I can hardly believe any one so bigoted to his creed as to hesitate for a moment when he thought that *life was in danger*; but was not Mr. Fergusson made aware by Dr. Bell of the nature of the case at — park? and was he not also led to understand by the same gentleman that a competent hospital surgeon was already in attendance?

These points may be worthy of notice.

St. George's-square, I am, Sir, yours &c.,
Stamford, Lincolnshire, May, 1858. SPENCER PRATT, M.D.

THE SOUTHAMPTON MEDICAL SOCIETY AND HOMŒOPATHIC QUACKS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The following resolution was passed by the Southampton Medical Society on the 4th of December, 1855:—

“That a homœopathic practitioner should not be met in consultation by a member of this Society under any circumstances.”

If our decision can in any way promote the cause you have lately so ably advocated, we shall feel obliged if you will give it insertion in your journal.

We are, Sir, your obliged servants,
J. KING SAMPSON, }
GEO. A. K. LAKE, } Hon. Secs.
Southampton, May, 1858.

PROPOSED QUALIFICATIONS AND TITLES OF DENTAL PRACTITIONERS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The members of the dental profession owe you a debt of gratitude for the very able manner in which you have made your readers acquainted with the proceedings of the two Dental Societies in reference to the examination of candidates for a dental diploma; and especially for the good-will you have shown them by your efforts to bring about the union of the two bodies, that their strength and influence might thereby be immeasurably increased.

To promote the same most desirable result, I beg, through the medium of THE LANCET, to lay before the medical and dental professions a plan by which it appears to me the great object common to both Societies—viz., the elevation of dental practitioners by a recognised qualification, and the consequent protection of the public from those who are unqualified; and also the special views of each of the Societies would be attained, and all obstacles to their honourable union thereby removed.

Those who have perused your leading articles on the subject will readily remember what these special views are—that the Odontological Society desire a union with the Royal College of Surgeons, and that the College of Dentists prefer an independent existence; that the Odontological Society wish the examination of candidates to be conducted by Royal College examiners and dental examiners conjoined, while the College of Dentists prefer the examination to be managed solely by dental practitioners.

At present gentlemen practising dentistry style themselves at will surgeon-dentists or dentists, the two designations being to them quite synonymous, and the one or the other of them preferred according to taste; and in the same number of *The British Journal of Dental Science*, Mr. Tomes appears as a dentist and also as a surgeon-dentist—as “Surgeon-Dentist” to the Middlesex Hospital, and “Consulting Dentist” to the London Dental Dispensary. But the public generally do not regard the two designations as synonymous, and have the idea that a surgeon-dentist is a surgeon and also a dentist; and partly on these grounds I base the following propositions:—

1st. That in future dental practitioners be styled surgeon-dentists or dentists, according to their qualification.

2nd. That the title of dentist be granted by a Dental College—formed by the union of the two existing dental bodies—after a prescribed course of study, and an examination such as may be deemed fit to prove the capabilities of candidates for undertaking the ordinary surgical and mechanical duties of the profession.

3rd. That the title of surgeon-dentist be granted by the Dental College to any licentiate or member of a College of Surgeons who passes the same examination as that conferring the title of dentist.

4th. That any one having the title of dentist from the Dental

College be permitted to style himself surgeon-dentist, should he subsequently become a licentiate or member of a College of Surgeons.

5th. That all the members of the Odontological Society and the College of Dentists be entitled, on the union of the two bodies, to style themselves surgeon-dentists.

Such, Mr. Editor, are the heads of a plan which will, I hope, be favourably received by the dental profession; for it seems to me calculated to satisfy the requirements of all parties—the public, dental practitioners, and the medical profession. The public would have a solid foundation for their belief respecting the qualifications of dentists and surgeon-dentists. The two dental societies would obtain their mutual and also their individual wishes; the College of Dentists securing entire independence, and the Odontological Society gaining all the connexion with the College of Surgeons that would ever, in all probability, be accorded them by the council of the College, who, in their reply of March 13th, 1857, to the memorialists of the Society, say—“At the same time the council entertained a strong opinion that the surgical qualification for the proposed examination in dental surgery should be the same as that required for the membership of the College”; an opinion which was not modified by the council in subsequent communications.*

The medical profession, I am very sanguine, will receive my plan favourably, as it gives an honourable place amongst dental practitioners to those of them who, possessing a surgical qualification, may desire to practise as surgeon-dentists.

Having sufficiently occupied your space already, I shall not at present point out other advantages that would, in my opinion, be likely to arise from the adoption of the foregoing proposals; but will, with your permission, take another opportunity of doing so, should they meet with a favourable reception.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A. STEWART, F.R.C.S.E.,
Russell-square, May, 1858. Surgeon-Dentist.

PRIVATE HOSPITALS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Some remarks having been made upon myself, in one of your editorial articles of the 8th of May, I beg to state that I have nothing to do with the *management* of the institution referred to, and if it is against *professional propriety* to have accepted the appointment of surgeon to the *Maison de Santé*, Portland-road, I plead guilty to the crime of breach of professional etiquette.

The principle of *maison de santé* is a very old one in the whole civilized world. In this country some very eminent and learned men are attached to private establishments for lunatics, and there is a Home founded in Harley-street on a somewhat similar principle, having highly respectable professional names attached to it. In France and Germany, names respected and dear to science are or have been attached to private institutions, as T. Venel, Heine, Jules Guérin, Civiale, Sichel, Demars, Duval, and others. I do not see clearly the reason why I should have refused the appointment.

It is unfortunate for me not to be known to the writer of the article, but if he had taken the trouble to make inquiry about me amongst his colleagues in THE LANCET, perhaps some one could have given him a satisfactory account of my professional bearing. The gratuitous epithet applied to my late work I leave, as I left my writings, to the judgment of the profession.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY DICK, M.D.
Wimpole-street, Cavendish-square, May, 1858.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Having seen in THE LANCET of the 8th instant an article containing censure on the *Maison de Santé* of which I have the management, I beg to elucidate some points respecting it, by which I think you will perceive you have been misinformed on the subject. In the first place, we make no prominent feature of spermatorrhœa or pseudo-spermatorrhœa, and agree with you that numbers are labouring under the erroneous belief that they are suffering from disease. Should any such visit us, care will be taken by our medical officer to disabuse them of the delusion, though I cannot perceive, in a scientific point of view, how one disease is more “filthy” than another.

* The Report lately published by the Odontological Society, and procurable, I dare say, at the Society's rooms, 32A, George-street, Hanover-square, contains the correspondence between the College of Surgeons and the Odontological Society, and also shows very clearly the present position of the two dental bodies.

To the medical investigator, the pathology of diseases of the bladder, urethra, and, if you will, the "vesiculæ seminales," must be as interesting as that of diseases of the heart, the lungs, or the ear, in all which branches of medical science and in numerous others quacks are unfortunately to be found. The complaints treated at this institution are syphilis and all diseases of the generative and urinary organs. You say the hospitals are "sufficient" for the purpose. Doubtless they contain abundant ability and skill; but the upper and middle classes of society do not apply to them, nor are they intended for them. It may be objected that those classes could be attended at home in the ordinary way. To this I reply that many suffering from these diseases dislike to be treated at home, and remove to hotels and private lodgings, where their wants are very inadequately supplied. Besides, there are in this great metropolis numbers of single persons residing in apartments, and strangers, who, when ill, would be glad to find a place where they could obtain good medical attendance and all the requirements of a sick room, with every provision for their comfort under the same roof.

A similar principle has been adopted in private asylums for lunatics, with which gentlemen of high rank in the profession are connected; and if these asylums be deserving of attention, why should an establishment for the diseases treated by us merit censure? Another error into which you have been led is, that we assume in our prospectus that sufficient attention has not been paid by the profession to these diseases. We presume to make no such statement. To your remark, that we "may open a path to a new and dangerous field of quackery," I reply that the "field" is an old one, and hitherto has been chiefly in possession of the quacks; and we were desirous to perform a part in redeeming that field, by opening a private hospital, at which patients would receive honest advice, and hoped thereby to obtain the countenance of THE LANCET, and all other supporters of straightforward legitimate practice. I should add that Dr. Dick has no pecuniary interest in the *Maison de Santé*, nor any part in its management. He is merely the medical officer, and is paid for his services, and was selected solely on the ground that for many years he had devoted his attention and practice, here and abroad, to the diseases which we had it in contemplation to treat.

Whilst ascribing to you the best intentions regarding medical interests, I can only think your article was written under erroneous information. I beg to enclose you a prospectus, and trusting you will in fairness insert this reply in your ensuing publication,

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,
Upper Norton-street, May, 1858. J. S. CONRAN.

* * Our article was written with a full knowledge of the character of the institution, and after a perusal of the prospectus, which is eminently open to the objections stated. If Dr. Dick is willing to connect himself with such a concern, he must be prepared to take the blame with the profit.—SUB-ED. L.

DISEASE AND DEATH IN THE FOOT-GUARDS.

[LETTER FROM DR. J. WEBSTER.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Under the above title, in THE LANCET of last week, an important mortuary report is given of the fatal casualties which occurred from 1839 to 1853, in the several regiments. The aggregate deaths therein mentioned are certainly large, and so very different from the amount more recently recorded, that it appears desirable to draw attention to the subject, since erroneous opinions prevail respecting the question mooted, not only amongst the public generally, but even the medical profession.

According to official statements often quoted, the household troops are reported to have been formerly unhealthy, especially in reference to consumption. Now, their condition must have become quite otherwise, if the total mortality which characterized the same regiments, subsequent to the Crimean campaign, be taken into account. For instance, during 1856, although the Foot-Guards stationed in London usually average about 3500 men, exclusive of officers, only 44 fatal cases were reported from all the battalions. In 1857, the total deaths fell to 29; while, during the first three months of the current year, 9 soldiers have died in the military hospitals.

The above authentic facts prove that few similarly large bodies of men enjoy better physical condition, when congre-

gated together in barracks, than the household troops quartered in the metropolis. Doubtless, it may be said, a number of guardsmen were invalidated after returning from the Crimea—at least 300 I have heard; but they were replaced by recruits who are often neither so strong nor able to undergo strict military duty like veterans, and hence disease might be thereby more easily developed. Notwithstanding such influences, the conclusion seems well founded that many assertions now prevalent respecting the sanitary *status* of her Majesty's Foot-Guards are greatly exaggerated, and not applicable to the present time. On the contrary, these troops must have lately enjoyed very good bodily health, seeing so few men have been cut off by disease during the last two years and three months throughout the several battalions.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant.

Brook-street, May, 1858.

JOHN WEBSTER, M.D., F.R.S.

THE PROPOSED STUDENTS' CLUB.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In THE LANCET of October 17th, 1857, you did me the favour to publish my letter, signed "Alpha," on the above subject. It is one that has occupied my attention for several years; and I was pleased to read, in your impression of the 1st instant, the admirable letter of Mr. Milton upon the same subject. It appears to me an object of very great interest, as the amelioration of the condition of medical students and assistants might be attained at a comparatively easy rate under the provisions of the Limited Liability Act. The requisite amount of capital might readily be raised in the form of shares; and, the scheme once fairly started, I do not doubt that the medical students would gladly embrace the change from the present comfortless system of lodgings.

Should any of your subscribers wish to assist in promoting the plan already suggested, I shall be happy to furnish them with what information I have been enabled to gather upon the subject.

Nottingham, May, 1858.

LORY MARSH.

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 7th inst. :—

CODRINGTON, OLIVER, Castle-street, Falcon-square.
COOKE, GEORGE PARDOE, H.M.'s Dockyard, Woolwich.
DALTON, HENRY AUGUSTUS, Royal Navy.
DANIEL, RICHARD SYLVESTER, Manchester.
DRYSDALE, CHARLES ROBERT, London.
HALL, EGERTON FRANCIS, Middleton Cheney, Banbury.
HEELAS, NEWTON, Wokingham, Berks.
HUDSON, ARTHUR CORT, Manchester.
LEWER, ALFRED, Merley Hall, Wimborne, Dorset.
SEWELL, WILLIAM MALLETT, Barnsbury-park, Islington.
THOMAS, GRIFFITH ROBERT, Swansea, South Wales.

The following gentlemen were admitted members on the 10th inst. :—

DEVLIN, H. WM., Greenhill, Ballygawley, co. Tyrone.
EARLE, JAMES NEALE, Brunswick-street, Trinity-square.
FAWKNER, JOHN, Manchester.
GRIFFITH, THOMAS, Warrington, Lancashire.
HOLLINGS, ROBERT, Woodlesford, near Leeds.
JACKSON, JOHN, Leicester.
ORD, GEORGE RICHARD, Brixton-hill.
SPENCER, HENRY BANKS, Chippenham, Wilts.
TOWNSEND, EDWARD RICHARD, Cork.
WAIT, JOHN STUBBS, Bury, Lancashire.
WALKER, HENRY, Malton, Yorkshire.

NEW FELLOWS.—The following members of the College, having been elected at previous meeting of the Council, were admitted to the Fellowship on the 13th inst. :—

BOXALL, HENRY, Wisborough-green, Horsham, Sussex; diploma of membership dated July 19, 1839.
DAVIES, RICHARD EDWARD, Charles-street, Manchester-square; January 13, 1843.
EBBAGE, THOMAS, Leamington; April 21, 1835.
JOHNSON, EDWARD CHARLES, Savile row; Feb. 24, 1843.
LIDDERDALE, JOHN, Kintbury; April 26, 1826.
MEACHIN, JOHN, Dartmouth; April 12, 1843.
MOORE, EDWARD, Hales Owen; October 28, 1842.