section of, a single line, on any subject, in the pages of this Journal. We print his note, and this observation, because we have been informed that he has before been guilty of unjustifiable remarks on the subject, in relation to his affair with Mr. Gray. Respecting the controversy we have only to say, that as the correspondence begins to want the quality of good taste, facts alone can find a farther place in our columns.

THE VACCINATION ACT AND THE BRENTFORD UNION.

REFUSAL OF THE EIGHTEENPENNY FEE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—The guardians of the Brentford Union having, on the 30th ult., addressed a circular to the resident general practitioners, inquiring whether they would vaccinate upon the terms stated in page 89 of the circular of the poor-law commissioners (viz. at *eighteenpence* per case), a meeting of such practitioners took place on the 9th instant; and, in order to obtain the concurrence of some who were absent from the first meeting, a second was held yesterday. The result is, that of the thirty-three general practitioners residing within the union, twenty-seven have subscribed the declaration, of which, at their request, I forward a copy for your notice or insertion: *one*, though, as a *guardian*, disqualified from joining in an offer to contract, is well known to be favourable to the higher charge; and the remaining five, although by various causes prevented from beginning, are virtually pledged not to accede to the present terms of the commissioners.

It is to be hoped that an example of such perfect unanimity will not be lost upon the medical men of other unions. I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,

FRAS. A. B. BONNEY,
Hon. Sec. to the Meetings.

Brentford, Oct. 14, 1840.

“We, the undersigned medical practitioners, residing in the Brentford Union, do hereby declare our adhesion to the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted at a meeting of medical practitioners residing in the said union, on Friday, the 9th day of October, 1840, viz. :—

“Resolved, that this meeting consider that the sum of one shilling and sixpence per case is not a sufficient remuneration under the Vaccination Act, recollecting that all classes of patients may avail themselves of the provisions of the Act; and that an answer be returned to the board of guardians, respectfully declining their offer, and, at the same time proposing to undertake the

duties at two shillings and sixpence per case.

“Thomas Haffenden, Hanwell, chairman.
E. J. S. Camden, Hounslow.
W. M. Case, Isleworth.
William Clubbe, Acton.
Henry Day, Acton.
Horatio G. Day, Isleworth.
F. C. Dodsworth, Turnham-green.
John Farrell, New Brentford.
Charles Knevelt, Hounslow.
Thomas Litchfield, Twickenham.
R. W. Loadman, Chiswick.
John Mackinlay, Isleworth.
John Nicoll, Hanwell.
H. J. Radcliffe, Brentford Butts.
Henry Richards, Old Brentford.
John Salt, Acton.
Henry Wilkins, Ealing.
F. A. B. Bonney, Old Brentford, secretary *pro tem*.
George Cooper, New Brentford.
William Raifs, Old Brentford.
Charles Martin, Twickenham.
M. Barry, Richmond-bridge, Twickenham.
Ralph Allen Frogley, } Hounslow.
Christopher B. Emmett, }
Ch. Cocks Eyre, Turnham-green.
Geo. Dickinson, Ealing.”

QUACK ADVERTISEMENT IN THE STOCKPORT NEWSPAPER.

LETTER FROM MR. MALYN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—The manifold contrivances of designing men, determined to achieve their object at any price, are such that even the most cautious person may be compromised.

Instead of my being one prone to court such unenviable notoriety as that conferred by the advertisement, on which you have commented with just severity in the 3rd No. of THE LANCET, I regard the publication of my name, in connection with such a matter, as a degradation that I should have merited only if I had committed some great offence. This feeling was, and is, so strong with me, that, on hearing from some provincial friends of the unwarrantable, the impudent liberty taken by this empiric, it became a question with me whether I ought not to avail myself of the protection of a court of equity. I declined this course for three reasons:—1, The unsatisfactory result of Mr. Green's application in a somewhat analogous case; 2, The positive benefit which would accrue to the empiric himself by the increased currency it would give to his pretensions; and 3, By a perhaps morbid fear that there might be imputed to me a desire to draw attention to myself, and to invest my name with an importance which did not naturally belong to it.

To state that I have commended, or, *until*

yesterday, even heard of, these vaunted "PILLS," is an unmitigated falsehood, and scarcely less so is it with respect to the "OINTMENT;" but I am bound to confess that, some time ago, I was unwittingly entrapped into an act, which, at the time, I thought not only justifiable, but praiseworthy, though I can now see that I ought to have been more guarded; and my chief consolation is, that I, like others, must purchase experience. It was as follows:—

Three or four years since, a quantity of ointment was sent to an institution with which I am connected, and a person, whose outward appearance and demeanour caused me then to mistake him for a gentleman, called at my residence, and, by the expression of open, straightforward intentions, and by disclaiming all views of secrecy, induced me to test its alleged superiority as a stimulating preparation.

On being subsequently urged to receive more of it, I declined, on the ground that, though it was similar, it was not superior to the applications I was accustomed to use; and when, at a still later period, I was pestered with letters from this man and a foreign associate of his (who, I am told, also uses my name), in which letters they gave each other the worst possible character, I invariably returned them.

Finally, on one of these persons introducing himself into my presence, I refused to listen to any remark or explanation, and, after expressing a strong opinion of his conduct, which I am sorry he has not profited by, I insisted on, and enforced, his quitting my house.

If you intend to follow up your comments, and can do so without publishing this letter, it would be much more agreeable to me that it should not appear; but if it be requisite to insert it, now or at any future time, I must leave it to your own discretion to avail yourself of it. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN MALYN.

James-street, Buckingham Palace,
Oct. 13, 1840.

* * The publicity of the demand made on Mr. MALYN obviously placed it out of our power to comply with the wish conveyed at the close of his letter. Justice to himself requires that his abhorrence of the course adopted by the quack should promptly be made known in this place. Respecting the fact stated in the fourth paragraph of Mr. MALYN's letter, we shall at present say nothing. We wish to hear what Mr. DENDY and others of the medical gentlemen whose names were quoted in the last LANCET, have to say on the subject of the advertisement. At present the matter looks not a little serious.

THE "REGULAR" QUACKS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—I thank you most sincerely for the measures you have taken to show up these blights on the character of our profession.

I rejoice to find that your castigation has reduced some of the offenders to the practice of common decency. Thus Mr. Gay, of the Greville-street Hospital, disclaims all connection with the impudent falsehood contained in the *Morning Herald* paragraph; and "C. W. C. Guthrie, Esq.," has already put his advertisement into a moderate and more respectable form, as may be seen by the cover of THE LANCET for October 10. How long the offence to the respectability of the profession would have been continued, without the just rebuke with which you visited the delinquents, it is impossible to say. But I think, Sir, that "the hopeful son of a venerable sire" will not venture to repeat his advertisements as he began them. Perhaps you will allow me to ask Mr. Gay, whether the falsehood with which his name was connected, has been contradicted by him in the paper in which it appeared? The puffing paragraphs about some of the people who use the "Greville-street Hospital" as the peg on which to hang their names, has become very notorious; and I hope if this nuisance be not abated, that you will employ THE LANCET *ad deliquum*.

There is also, Sir, another nuisance to which I beg to direct your attention. Some apothecary, I think in Parliament-street, has long had his name circulated in a most disreputable way in the daily prints. He rejoiceth in the name of *Mac Pott*, or some other equally euphonious appellation; and was especially notorious a short time since for such paragraphs as the following:—"We understand that Mr. Mac Pott, the celebrated surgeon in Parliament-street, who has been in constant attendance on the atrocious Oxford, has presented many of his distinguished patients with a lock of the horrid criminal's hair." Among other papers, I recollect that this buffoonery appeared in the *Standard*. I am, Sir, your most humble servant,

ARISTOGENES.

PROFESSOR PLAGIARY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—In answer to the inquiries of your correspondents ("PHILIATRUS," LANCET, October 3, and "NICODEMUS," LANCET, October 10), whether the individual who has earned for himself the designation which is placed at the head of this communication, has been countenanced by the "British Association for the Advancement of Science?" I beg to state that it would seem that this