censors by and by, and give their portraits *seriatim*, and show what a monstrous absurdity it is to let such men play such fantastic tricks; but now, my immediate object is to ask counsel from your practised head, how the extra licentiates had best proceed, in order to give a timely check to this treacherous trick. Do this, but in your own terse and intelligible way, and oblige,

Middlesex, March, 1848.

AN OLD SUBSCRIBER.

* * The extra licentiates should assemble, discuss their grievances, take into consideration the obnoxious provisions in the proposed new charter, and present a petition to the House of Commons, which should embody distinct allegations relative to their present position, and what would become their position if the proposed charter were to be granted by the Crown. A motion might be made to refer their petition to the Parliamentary Committee now sitting, and by that body we would undertake to say that it would receive every requisite attention. It is to be regretted that the extra licentiates do not attach their names to their communications for the purpose of publication. They ought to come out boldly and without fear upon such an occasion.—Ed. L.

THE LONDON UNIVERSITY, AND THE NEW REFORM SCHEME.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Allow me, as a humble individual, to acknowledge and encourage your kind efforts in behalf of the graduates of the University of London. 'Tis indeed passing strange, that so extensive a highway, paved with contributions from every department of science, should lead nowhere—that an institution so eminently adapted to counteract the invidious and depreciating spirit of the times should stand, virtually and politically, a nonentity—that, after so vast an expenditure of time, labour, and anxiety, the most successful among us should at last be rewarded with a “vox et præterea nihil.”

I am, Sir, obediently yours,

Brenchley, Kent, 1848.

STEPHEN MONCKTON, M.B.

EMPLOYMENT OF ANÆSTHESIA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I wish to include in a paper on “Anæsthetic Agents,” which I am preparing for publication in THE LANCET, reports of the number of cases in which ether and chloroform have been exhibited; the quantity of each agent respectively which has been inhaled at one time, in some individual cases, and in others, on an average; with the length of time in individual cases, and on an average, during which a state of anæsthesia has been maintained. Each gentleman's name will be attached to his “report.” Any one thus favouring me, in the course of a week, will much oblige.

I am, Sir, very truly yours,

Braunston, Northamptonshire,
March 20th, 1848.

T. CATTELL, M.D.

THE ENQUIRY AT QUEEN CHARLOTTE'S LYING-IN HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you do me the favour to insert this note, in denial of the use of any such words as were attributed to me in the board-room of the Queen Charlotte's Lying-in Hospital.

The remarks that you kindly appended to the letter of your correspondent fully exonerate me from any charge whatever, but owing to the circumstance not being quite clearly explained by your correspondent, it might appear that a doubt existed as to whether or not I used the language imputed to me.

The personal knowledge of me by the members of the committee would, I feel sure, have rendered unnecessary my assertion that I had not employed this language, even had not the Secretary, who was present when it was alleged I had done so, at once, and without hesitation, confirmed my denial by stating that not one word of those attributed to me had I uttered.

Those who know me will be aware, that in speaking of other persons I am not likely to have used such words as “low,” “vulgar,” “beast;” it is not very probable, therefore, that in relation to a poor hospital patient, or her friend, I should so readily apply them,—one of whom I had scarcely ever seen, and the other never.

The lady, I have reason to be aware, was satisfied that I did

not use the words towards the patient about whom she kindly interested herself, and that not only did I make no accusation against herself, but that I never for one moment entertained any idea of the kind.

A conversation I have since had with one of my colleagues goes to prove that a mistaken impression existed, and that the whole matter arose from an accidental circumstance, of which I should have taken no further notice, had not the letter of your correspondent, in the last number of THE LANCET, obliged me to deny more fully that I ever expressed myself in language so indecently coarse.—I am, Sir, your faithful servant,
Hertford-street, March, 1848.

G. T. GREAM.

THE NEW EDITION OF THE LONDON PHARMACOPŒIA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Through the medium of your valuable journal you will greatly favour me by affording early information—provided it consists with your knowledge—as to whether the new edition of the “London Pharmacopœia” is really to be published soon. It was spoken of as likely to appear in October last—a period when its issue would have been indeed useful; and especially so to the numerous class to which I belong, as about that date our initiatory studies in pharmacy &c. commenced. From the non-appearance of the said new edition, however, and in belief that it would not appear before the beginning of next winter, our studies, together with the prelections of our own and other teachers over the country, on the above subjects, have hitherto been directed by the present edition of the “Pharmacopœia.” I need not tell you, that under these circumstances the introduction of a new standard guide-book on any branch of medical science, within a few weeks of the end of a session, seems, to say the least, an inconsiderate arrangement—one calculated to confuse, and, consequently, to dishearten.

Whose fault is it that the new “Pharmacopœia” did not come out sooner? or that it is now untimely to be published, as if for the express purpose of perplexing those attending the medical schools, by the necessity for unlearning much of what had so recently been acquired?

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

Yorkshire, March, 1848.

A STUDENT.

UNFAIR ASSESSMENT OF THE INCOME-TAX ON PROFESSIONAL MEN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It appears that the income-tax—that unconstitutional, inquisitorial, and unjust tax—is to be renewed, from the 5th of April next, for three years, without making any alteration in the way in which it is levied. Can this be just? Does not the income-tax press most unfairly upon all persons of a limited income? For example, upon officers receiving half-pay—the brave defenders of their country. The half-pay of a commander in the navy, and a major in the army, is, I believe, about £155 per annum; out of this they have to pay, for income-tax, £4 10s. 5d. Can this be fair or just? A person whose income is £149 a year pays nothing, while another, with £150 a year, pays £4 7s. 6d.; so that the one receiving £149 a year is better off than the other receiving £150. Now what I contend is, that it ought to be a tax upon property, and not upon income, or that the latter should be modified; that incomes under £200 a year should be exempt, or, at all events, the tax should spring from £150; thus, persons with £160 a year would have to pay upon ten only, or 5s. 10d. instead of £4 13s. 4d., as at present. The manifest injustice of the income-tax more particularly regards professional men and artists. Those hard “workers,” whose incomes are uncertain, and dependent upon causes over which they have no control, are called upon to pay income-tax at the same rate as the “drones,” who do nothing, and whose property is safely invested, at three, four, or perhaps five per cent. Thus, a professional man, with a wife and large family, who returns £500 a year income, pays £14 11s. 8d. for income-tax—the same as his independent, idle neighbour, who is, perhaps, a bachelor and a miser. Again, let us take the case of a London physician, without private means, (and this will apply to other professions,) who returns £1000 a year income. He is called upon for £29 3s. 4d. income tax, although he already pays about £40 a year for assessed taxes, being, from necessity, obliged to keep a carriage, a pair of horses, and two men servants, at an expense of, probably, £300 per annum. Deduct the £29 3s. 4d., the £40, and the £300, from £1000, and there remains £630 16s. 8d., for rent, rates, cesses, house-