A.'s case to be one of suppression, not retention. The prescriptions, I think, prove the same. With regard to the remainder of Dr. Macrorie's paragraph, the patient denies its truth in the most energetic language. Now, what were these gentleman doing on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday? Here are their prescriptions, they are not dated, and, therefore, we must guess at the order in which they were written.

[These prescriptions merely direct the administration of purgatives with opiates, and need not, therefore, be given in detail. ED. L.]

On Saturday, the Dr. began to suspect that there was some accumulation of water in the bladder. This he ought to have known during the whole of the week. He ought to have known that dribbling of urine from the penis is a sign of over distension. The supposition that the bladder is relieved by such dribbling is a mistake into which the ignorant have often fallen, and one which the tyro is recommended, in all books of surgery, carefully to avoid. The Dr. now admits that there was tenderness of the belly, thirst, and a brown tongue, but he says that his pulse was only 72. It is not possible. When I saw him in the evening his pulse was 130. He was tossing about in great pain, and covered with perspiration; and in this state, What was proposed? Why! to try the catheter, and if this failed, and it would have failed, to put into the rectum a suppository of six grains of opium. This was the *coup de grace*. Another observation, and I take leave of the Doctor. Dr. M., on taking leave of the patient, said, "Well, my dear Sir, I take my leave of you, and I hope you may be more fortunate than your poor wife has been." His wife died under my care. The patient has since said to me many times, "I could forgive him all the pain and torture I have been put to by him; but to attempt to distress my mind, by making me believe that you killed my wife, it is too bad. Now when you were called to her, she was too far gone in consumption; you told me, her case was hopeless the second or third visit; but, had he attended to her, and treated her properly in the beginning, when she had only the influenza, I feel satisfied she would be a living woman at this day."—Why not meet Dr. M., it may be said? I met him once, and I was so disgusted on that occasion that I determined never to meet him again. Should any professional gentleman require it, I shall be happy to state the particulars. I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
J. O'DONNELL, M. D.

M. CHARRIÈRE'S CHALLENGE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—In the last number of THE LANCET I observed an extraordinarily bold asser-

tion, put forth by Charrière, of Paris' stating that *he* made *most* of the lithotritic instruments used in London. He some time ago boasted of the superior quality of his instruments, and I ordered some of them, with the view of comparing them with mine. He brought them over himself, and tried one of them with a marble, such as boys play with; it would not break it, and I then tried with my instrument, and broke the marble, with ease, into several pieces. He expressed surprise at the power of my instrument, but said, that if he could obtain the same price as I obtained, to enable him to put in the same work, he thought he could make them as well. This is a fact which he cannot deny. The French instruments may be seen at my house, and I shall be happy to sell them at a reduced price.

He is evidently angry that the Russian Government should have given me their orders for lithotritic instruments; but I would ask the profession, who is the most entitled to receive them, I, who invented and perfected the instrument, or Charrière, who merely copies it? Whatever alterations have been made in it, my principle is still adhered to, and it is much easier to copy an instrument which the inventor has spent much money and time in bringing to perfection, than to invent it in the first instance. I would, therefore, advise M. Charrière to keep quiet in this matter, and not risk the loss of his money. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN WEISS.

62, Strand, Oct. 10th, 1837.

* * * As Mr. Weiss does not, in his note, accept M. Charrière's challenge—probably because a trial of the kind has already been made between the two manufacturers,—we need not point out to him where the original of that challenge may be found; otherwise we should do so, in order that Mr. Weiss might see that M. Charrière does not, either in the French journal or in our extract, say that "*he* (M. C.) made *most* of the lithotritic instruments used in London."

MARYLEBONE INFIRMARY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—Presuming that I am the "Candidate" for the office of surgeon to the *Marylebone Infirmary*, to whom you have alluded in last Saturday's LANCET, perhaps it may not be amiss, with your permission, to state briefly the particulars. An advertisement in "The Times," declaring the office of surgeon vacant, and calling for candidates to send in their testimonials of qualification on, or before, the 18th ult., to the Committee appointed by the Board "to receive and

examine" them. I accordingly issued circulars, declaring myself a candidate, and commenced my canvass. My success (if reliance can be placed upon men,) was beyond a doubt, and I made no secret of it. You may, therefore, imagine my surprise and indignation, to find, on the morning of examination of candidates and their testimonials, that five of the Committee (the whole being ten in number), three of whom were medical men, then, and then only, passed a resolution, disqualifying, as it *now* stands on the minutes, any person from being a candidate who practised as a general practitioner. If that resolution had previously existed on the minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Guardians, although I might object to it on principle, I should not have complained, but to pass such a resolution without the power of the Board, and at the very moment of examination, was not only invidious, but was evidently intended to favour some other candidate. I therefore memorialised the Board to be heard against the confirmation of that resolution last Friday week, stating not only its injustice and impropriety, but that it disqualified nine-tenths of the profession,—many of the late, and indeed I might say all, as well as the present members of the Council of the College of Surgeons, and all the surgeons in the army and navy. Although one of the medical men on the Committee was candid enough to admit, on the morning previous to the non-confirmation, that this resolution was levelled at me, and had before promised that he would move its non-confirmation, before two gentlemen, yet whilst the secretary was reading my memorial, he took up his hat, and left the board-room. I shall not comment further than to remind him of what Cicero says, "*Justitiæ primum munus est, ut ne cui quis noceat.*" The facts speak for themselves, and show how united, and with what accordance some medical men combine to maintain a principle disadvantageous to themselves and the public; they also show how *far* a reliance is to be reposed in them by gentlemen belonging to a Board of Guardians, and I have no doubt that some of the latter have discovered this already. It is, Sir, this blind confidence which I deprecate, as well as the gross injustice of framing so invidious a resolution; and if in the coming contention (and contention it will be) for the annihilation of all invidious and unmerited distinctions, and the amalgamation of medicine and surgery, its members shall thereby forsake their own interest, the interest of the public, and the interest of science, then, Sir, shall I miserably deplore the baseness, envy, depravity, vindictiveness, and narrow-mindedness of human nature, so strikingly manifest in the profession. I am, Sir, with great respect, your most obedient servant,

WILLIAM BAXTER.

1, Queen Charlotte-row, New-road,

Oct. 3, 1837.

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—I am directed by the President to request that you will have the kindness to correct one or two inaccuracies which have crept into your report of the anniversary meeting of the British Medical Association, which might lead to mistakes.

When the President proposed the toast of "The Professors and Teachers of Medical Science, &c.," he did not say that "the Company were favoured with the *presence*," &c., but that "we have the pleasure of numbering amongst our *members*, or among *the company, this day*, men, second to none, as anatomists, physiologists, pathologists, and surgeons, and who have acquired European reputations," &c. Mr. Liston (inaccurately given *Wilson*), and Mr. Grainger, were not *present*, though they are *members* of the Association. Dr. Marshall Hall, in returning thanks for the vice-presidents and council, *did not say* "if I were at the top of the profession to-morrow, I would say as I do to-day that I view all my brethren as members of one body," &c.; but "if I were *out of the profession* to-morrow," &c.

I beg to hand you the list of the new Council elected by ballot. I remain, Sir, yours very respectfully,

MATTHEW FRENCH WAGSTAFFE,
Hon. Sec.

Oct. 10th, 1837.

Copy of the Scrutator's Paper.

Bayfield, S. J., Esq.	Hilles, M. W., Esq.
Beane, J. M., Esq.	Hooper, R. L., Esq.
Brady, C., Esq.	Howell, J., Esq.
Bristowe, J. S., Esq.	Hull, G., M.D.
Butler, J., Esq.	Ireland, C. G., Esq.
Castle, J., Esq.	Lane, G. B., Esq.
Clarke, J., Esq.	Linnecar, E. H., Esq.
Crisp, E., Esq.	Liston, R., Esq.
Davidson, R., Esq.	Menzies, R., Esq.
Delph, N., Esq.	Parsons, G., Esq.
Doubleday, E., Esq.	Pilcher, G., Esq.
Eales, W., Esq.	Porter, T., Esq.
Evans, E., Esq.	Smith, J. J., Esq.
Farr, W., Esq.	Wakley, T., Esq.,
Grant, R., M.D.	M.P.
Hall, M., M.D.	Webster, G., M.D.
Harrison, C. H. R.,	Whitmore, H., Esq.
Esq.	Wagstaffe, M. F., Esq.
Herring, W., Esq.	

Treasurer.—E. Evans, Esq.

Auditors.—J. S. Bristowe, Esq.; R. L. Hooper, Esq.; J. Howell, Esq.

At the first meeting of the Council since the anniversary, held this day, the 10th of Oct., G. Webster, Esq., was re-elected to the office of President.