space has been in this manner acquired since the war time, when, if history informs us rightly, the royal navy was efficient. I trust that some member of Parliament will move for a return of the size of each class of ships in the year 1805, with the space allotted to the officers and crews respectively, to be compared with a similar return for the year 1850.

It was in the year 1805 that King George the Third ordered that naval medical officers should receive the same treatment as their army brethren. Four years previously, I know for certain, the assistant-surgeons of the army serving in Lord Nelson's fleet at Copenhagen, were messing in the ward-room; yet evasion was practised by the Admiralty of that period, with reference to the king's order to assimilate the position of the medical officers of both services, as it is in this present year. Let the Admiralty know that Parliament can order a rearrangement of the internal fittings of ships. Are the cabins occupied by the captains and officers, in 1850, of the same dimensions as those in 1805? This is an important question; for if the cabins have been enlarged, they have been so augmented by the sacrifice of the right of the assistant-surgeons to cabins. Have cabins been given to officers of any other class (for instance, to naval instructors, engineers, &c.) since the year 1805? If so, the cabins have been erected on the space intended for the assistant-surgeons by King George the Third and his successors.

If necessary, let the cabins of the captains and officers be diminished, so that the order in council of 1805 may be carried into effect. But I have proof by me that there are now, in every class of ship and vessel in her Majesty's naval service, not only ample space for the erection of cabins, without interfering with the efficiency of the ships as men of war, or with the accommodation of the crew, but also unoccupied cabins.

I will, at another time, publish the documents in *THE LANCET*, if, Sir, you will kindly give them insertion.

I remain, Sir, your most obedient servant,

FREDERICK JAMES BROWN, M.D. Lond.,
Strood, Rochester, July 16, 1850. Late Assist.-Surg. R.N.

THE APOTHECARIES' COMPANY AND DR. BURT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In your valuable paper of the 7th inst. is a communication with the signature of "M.R.C.S., M.D., L.A.C.," commenting on the case of Dr. Burt, which he details in *THE LANCET* of the 8th of June. Your correspondent expresses his "amusement" at the persecutions with which the above-named gentleman has been assailed at the instance of the worshipful Society of Apothecaries. I readily credit his statement; there are some persons who do feel amused at the misfortunes and the annoyances of better men: it is their nature; and such I suspect to be the character of M.D. &c., who, secure on the rock of his own littleness, dares to shoot from behind a hedge his anonymous balderdash against time-honoured institutions, that existed before he was born, or the Company thought of, and will, I trust and hope, flourish when the one and the other have passed into oblivion. I have been a subscriber to *THE LANCET* for now nearly twenty years. Your policy has been, during that period, to defend the true honour and interests of our much-divided profession; and I am confident I speak the sentiments of a large number of respectable men in saying they confidently hope and expect from your powerful pen some defence, as graduates of the Scottish universities—as practitioners and as gentlemen, from the persecutions of the Apothecaries' Company, as in the case of Dr. Burt. Are there no quacks infesting the country? Are there no impostors beguiling an ignorant public, who require the polite attentions of the Society, that victims are chosen from among qualified practitioners?

It has always been understood that the Apothecaries' Company were well disposed towards the National Institute; and, indeed, one or more of the examiners hold office in the new College, whose laws recognise all certificated men of the United Kingdom as general practitioners. Is it not rather inconsistent to admit the rights of a man to general practice in Regent-street, and assail him with a torrent of wrath from Blackfriars the next morning? Surely, Mr. Editor, it does afford rather an indecent spectacle to the enemies of what should be a noble profession, to behold a public body persecuting and hunting down men of education—members by examination of the time-honoured medical institutions of the country—because, forsooth, although qualified to prescribe for a king, as admitted on all hands, they are not competent, legally, to mix a dose of jalap for a beggar: this is indeed

"rending the book in struggles for the binding." It never could have been contemplated, when this Act became law, that physicians should thus be made to suffer, and impostors to infest the country and poison her Majesty's lieges, uncared for.

Let the Company open their doors on payment of a moderate fine, to all qualified medical men at present in actual practice as general practitioners; and, for the future, let all such who refuse to obtain the licence be at the mercy of the informer; and hereafter, if university graduates require licence to practise pharmacy, allow them to procure it on payment of an entrance fee—say £40 or £50. This would still keep the Company a close borough, and yet avoid the unpleasantness, to all parties, of such proceedings as those lately of the Apothecaries' Company *v.* Dr. Burt. A real medical reform would be thus effected, and one fertile source of envy, hatred, and malice, removed from among us. Hoping to see some remarks on the subject in *THE LANCET*, believe me, with much respect, an admirer of fair play, and your very faithful servant,
VINDEK.

July 10, 1850.

THE EXAMINATION FOR THE M.D. DEGREE AT KING'S COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As a member of the profession, will you favour me with a short space in your valuable columns, to offer a few remarks in answer to your correspondent, "A Successful Candidate," whose letter appeared in the number of last week.

I do not do this from any feeling of professional jealousy, or, indeed, any other motive than a conviction that if the specimen of the examination which he appears to have undergone at Aberdeen be a sample of that usually adopted there, his assertion that this examination is more difficult than that of the Apothecaries' Hall is not only incorrect, but liable to mislead many students proposing to pass the latter, by inducing their attempting to qualify themselves when possessing only such a superficial knowledge as would be requisite to answer the questions which your correspondent has subjoined to his letter.

Having thus premised, permit me to point out some of the deficiencies of the one as compared with the other. First, then, I apprehend that the College of Aberdeen has for its object a perfect qualifying for the practice of medicine, yet not one question do we find on that important and useful branch—midwifery: an eventful and trying duty in every professional man's career. Neither does any consideration appear to have been attached to materia medica, a sound knowledge of which is so indispensable to the practitioner. Inorganic chemistry, chemical tests, forensic medicine, and botany, appear likewise to be considered of no importance. Neither do we find any allusion made to the educational attainments of the proposed M.D.: I allude to his Latin.

Now, with the Hall, all of these form subjects of severe study with the student, in each of which he must be well versed, otherwise his rejection is unavoidable.

Although "A Successful Candidate" must have been acquainted with all these when he obtained his L.A.C. in 1846, yet this was four years since, and it is notorious that every year the examinations have become more severe; and as it appears that the examination which he then underwent was so secondary to that of Aberdeen, it must have been particularly easy indeed; but let me assure him that it is not so at the present day.

I do not speak from personal, but general opinion, that any man who already possesses the Hall qualification has only to present himself for the Aberdeen diploma, and his success is scarcely a matter of speculation; and also, judging from the before-quoted questions, any man who has lately passed the Hall will agree with me in this.

I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,

July, 1850.

C. N., L.A.C. of 1850.

COLLODION IN ERYSIPELAS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—With reference to the report from the London Hospital in your number of the 13th inst., I would beg to observe, that what credit may attach to the first use of collodion as a topical application in erysipelas, is properly due to Mr. Busk. It has been thus employed in this hospital very nearly since the first introduction of collodion into surgical practice, and long prior to

its use for the same purpose in Paris. The benefit derived from the use of this application has been most marked, if not in controlling or shortening the duration of the affection, yet in moderating the violence of the inflammation, and in removing the distressing soreness and pain attending it.

Its constringing or compressing power has always been remarked upon by Mr. Busk as partly the cause of its beneficial effects, which, however, are also in part due to the mechanical protection afforded by the membranous film to the irritated and tender surface.

These facts are well known to Mr. Bird, as he would, doubtless, be the first to acknowledge.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY S. L. ROOKE, M.D.,
Resident Surgeon.

The Dreadnought, July 16, 1850.

DR. CARPENTER'S PRIZE ESSAY ON TEE-TOTALISM.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you allow me to ask Dr. Carpenter a few questions respecting the adjudication of the prize of one hundred guineas to himself?

1. Was not the essay which gained the prize, or the substance of it, published in an abridged form in the *British and Foreign Medical Review*, of which his friend, Dr. Forbes, was formerly the editor?

2. Were not Dr. Forbes, Dr. Roupell, and Dr. Guy, the adjudicators of the prize; the essays having been sent to them in sealed envelopes, with mottoes corresponding to the essays?

3. Was Dr. Forbes so ignorant of the modes of thought, style of writing, nay, handwriting itself, as to make it possible that he could have adjudicated without knowing that Dr. Carpenter was the writer of the successful essay?

I should be glad to see an answer to these queries, for the very suspicion or possibility of partiality should not be suffered to exist in such cases.

Your obedient servant,

JUSTUS.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AND ASSURANCE OFFICES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—On the 16th ult. I received the following printed letter:—

London and Provincial Law Assurance Society,
32, New Bridge-street, Blackfriars, London. June 15, 1850.

SIR,—You being referred to in a proposal for assurance on the life of Mr. G. T—, for the requisite information as to his present and general state of health and habits of life, the directors request the favour of your attention to the questions stated on the preceding page, and that you will oblige them with the best information which your *medical* knowledge enables you to furnish to each inquiry.

Fully sensible of the delicacy felt by members of your profession in returning answers to such inquiries, the directors beg to assure you that your communication will be regarded as strictly confidential.

The policy cannot be granted until you have replied to the accompanying questions.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

To — McDonald, Esq.

J. KNOWLES, Sec.

To this I replied, as follows:—

Kingsdown, Bristol, June 17, 1850.

SIR,—In reference to the queries the London and Provincial Law Assurance Society have made respecting the health of Mr. G. T—, I beg to inform you that I am amongst those of my profession who have determined not to render insurance offices the required information respecting candidates for insurance, unless the usual fees be paid by the offices seeking such information.

Under these circumstances, should your office think fit to transmit me the usual fee for my report in the present case, I shall feel much pleasure in forwarding it at once, otherwise I must decline altogether.

To obviate the necessity of your referring me to Mr. G. T— for payment, which is the usual course pursued when offices decline it themselves, I would say that we are going entirely on the principle, that those who require our services should pay for them, and that we look for payment to none others than those who need them.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

To the Secretary &c.

J. P. McDONALD.

To this communication, as I expected, I received no reply. In a few days, however, Mr. G. T— called on me, and urged me most strongly to furnish the office with the necessary report, offering me any fee I might require, as it was of great importance to him to insure his life. I explained to him the nature of the case, and refused to do so unless paid by the office. Several days passed, and he again renewed his request, but I as resolutely refused. He then showed me a letter from the office to (I believe) his attorney, directing him to request Mr. G. T— to proceed to the Society's medical referee in Bristol, who would furnish the necessary report. Beyond this, I have heard nothing of the case.

It struck me at the time, that the said office must be very hard up for members, if, after making such very important questions, (as contained in the category I received,) they content themselves with the report of a perfect stranger to the candidate, ignorant, of necessity, of his previous habits and health, although to the candidate's medical adviser they declare that "the policy cannot be granted until he has replied to the accompanying questions."

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES P. McDONALD, M.R.C.S.

Kingsdown, Bristol, July 13, 1850.

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 12th inst. :—

BISSHOPP, JAMES, Arundel, Sussex.

BUTT, WILLIAM BOYNE, Edgeware.

CARROLL, JOHN, Trim, co. Meath.

EDDOWES, WILLIAM, Shrewsbury.

LATTEY, PARKE PITTAR, Harley-street.

MORGAN, JAMES HAY, Newcastle-Emlyn, Carmarthenshire.

PAINE, LEWIS, Great Chart, Ashford, Kent.

PESKETT, ALFRED, Petersfield, Hants.

SMALL, JOHN THOMAS, Toronto, Canada.

VAN-HEMERT, FRANCIS THOMAS, Frodingham, Lincolnshire.

WIGHTMAN, WILLIAM, Swinefleet, Yorkshire.

YOUNG, CHARLES, Lewes, Sussex.

ERRATUM.—In our last we stated that the gentlemen in the second list had passed for the Fellowship; it should have been "were admitted members."

APOTHECARIES' HALL.—Names of gentlemen who passed their examination in the science and practice of medicine, and received certificates to practise, on

Thursday, July 11, 1850.

HILLS, WILLIAM CHARLES, London.

SIMPSON, EDWARD, York.

TODD, JOHN, Rothbury, Northumberland.

WATSON, HENRY NOBLE, Clitheroe, Lancashire.

MEDICAL REFORM.—The following is a significant extract from the report of the Council of the Bath and Bristol branch of the Provincial Association, read at the annual meeting recently held in Bath:—"In accordance with the wish announced by the Worcester Council, a special general meeting of the members of the branch was held in April, at which the resolutions drawn up by your Council were passed without a dissentient voice. The points adopted by that meeting were—that the College of Physicians should be so modified as to embrace all the provincial physicians. That its fellows should be chosen by examination, with a power of election for special cases. That the charter of the College of Surgeons should be so modified as to admit any of its fellows to be eligible to the Council, irrespective of the practice of midwifery or pharmacy. That the members previous to 1843 should by degrees be made fellows without the payment of any fees. The meeting also coincided with the view that the Council of the College might beneficially be so enlarged as to admit into its body some of the provincial fellows. Your Council did not suggest a resolution relative to the proposed new College that they might not have any, the slightest want of unanimity; but they venture to assert, that, as far as their knowledge extends, the feeling of the provincial practitioners against the formation of a new college is all but universal; as it would perpetuate an anomaly in our profession, and render its future settlement more than ever difficult."