the crime and the penalty, although inconceivable to his morbidly constructed mind, will be admitted by everyone who reads his history, and is conversant with the ways of madmen.

If I may presume to allude to the limited exertions of my own professional life, they have assuredly manifested no wish to injure the insane; and, when occasion required it, I have not shrunk from defending their cause, without regarding the consequences to myself. No man feels a greater jealousy of interfering with any man's liberty than I do; but liberty to do evil must not be permitted; liberty to treat a family with cruel neglect; liberty to waste property, and to endanger the personal safety of other people. We may incur obloquy for doing our duty in such cases, but the duty itself is plain and undeniable, and must be done, whatever the cost. I trust that the many honourable men engaged in a high department of medical study and practice will not be deterred, any more than I shall allow myself to be, from performing this duty—a duty to the public—in any future instance, let the consequences be what they may.

I remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,
Hanwell, July, 1859. J. CONOLLY, M.D.

THE TITLE OF "DOCTOR."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The following correspondence relative to the new licentiates of the Edinburgh College of Physicians we hope you will consider of sufficient importance to publish. We refrain from adding any comments of our own at present.

In answer to a letter to Professor Christison we received the following reply:—

"Edinburgh, May 19th, 1859.

GENTLEMEN,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, in which you ask me, as a Professor of the University of Edinburgh, "whether the licence which has been sold for £10 by the College of Physicians of Edinburgh to certain practitioners of medicine and surgery in England, confers on them the legal right of assuming the title of Doctor?" In reply, I have to inform you that the licence of the College of Physicians does not confer any such right; and that, in Scotland, the right of assuming the title of Doctor can be acquired by a medical man only by graduation at a university.

I am your most obedient servant,
To ———. R. CHRISTISON.

In answer to a letter to Dr. F. Hawkins, informing him that two gentlemen of the town who had recently obtained the licence of the Edinburgh College of Physicians were calling themselves, on their door-plates and visiting cards, Doctors; and that his receipt for 5s. (registration fee for this new qualification), in which they were styled Doctor, was being handed about as the highest authority for their assumption of the title; and asking if these gentlemen had really a right to be called Doctors, or if the title had been inserted accidentally,—the following was received:—

"Medical Registration Office, June 3rd, 1859.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your communication just received, I beg to say that a licentiate of a college of physicians, not being a graduate of a university, is not a doctor of medicine by legal right, and can be only called Doctor by courtesy.

But as the courtesy is customary, and is, in fact, recommended by long prescription and usage, I have not hitherto seen reason to depart from it, except in documents of a strictly formal character, which a mere receipt for money is not.

I do not designate a licentiate, as above described, as M.D. in the Register, or in any certified copy of the Register.

I am, Gentlemen, yours faithfully,
To Drs. Lake, Scott, and Aldridge. FRANCIS HAWKINS.

Graduates to Professor Christison.

"DEAR SIR,—We beg to thank you for your communication of the 19th instant, respecting the right of licentiates of the College of Physicians, Edinburgh, to call themselves Doctors. Allow us again to trouble you in the matter. Two gentlemen of this town have recently obtained the above licence, and have assumed, both on their cards and on their door-plates, the title of Doctor. They defend this assumption by a receipt from Dr. F. Hawkins for the registration fee, which runs thus: 'Received of Dr. ———,' &c. This document they hand about as an official recognition of their right to the title by the highest authority. We have written to Dr. F. Hawkins, stating the

matter, and have received the unsatisfactory answer which is enclosed.

We must further observe that the public are quite unable to comprehend the distinction between a M.D. of Edinburgh and a licentiate of a College, who call themselves Doctors of Edinburgh, and that thus an injury is inflicted, not only on ourselves, but indirectly on the University itself.

Under these circumstances, we hope you will, both as a member of the Council and a professor of the University, give us your advice in the matter, or how far the University of Edinburgh itself is inclined or able to protect the rights of its graduates.

We beg to remain your obedient servants,

GEO. A. K. LAKE.

GEO. SCOTT.

JOHN H. ALDRIDGE."

Graduates to Dr. F. Hawkins.

"Southampton, 9th June, 1859.

SIR,—We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd inst. We cannot help expressing our surprise that you should not consider your receipt for money as a document of strictly formal character, as it appears to us that all communications relating to medical qualifications and titles emanating from the Medical Registration Office are necessarily strictly official. That the two gentlemen of this town, who have lately bought the licence of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh, consider your receipt as a formal document, is evident by the fact of their showing this paper to their friends and acquaintances in proof of their right to assume the title of Doctor. It was because they were using your money receipt as a formal acknowledgment of their legal right to style themselves Doctors that we took the liberty of addressing you in our last, and we must candidly state that we are by no means satisfied with the ambiguous answer with which you have favoured us.

We have always looked upon your office as one formed for the purpose of enabling both the profession and the public to ascertain without difficulty, and on authority without appeal, the positions and title which each member of the profession is legally right to assume. If, therefore, you do not deem the licentiates of the Edinburgh College of Physicians entitled to be formally registered as doctors, is it right that they should show your money receipt to the world as a legal proof of their right to style themselves such on their door-plates and cards?

We beg to remain your obedient servants,

GEO. A. K. LAKE.

GEO. SCOTT.

JOHN H. ALDRIDGE."

Dr. F. Hawkins to Graduates.

"Medical Registration Office, June 14th, 1859.

Dr. Francis Hawkins presents his compliments to the gentlemen who have addressed him from Southampton, and begs to tell them that, although he is sorry to discontinue a courtesy which, under the sanction of no slight authority, he has been accustomed for many years to observe, since it seems that in some instances an attempt has been made to take an improper advantage of it, he has directed that in letters and receipts sent from this office no person shall be addressed as doctor who has not taken the degree of M.D."

Professor Christison to Graduates.

"Edinburgh, June 16th, 1859.

GENTLEMEN,—In answer to your letter of June 19th, I beg to inform you that I am not aware of any right, either in law or in courtesy, by which a licentiate of the Edinburgh College of Physicians can call himself Doctor, unless he is also a graduate of a university. You are well enough aware of the usage in society,—not unknown in England, but more common in Scotland, where there is a far larger proportion of graduates,—according to which almost every medical man is familiarly spoken of, and addressed by unprofessional persons, as Doctor. You probably also know that the Medical Act of last year does not prevent a man from calling himself Doctor, provided he do not call himself Doctor of Medicine. Hence any of the new licentiates may, in strict legal phrase, call himself Doctor, because anybody whatever may do the same—even a low quack.

But in Scotland there is neither law nor courtesy to support the pretension of an ungraduated licentiate of the Edinburgh College of Physicians to be called or to call himself, in any formal way,—as, for example, on his door-plate, or in announcing himself on going into company,—Doctor. The

simple reason is that, until a few weeks ago, no such anomalous individual was known in Scotland at all as an ungraduated licentiate of the College of Physicians.

As to the usage in England I cannot speak,—England must regulate its own courtesies. Whether the general Registrar is correct or not in addressing these ungraduated Edinburgh licentiates as Doctors in his letter, I cannot pretend to say; but I think it is an error. *The grand general principle of the Medical Act is to concede to every practitioner of the realm those rights which he has acquired by his qualification or qualifications in any division of the realm.* If this equitable principle be dispassionately acted on, it ought to affect rights *by courtesy*, as well as rights *by law*. In that case, the said licentiates have no right to call themselves Doctors in England, having no such right in Scotland.

I have delayed answering your letter, in the hope that the question might be cleared up by our College of Physicians at a meeting held yesterday, I was unfortunately unable to remain long enough at the meeting to put the question at the only right time for it; but another Fellow informs me that he put the question, and that the President—the head of this very dubious movement—declined to give an answer. I can say, however, that several of the Fellows who have concurred with him in the movement assured me, some time ago, that it was neither their wish nor their intention that ungraduated licentiates should call themselves Doctors.

I wish I could accede to your request to be advised by me as to your course of procedure under these circumstances. I do not at present see that the University of Edinburgh can take any steps in the matter. It is not improbable that the question may be mooted at the next meeting of the General Medical Council in August; but I do not know whether that body can solve the difficulty. Meanwhile, every graduate ought to avoid the concession of the title of Doctor to any but *graduates*, unless he be satisfied that ungraduated licentiates of the *London* College are already, by established courtesy, a fair exception.

I am, Gentlemen, your most obedient servant,
Drs. Lake, Scott, and Aldridge." R. CHRISTISON.

Graduates to Dr. F. Hawkins.

"Southampton, June 28th, 1859.

SIR,—We beg to thank you for your letter, and the order you have given as communicated in your last.

We have the fullest authority for stating, that in Scotland ungraduated licentiates are neither in practice, courtesy, or law styled in a formal way *doctor*; moreover, this being a new thing, your remarks, "that you discontinue a courtesy which, under the sanction of no slight authority, you have been accustomed for many years to observe," cannot apply at all. There is no secret made in this town, that the sole object of obtaining the Edinburgh licence to practise is to be styled *doctor*; and it seems not a little mortifying, that the first results of the new Medical Act should be such a prostitution of medical titles.

We beg to remain your obedient servants,
GEO. A. K. LAKE.
GEO. SCOTT.
JOHN H. ALDRIDGE.

To Dr. F. Hawkins."

REPLACEMENT OF AN EXTRACTED TOOTH.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The belief is entertained by many individuals that when a sound tooth has been removed it cannot be returned to the alveolus, and resume its vitality. That this is incorrect the following statement will prove, although I may mention that it is by no means the only instance which has occurred in my practice.

About two months ago a gentleman came to me complaining of pain in the right side of his face, which appeared principally to affect the first upper molar tooth, which was to all appearance perfectly sound. He was anxious to have it extracted; this was declined, a liniment and aperient medicines being prescribed instead. He returned to me for the purpose of getting this tooth out, and I recommended him to go to the seaside for a fortnight, which he did, with decided benefit whilst there. On his return to town, however, the old pain came back, and at his most urgent request I removed the tooth with the aid of the electrical anæsthesia. It was, as I suspected, perfectly sound, and, after rinsing the mouth, in about five minutes it was replaced in the socket, in which it was kept by the teeth of the lower jaw coming in contact. He felt uncom-

fortable for a week; all uneasiness then passed away, and now the tooth is serviceable and sound.

The electric cautery, which has proved so useful in my hands, was inapplicable to such a case as this, because there was no broken surface nor sign of irritation along the margin of the gums. My patient afterwards went under the care of Dr. B. W. Richardson, who treated him for gouty facial neuralgia with decided success.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,
Park-square, Regent's-park, June, 1859. THOS. H. HARDING.

Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, JUNE 30TH.

CUSTODY OF LUNATICS.

Mr. WALPOLE moved that the select committee to inquire into the operation of the Acts of Parliament and regulations for the care and treatment of lunatics and their property, which had sat for a considerable time under the late Parliament, and received much valuable evidence, should be re-appointed. He was happy to see that, with one exception, the whole of the members on that important committee had been again returned to Parliament, and he trusted they would be allowed to continue the very useful investigation they had commenced as to the condition of lunatics in workhouses, in private asylums, in public asylums, and also of those under the care of the Lord Chancellor, and under arraignment for trial, and other cases not yet gone into.

The motion was agreed to.

FRIDAY, JULY 1ST.

THE STATE OF THE THAMES.

Mr. JOHN LOCKE asked the First Commissioner of Works whether the Metropolitan Board had commenced the construction of the low-level sewers, for the purpose of preventing the sewage of the metropolis from passing into the river Thames; or whether, on the contrary, they were merely proceeding with high-level sewers, in order to divert the water from brooks and rivulets, and also the rain waters from passing into the river from the present sewers?

Mr. FITZROY said the department over which he presided had no control or supervision over the Board of Works in respect to the drainage of the metropolis. But not wishing to be wanting in respect to his hon. friend, he had communicated unofficially with the chairman of the board, and had received from him a statement to the effect that the board had commenced the work of intercepting the high-level drainage. Perhaps he might be allowed to suggest that it might be for the convenience of the House if questions on those matters were addressed to the Board of Works, who had seats in that House.

MONDAY, JULY 4TH.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT (1858) CONTINUANCE BILL.

Mr. LOWE moved for leave to bring in a Bill to make perpetual the Public Health Act (1858). He observed that the Bill of 1858 was proposed at the end of the session, for the purpose of giving to the Privy Council the powers which were contained in the Diseases Prevention Act of 1855, the principal of those powers being the power of inspecting diseased districts. The Act of 1858 would expire on the 1st of August. The practical object of the new Bill was to keep in force the provisions of the Diseases Prevention Act of 1855, which had been very effectual. The proposed measure did not comprehend the compulsory powers of the old Board of Health, but simply gave the Privy Council those powers which had been found necessary and serviceable.

Leave was given, and the Bill was subsequently brought in and read a first time.

ADVERTISING COLUMNS IN THE STREETS.

Mr. COWPER gave notice that upon an early day he should move for leave to bring in a Bill to restrain private persons or public companies from obstructing the public thoroughfares in the metropolis, by erecting ornamental or other columns therein for advertising purposes.