bérard, addressed himself particularly to the pupils, before whom he stood for the first time in his official capacity. After having alluded to his recent appointment, and to the expected law for regulating the practice of medicine, the learned professor dwelt on the cholera, and especially on the admirable alacrity with which the students, when called upon, had hastened to

\* Not one shilling per case, including medicine.