Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

MILITIA SURGEONS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As you are such a thorough medical reformer, I shall be obliged by your inserting the following remarks in the next number of your journal.

The just claims of militia surgeons being likely to be brought before the profession and the public at an early period, would it not be advisable, Mr. Editor, for assistant-surgeons of militia regiments to throw in their just claims. I, with many other assistant-surgeons, have held for some time past commission as assistant-surgeon and ensign, with the pay (when on duty) of 8s. 9d. per diem; but owing to recent regulations, assistant-surgeons are no longer to be allowed to hold commission as ensigns, but are in future only to have the pay of 7s. 6d. per diem, and to rank with lieutenants. Surely this is unfair, as during the period of training great tax is made on our valuable time; and therefore no reduction ought to have been made in the pay, more particularly as coming events are likely to assume a grave aspect, when it is not unlikely that the militia regiments may be called upon for duty; therefore I consider it behoves our government to place not only the surgeons, but likewise the assistant-surgeons, upon their proper footing; for if not, the country will be deprived of their services when most required.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

AN ASSISTANT-SURGEON IN A MILITIA REGIMENT.

Nov. 1853.

DR. GAVIN AND THE MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS OF NEWCASTLE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Allusion having been made in your pages to the manner in which the service as Medical Superintending Inspector of the General Board of Health was carried out by me at Newcastle, I hope I do not trespass too much in transmitting to you the accompanying documents, which I received this morning. I need scarcely add, that the address is the spontaneous act of the professional gentlemen of Newcastle.

I would take this opportunity, Mr. Editor, on behalf of my colleagues and of myself, if you will permit me, of thanking my professional brethren in Newcastle for this highly gratifying and honourable mark of their good opinion and approbation. Under no circumstances could the officers of the Board be placed in more trying circumstances, or be more exposed to competent observation and criticism.

I would add, that it will ever be the earnest desire of the medical inspectors of the Board to exercise their duties so as to obtain the confidence, approbation, and good feeling of the members of the profession.

With that confidence and good feeling, great things may yet, it is to be hoped, be accomplished, not only in the prevention of disease by efficient medical arrangements, but in the interests of the profession itself. With an appreciation of the value and importance, therefore, of harmonious co-operation, it is to be hoped that the officers will be animated with a proper and due regard to the obtaining and meriting the respect, approval, and co-operation of their professional brethren.

I have the honour to be, Mr. Editor,

Your obedient servant,

Dundee, Nov. 28, 1853.

HECTOR GAVIN.

Newcastle, Nov. 24, 1853.

DEAR DR. GAVIN,—I beg to forward to you an address from forty-seven of the medical practitioners of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, testifying their opinion of your proceedings in Newcastle during the late very severe attack of cholera.

Doubtless you will give it that publicity which appears necessary.—I remain, dear Dr. Gavin, very truly yours,

(Signed) D. EMBLETON.

Hector Gavin, Esq., M.D.,
Superintending Inspector General Board of Health,
9, East Claremont-street, Edinburgh.

(COPY.)

Newcastle-upon-Tyne, November, 1853.

The undersigned medical practitioners of Newcastle-upon-Tyne desire to express their appreciation of the valuable services rendered by Dr. Gavin and the officers of the General Board of Health, and their approval of the vigorous measures

adopted by these gentlemen during the epidemic cholera, with which this town and neighbourhood have recently been visited.

They are especially anxious to bear testimony to the untiring energy displayed by Dr. Gavin in carrying out the necessary requirements of his responsible office, and to the uniform courtesy shown by him to the members of the profession in the difficult circumstances under which he was called upon to act.

T. E. HEADLAM, M.D., Consulting Physician of the Infirmary.

D. B. WHITE, Physician to the Infirmary, &c. &c.

T. M. GREENHOW, F.R.C.S.E., Senior-Surgeon to the Newcastle Infirmary.

HENRY HEATH, F.R.C.S., Surgeon to the Infirmary.

J. M. BATES, M.D., Physician to the Infirmary.

JOHN FIFE, F.R.C.S., &c. &c. &c.

EDWARD CHARLTON, M.D., Physician to the Infirmary.

DENNIS EMBLETON, M.D., Physician to the Infirmary.

JOHN SANG.

SAMUEL M. FROST, M.R.C.S.E.

JOSEPH BAINBRIDGE, Fife.

R. R. FROST, M.R.C.S. Eng.

W. C. PRESTON.

WILLIAM WINSHIP, M.R.C.S.

THOMAS ANNANDALE, M.R.C.S.

ARTHUR H. TALMADGE, M.R.C.S. Eng.

ROBERT W. BLEASBY, M.D.

WILLIAM NESHAM, M.R.C.S. Eng.

JAMES EDGECOME, M.R.C.S. Eng.

W. GAVIN, M.R.C.S. Eng.

W. A. IANSON, M.R.C.S. Eng.

D. MACKINTOSH, M.D., Physician to Newcastle Lunatic Asylum.

THOMAS HUMBLE, M.D., Physician to the Dispensary and Town Hospital.

JOHN LIDDLE, M.R.C.S.E.

JAMES LUNN GILCHRIST, M.R.C.S.E.

JOHN HOUSEMAN, M.D. Ed., M.R.C.S.L., &c. &c.

HENRY HARVEY, M.R.C.S.E.

CHARLES J. GIBB, M.R.C.S.E.

WM. BOYD, M.R.C.S.E.

JOHN HAWTHORN, M.R.C.S.E., Surgeon to the Dispensary.

HENRY R. ALLISON, M.R.C.S.E. &c.

JOHN SAMUEL PEARSE, M.R.C.S. Eng.

WM. PRESTON, M.R.C.S.E. &c.

ARTHUR UMPHELLY, M.D., M.R.C.S.E.

THOMAS Y. THOMPSON, M.R.C.S. Eng.

JAMES MILLER, M.R.C.S. Eng.

M. BURNUP, M.D. Edin.

CHARLES GIBSON, M.D.

FRANCIS W. MANFORD, L.R.C.S. Edin.

CHARLES BIRLEY, M.R.C.S.E.

JOHN STEVENSON PAGET, M.R.C.S.

JAMES ALEXANDER, M.D., M.R.C.S.

THOS. LESSLIE GREGSON, M.R.C.S. Eng.

GEORGE Y. HOOD, M.R.C.S. & L.A.H.

W. H. FIFE, M.R.C.S.L. &c.

JOHN LANG, M.R.C.S. Edin.

GEORGE A. HUTTON, M.R.C.S. Eng.

MR. STATHAM ON INFLAMMATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I hope you will permit the insertion of the following statements mentioned in the paper read at the last meeting of the Medico-Chirurgical Society. That inflammation is an independent, anomalous development of plasma, and low inflammation—not *asthenic*, being always due to the presence of low poison—an imperfect form of the same. (For descriptions of specimens of these forms of low pus, I would refer to THE LANCET of June 18th, 1853.) Another form of low inflammatory corpuscles as occurring in the lungs was now (November) for the first(?) time described. That the low inflammation may occur in any tissue, or by absorption of the poison be set up in any preferable part of the body. For ordinary hospital practice, excluding midwifery, absorption was stated from thirteen cases to have occurred: in six by the lymphatics, three by the veins, in the remainder it is very probable that a

greater number than the above proportion were by the lymphatics. These were cases of pyæmia.

As the blood is less arterialized and less fibrinous, it was stated that this state or the contemporary proportionally increased quantity of white corpuscles, might fully explain the localization of low inflammation causing purulent deposits in the lungs; while both the affection of these organs, as well as the similar conditions found in the liver and intestines, are doubtless connected with efforts made by these organs for the excretion of substances from the body.

A consistent explanation was offered for the affection of the joints, so common in pyæmia.

The observations from twenty cases were given, where the appearance of the clots of blood after death, as examined by the naked eye, and confirmed by the microscope, might have been sufficient for the diagnosis of pyæmia, and probably of low inflammations, as distinguished from the blood of the former, or from that of other diseases. Allow me to add, Sir, that the frequency of low inflammation was shown by its being found in fifteen out of thirty post-mortem examinations.

Dec. 1853.

S. F. STATHAM.

Medical News.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.—The following gentlemen having undergone the necessary examinations for the diploma were admitted members of the College at the meeting of the Court of Examiners on the 2nd inst.:—

BRADY, GEORGE STEWARDSON, Gateshead.

BRIERLEY, THOMAS BOOTH, Tattenhall, Cheshire.

CATTELL, WILLIAM, Weston-under-Lizard, Staffordshire.

GREENHOW, HENRY MARTINEAU, Hon. East India Company's Service, Bengal.

JULER, HENRY CUNDELL, Norwich.

NATERS, WILLIAM ELLWARD, Sandysford, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

ORTON, JOHN, Foleshill, near Coventry.

SILVESTER, HENRY ROBERT, Clapham.

SMITH, ROWLAND, Boxted, Suffolk.

STEPHENS, JOSEPH, Probus, Cornwall.

THOMPSON, HENRY, Dublin.

The name of WILLIAM MASON, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, was accidentally omitted in the list of gentlemen who passed their examinations on the 18th ult.

LICENTIATES IN MIDWIFERY.—The following gentlemen, all of whom it will be perceived had previously been admitted Members of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, have just been licensed by the College to practise Midwifery:—Jeremiah Henry MacGreal, Bolsover, Oxon, diploma of membership dated May 3, 1844; John Hodgson Waterhouse, Sheffield, Nov. 4, 1853; Silvanus Tucker, Bridport, Jan. 14, 1853; William Wilking Stabb, Ilfracombe, Dec. 12, 1851; James Cleife Lane, Grosmont, Hereford, Jan. 18, 1850; Samuel Harris, Horbling, Lincolnshire, Nov. 26, 1851; Frederick Edgar Cockell, Dalston, Nov. 18, 1853; Joseph Stephens, Probus, Cornwall, Dec. 2, 1853; Edmund Waller, Chesterfield, July 11, 1853; William Evans, Ystradyfotwg, March 11, 1853; Theobald Ringer, Clifton, July 20, 1849; William Robert Woodman, Exeter, July 23, 1851.

MEDICAL BENEVOLENT COLLEGE.—We are requested to state that the announcement of the amount collected, (£73,) in aid of the funds, in St. Michael's Church, Pimlico, on the 20th ult., was inadvertently omitted in the list of contributions published in last week's number.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.—The Council, at their session on Saturday last, by the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine of the College, awarded the Longridge Prize of £40 for general proficiency in medicine and surgery to Mr. Frederick William Sayer, of Newport, Isle of Wight.

MEDICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.—The paper to be read at the third Physiological Meeting of this Society, on Monday next, Dec. 12th, is by Dr. Snow, "On the Modus Operandi of Narcotico-Irritants."

KENT COUNTY COURT, MAIDSTONE.—**THE APOTHECARIES' COMPANY v. BALDWIN.**—This was an action brought against the defendant, who for several years has practised as a surgeon in Maidstone, to recover the penalty of £20, for practising as an apothecary without the requisite certificate from the above company.—Mr. C. Morgan appeared on behalf of the company, and Mr. Monckton for defendant.—Mr. Morgan said the action was laid under the 20th sec. of the

55th George III., and in order to bring the offence within this statute, he should prove that defendant attended three persons, two named Martin, and the third Copleston, for medical as distinguished from surgical cases; that he supplied medicine to them, and subsequently gave certificates of the death in his own handwriting to the parents, who deposited them with the registrar of births and deaths, which was a very material point in the action, as the certificates showed the nature of the disease of which the persons died. It was well known that the defendant had for many years practised in this way, and up to the present time evaded the law. After remarking upon the injustice rendered by this practice to those gentlemen who had been regularly qualified, Mr. Morgan observed that it might be suggested that this action had arisen from jealousy, but he thought the court would agree with him that it was their duty to endeavour to put a stop to this practice. He could cite several cases of the kind reported in *THE LANCET* and the *County Courts' Chronicle*. (His Honour, however, did not think them any authority to rely upon.) It might, he (Mr. Morgan) said, be set up in defence that the medicine was not paid for, but he apprehended that would not be considered any answer whatever, as it was perfectly ridiculous to suppose that he attended and supplied the medicine gratuitously. Mr. Morgan then called James Martin, and his wife, living in Sheppy-street, Maidstone, who stated that in September last two of their children were taken ill, and were attended by defendant. The father fetched one bottle, containing medicine, as he supposed, from the defendants, after one of the children had died, and the other child took a small portion of it and died subsequently. They had not paid for any medicine or attendance, nor had they received any bill. Defendant left two papers at the house, which they took to Mr. Ruck, the registrar. In cross-examination these witnesses stated that the children were taken ill suddenly, and defendant was applied to at night, while in bed, when he got up, and on seeing the children at once said he could do nothing for them. One of them died that night, and the other on the following day. Defendant had twice previously attended Mrs. Martin in her confinement. Neither of them could say what the bottle contained, or that defendant gave any directions respecting it.—Edwin Ruck, son of the registrar, identified the certificates produced as having been brought by James Martin.—Mr. Joy, surgeon, stated that he had been a licentiate of the Apothecaries' Company for twenty-six years. From correspondence he had had with Mr. Baldwin he believed the certificates produced were in his handwriting. (This was admitted by defendant's solicitor.) The causes of death assigned in them were hooping-cough and inflammation of the stomach, which fell purely within the province of apothecaries, and were not surgical cases.—Mr. Morgan said that was his case.—Mr. Monckton was about to address the court for the defence, when his Honour said that the plaintiffs must be non-suited.—Mr. Morgan asked on what grounds?—His Honour said that there was no evidence whatever to show that defendant was practising for profit. On the same ground the court would have a right of action against every person living in remote parts of the country, who kept medicines to give away to poor persons. There was no evidence also to show that the bottle contained medicine; it might have contained brandy or wine-and-water.—Mr. Morgan said it was an impossibility to prove what the contents of the bottle were. He would now go into the other case, in reference to Copleston.—Mr. Monckton contended that Mr. Morgan's case was ended.—His Honour held the objection to be good, as separate summonses should have been issued to the parties.—Mr. Morgan contended strongly that he had a right to go into the other case, and said he could show by the reports to which his Honour had refused to allow him to refer that it was the usual practice to include three or four cases.—His Honour said that as three persons were included in one summons, and Mr. Morgan had said "that is my case," he was not entitled to proceed with the case of Copleston.—Mr. Morgan said he intended the case as regarded Martin. He hoped his Honour would not allow the ends of justice to be defeated by such a frivolous mistake on his part.—His Honour said that justice would not be defeated, as defendant might be summoned at the next court.—Mr. Monckton said he would withdraw the objection; but his Honour said in his opinion it was one that ought to prevail, and refused to allow Mr. Morgan to proceed.—Mr. Monckton then applied for costs, and said he believed they were entitled to double costs.—Mr. Morgan denied this.—His Honour said he should look to the Act of Parliament, and if in his opinion it gave him the power he should grant double costs. He thought it exceedingly strange that no solicitor attended from the Apothecaries' Hall.