energies of the uterus, thereby enabling the practitioner to deliver when timely required, without, at the same time, making the least demand upon her already exhausted powers, which is the case when we have recourse to the manual operation of version and extraction of the child; but it is also a powerful general stimulant, and raises the power and action of the heart. This happy result I have observed in several cases, and the power in question gives to this agent a great superiority over the secale cornutum in such cases.

Since my former communication on the use of galvanism, I have used it in several cases of flooding and also of tedious labour, and I am only further convinced of its great value as a remedial measure. These cases shall be in due time be before the profession.—I have the honour to be, Sir, most respectfully yours,

Thomas Radford.

Manchester, Nov. 1846.

PLACENTA PRÆVIA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Sir,—The case related by Mr. B. Talban, in THE LANCET of Nov. 14th, certainly demanded the most prompt and energetic treatment. As to the conduct of the patient's usual medical adviser, I shall only remark, that it admits of no defence. In answer to the following question of Mr. Talban,—"Should I have contended myself with plugging the vagina, and not have delivered or should I have contended myself with merely separating the placenta?" permit me to say, that in such a case I should have used the vagina, and for this reason, namely, that the plug might, and probably would, have prevented the flow of blood externally, but would not have prevented its flowing internally, and distending the uterus, which would have been dangerous. As much more could be no doubt about the death of the child, I should have instantly extracted the placenta, and delivered, by turning, as speedily as possible, pressure being kept on the uterus by the hands of an assistant. This pressure might have been continued afterwards by the use of the basin, as I have described in the Medical Gazette, Jan. 30, 1846, and in THE LANCET of about the same date. The recumbent position, open windows, and the minimum of patience and bravery, I regard as very judicious; but in a case of such extreme exhaustion, all our efforts are, unfortunately, likely to prove unsavelling.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Castle Hedingham, Nov. 1846.

GEORGE HARVEY.

PARACENTESIS THORACIS.

The cases of Mr. Davies, published in 1835.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Sir,—My attention has been drawn to a gross and illiberal attack made upon my late father, Dr. Theophilus Davies, in the notes to a recent translation of Laennec, purporting to be published by Dr. Theophilus Herbert. In these notes I find a statement directly charging my late father with having wilfully misrepresented the results of his practice, in regard to paracentesis thoracis, but in which the operation had never been performed. As there could be no exception to the truth of such a statement, I am free to state that I have never cited it, and that I have never had recourse to such a remedial agent.

A brief consideration of these facts will be sufficient, I conceive, to enable the medical profession generally to estimate the degree of culpability to be attached to those notes to Laennec, and will be sufficient also to enable those who are in any way acquainted with the parties connected with the work, to infer the motives which have led to the publication of gross and false accusations.

Hoping you will allow the insertion of these remarks in your valuable journal, I beg to remain, yours, obediently,

H. Davies.

Finbury-square, Dec. 1846.

HERBERT DAVIES.

LICENCE OF THE APOTHECARIES' SOCIETY OF LONDON NOT A QUALIFICATION IN CANADA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Sir,—It may be of importance to many students of medicine to be made aware that a licence of the Apothecaries' Company in Blackfriars will not entitle the possessor to admission as a general practitioner in the British territory of the Canadas.

In the Medical Gazette of August 20, 1845, in the editorial article of that week, it is stated that "the licence of the Apothecaries' Company is no criterion of competency to practise midwifery." The licence of Blackfriars is also confessedly no criterion of competency to practise surgery. But the general practitioner of England is expected to practise both midwifery and surgery. Yet the general practitioner derives his sole legal licence from the Apothecaries' Company, and requires no other.

An individual to whom the Apothecaries' authorities have granted a licence, being called to attend the delivery of a female, not only tears out her womb, but rips forth her bowels, pulls out and cuts away her very entrails, disembowels her alive! So far as our patients have been surgical cases, there is no guarantee that the persons to whom they give their licences do not perform surgical operations with a skill equal to that of the obstetric operation by one of their licentiates described.

At first sight it would seem an injustice, that in the Canadas a licentiate of the Apothecaries' Company is not permitted to practise without examination by the Board of Medicine of the country; but upon considering the above particulars, the justice as well as the absolute necessity of the local regulation is more than apparent.

How long are the highly intelligent class of gentlemen who constitute the general practitioners of all England to continue to have no better legal authority than an apothecary's licence, and to enjoy no other position in the community than the dignity derived from a retail druggist's shop in Blackfriars?—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Hamilton, South Canada, Nov. 1846.

B. Haygarth, M.D.

NOTE FROM MR. BURSEY, SURGEON, WALTHAM ABBEY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Sir,—Being busily engaged in practice, the number of THE LANCET for November 14th did not come under my notice until yesterday, when I was most astonished to find my name figuring in no very reputable manner in the communication of one who signs himself "Rhadamanthus." With respect to the handbills so properly held up to public condemnation, I have merely to say, that although the author of those handbills is certainly a relative of mine, I never had the least idea of any such purpose, or communication with him upon any such subjects. As for "my practice of dry cupping," stated to be so eminently successful" in such a strange variety of disorders, I do not recollect ever having had recourse to such a remedial agent.

I appeal to your sense of fairness for the insertion of this letter in THE LANCET as early as possible, lest others, as well as "Rhadamanthus," should conclude me capable of thus "degrading" my profession, or let it be supposed that "licens-ciage should warn me to desist, on pain of expulsion," &c. &c. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Henry Bursey,

Waltham Abbey, Essex, Dec. 1846.

late of Chardnoo-street, Strand.

* They were also published in THE LANCET at about the same date.

"Apothecary" is polite classic for "druggist" in plain English. Is "druggist" not a proper appellation for medical practitioners, why call them "apothecaries"?