spoil amongst them. I am never so bilious as about pay-day.

If a man, however, is determined to come out to India, let him "throw physic to the dogs," and come out as anything else. Let him seek, if he has interest with the railway people, the appointment of assistant-engineer, and he will commence at once on *twice* our pay and much more brilliant prospects. If hopelessly wedded, however, to medicine and the scalpel, let him obtain a veterinary appointment. It will not take a man long, who has mastered the "Dublin Dissector," to "get up" the anatomy of a horse; and he will find, when out here, that a horse-doctor gets better pay, is equally if not more respected, gets attached at once to a cavalry corps, which are always in the healthiest quarters, and he will have the advantages of our fund, &c. So much for glory!

Believe me, my dear Mr. Editor,

Your very obedient and yellow servant,

Madras, 1856.

A BILIOUS ASSISTANT-SURGEON.

THE BANBURY UNION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The aspersions cast on my character in your last week's journal by Messrs. Caparn and Chesterman compel me to offer a few remarks in vindication.

In reference to Dr. Caparn's long letter, I shall merely observe, that ignorance is no excuse for misrepresentation; if he has not wilfully distorted facts, he has undoubtedly been guilty of neglecting to obtain correct information. But as regards Mr. Chesterman, I cannot allow this excuse, poor as it is. He must know that he has not only violated the confidence of private intercourse, but has given an incorrect account of what did occur.

I positively deny having, in any terms, alluded to the clergy, or used the words parsons- or squires-justices, or indeed, *any* intemperate or ungentlemanly expression. I did not "hint that a letter of sympathy would be acceptable to me"—*that originated with Mr. Chesterman himself*; neither did I intimate that the dispute with the board of guardians was occasioned by my application for an increase of salary, but quite the reverse.

I was induced to offer myself for re-election in consequence of having received two testimonials: one numerous signed by the poor; and the other, by guardians and ratepayers, both requesting me to continue in office, and which were also backed by the advice of many friends.

I will not occupy your space by refuting every point in Mr. Chesterman's letter, but will observe, that I was honourably reinstated at a full meeting of the board by a majority of nine votes; and also, that my conduct in this matter has met with the entire approbation of every other medical gentleman in the town—gentlemen of high standing in our profession, of whose honour and veracity it is an assumption to doubt.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Banbury, April, 1857.

RICHARD GRIMBLY.

THE STOCKBRIDGE UNION.—FOX V. TAYLOR.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In recalling the attention of the profession to the conduct of Mr. Francis Taylor, of Romsey, in accepting an office in that Union, vacated by me on account of insufficient salary, (recorded in THE LANCET of January 17th,) permit me to thank the numerous gentlemen in different parts of England who have kindly tendered me their sympathy and support. To you, Sir, also are my thanks due for the expression of your opinion on the matter, and for the insertion of my former letter. I deeply regret it should be necessary to trespass again on your columns, but a regard for my own character, and respect for the great question of Poor-law Medical Reform compel me to lay the case of Fox v. Taylor once more before the profession, that they, as the superior court, may amend the verdict of an inferior court just pronounced.

When this case was first reported in the journals, it was suggested to me to bring it before the Southampton Medical Society, which took cognizance of medical ethics, and of which body Taylor and I were members. I applied to the Society for a hearing of the case, and the following is an abstract of what took place:—

The secretaries fixed a day, and informed Taylor and Fox thereof. Taylor replied, "Too busy to attend." Secretaries then wrote, asking Taylor to fix a day. Reply, "Can't fix;

don't want any controversy." Fox wonders at the delay, and urges the secretaries to proceed. At length they fix a day, give Taylor notice, and request him, if not able to attend, to write in defence or explanation. Meeting 24th of February, Dr. Oke in the chair. Taylor absent. Letter received from him and read. "That he can justify every step he has taken, and has no objection to communicate *privately* with the president or secretaries." Case heard. Fox and Taylor medical officers to the Romsey Union. Fox's district, 5000 acres; population, 1500; salary, 13s. 10d. per week. Fox applies for increase of salary on Monday, December 26th, 1856; board day. Board of guardians refuse; letter dated Monday, December 29th. Fox resigns in consequence; date of letter, Wednesday, December 31st, to be laid before board on Monday, January 5th, 1857. No appointment made that day, but Mr. Taylor and Mr. Sainsbury (another medical officer) were offered the district, at all events were written to on the subject. *January 3rd, before Fox's resignation could be known by the board*, (their meeting being on the 5th,) Fox informs Taylor thereof, with his reasons for, and asks for Taylor's sympathy and support. Taylor replies to Fox on January 10th, stating that he has taken the district on the old terms, "because it came in with his work," &c., (vide THE LANCET, Jan. 17th,) and apologizes for having so long delayed answering Fox's letter of January 3rd. *Meeting adjourned* to give Taylor another opportunity of explanation. Fox lives seventeen, Taylor eight miles from Southampton.

At the next meeting the Society were unanimous in condemning Taylor's conduct, and passed a resolution so strong as to be considered libellous. Withdrawn. Committee appointed to hear Taylor privately. President and secretaries to be a sub-committee for an interview. Meeting adjourned.

March 27th.—Meeting, Dr. Oke chairman. Sub-committee retired to adjoining room to communicate to committee the result of private conference with Taylor. On their return the President communicated such information to the meeting as *Mr. Taylor allowed to be made public* in his defence, which was, first, that he had accepted the office before he received Fox's letter, and, therefore, was not acquainted with the circumstances attending his resignation; and, secondly, that the Rev. C. Kingsley had said the salary was an average one. It came out accidentally that the reason Mr. Taylor could not attend the general meeting was a predisposition to palpitation of the heart, and Dr. Elliotson had recommended the avoidance of all excitement. Fox having been called in, and Taylor's defence read to him, it was suggested that *Taylor might have had the office offered to him before the meeting of the board on Jan. 5th*; to which it was replied, no one could have been authorized to offer it; but admitting that, Taylor had plenty of time after knowing the circumstances, to rectify his mistake, had it been a mistake only. The Society proceeded to return a verdict, and after some discussion, the following was handed to Fox:—"The Medical Society having maturely considered the circumstances connected with the resignation by Mr. Fox of the appointment of medical officer of the Mottesfont district, and the acceptance of the office by Mr. Taylor, cannot but express their regret that Mr. Taylor did not communicate with Mr. Fox prior to accepting the office, and would urge on both gentlemen that it will be the wisest and kindest course to take no further proceedings in a matter which may lead to much unpleasant converse, and very painful results."

I call upon my medical brethren throughout the kingdom to say if I have been treated fairly in this matter by the Southampton Medical Society. I ask them to say if any private matter should have been introduced, or allowed to operate in deciding on a public question. Emerson says, in his "Traits," "The English game is fair play and open field, without trick or dodging; they hate craft and subtlety. They neither poison, nor waylay, nor assassinate." Let me have English treatment, and I fear nothing. Some slander must have operated to induce a body of men one day to pass the strongest possible resolution, and the next such an one as that just quoted, on the same subject. How far this is just I leave my brethren to say. I now call upon Dr. Oke, (as I did at Southampton,) regardless of consequences to myself, to declare boldly, in open daylight, the grounds for advising the Society to change their tone in reference to Mr. Taylor's conduct. I deny altogether the fairness of allowing Mr. Taylor to earwig the venerable President; but as I am only desirous that truth should prevail, I make this proposition to Dr. Oke. Then if Mr. Taylor can justify his breach of professional etiquette, by any circumstance or matter of a private or public nature whatever in relation to myself, to be decided by any impartial professional man, I hereby promise to pay £10 to the treasurer of the Southampton