visit a person who was reported to have gone out to work without complaining of any unusual sensation, and apparently in good spirits, who suddenly fell down and speedily died: On my arrival, vitality having fled, I asked the relatives to permit an examination of the body; they readily gave consent, but recollecting that an inquest would be held, I abandoned the intention for the present. I afterwards heard that the inquest was held, that no post-mortem examination was thought necessary, nay, was even condemned, at the inquest, and that a verdict of 'Died by the visitation of God,' was returned."—This inquest is clearly one of those which fall under the class UNNECESSARY. To institute such sham investigations into the cause of death is perfectly useless. A protest should be entered against payment of any fee to the Coroner for holding what he has himself pronounced to be, by the rejection of a post-mortem examination, *an unnecessary inquest*. The commonplace verdict of "Died by the visitation of God," is one of the most dangerous inventions of the time. It is the constant subterfuge of ignorant coroners and ill-guided juries, and serves at once to dispense with medical evidence, and defeat the wise purpose of the coroner's court.

MR. GRAINGER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—As your remarks on certain proceedings that have been perpetrated at Webb-street, materially affect the character of our respected teacher, Mr. Grainger, will you permit me to state, that I, in company with Messrs. Bradden and Taylor, heard Mr. GRAINGER declare his total dissent from that resolution which approves of the existing Medical Corporations; and when surprise was manifested that he did not so express himself in the meeting, he said, that having been requested to preside on that occasion by the students, he was unwilling to bias their opinion by the expression of his own; at the same time, he felt not only grieved but surprised at their decision. Deservedly does that decision call for your heaviest censure; but I most sincerely hope, that after this explanation you will still consider our illustrious teacher as "one of the faithful." Yours, &c.

A. C. LEE.

Three Crown-square, Borough,
Dec. 17, 1838.

[We publish the above note with feelings of sincere satisfaction. We confess that the merits and public spirit which were displayed by the late undaunted FOUNDER of the Webb-street School, have established, in our minds, a strong prejudice in favour of the name of GRAINGER.—ED. L.]

RECENT MEETINGS AT THE WEBB-STREET SCHOOL.

LETTER FROM MR. GRAINGER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—Although I have no wish to obtrude my opinions on the notice of your readers, yet as the observations published in THE LANCET of Dec. 8th and 15th, in reference to two meetings lately held by the students of this School, are calculated to create a false impression of my sentiments on a question of great public interest, I must request you will do me the justice to give insertion to this letter in the next Number of your Journal.

It is not correct that I was in any manner instrumental in calling the second meeting, held on Nov. 28th, or in preparing the resolutions which were brought forward on that occasion, further than suggesting a verbal alteration in the second; nor is it correct that the movers and seconders of those resolutions were my private friends;—those gentlemen were known to me simply as pupils, and I in no degree influenced their opinions or controlled their actions. It is incorrect that I prevented, either directly or indirectly, any individual from expressing his opinions, whether those opinions were in favour or in condemnation of the propositions submitted to the meeting of which I was the chairman. It is not correct that I myself proposed and seconded the above resolutions, or that I took any other share in that part of the proceedings, beyond submitting the propositions to the decision of the meeting.

Having corrected the misstatements to which I conclude you have unintentionally given publicity, I feel it incumbent on me to notice the observations you have offered concerning my conduct on the above occasion. I have yet to learn that the chairman of a public meeting is responsible for the opinions expressed by the individuals who take part in its proceedings, or for the decision at which the majority ultimately arrives. If it should have been supposed by you or others that, from my position in this School, the present instance constitutes an exception to a general principle which none can be so absurd as to contest, I must deny *in toto* the justice of such a conclusion. At all the public meetings which have been held within these walls, I have scrupulously avoided whatever might have even the semblance of checking the freest expression of opinion; and deeply should I regret if I were myself capable of attempting, or if the members of this School were contented to submit to, such an unwarrantable interference. In thus disclaiming the responsibility you have endeavoured to attach to me, I do not shrink from