gestions. These authorities must have been well disposed to depart from the principles of * * * * * when they attended for a moment to the representations of the said Anthony Todd Thompson, and they alone are responsible for the evil that has resulted from the disgusting decision on the subject of the parish surgeon. What can be more unbecoming on the side of the Committee Men, than that of having set up a stranger (against their neighbour, who had long been paying taxes) with a salary of 300*l.* a year, an assistant, and medicines, to oppose the long resident respectable medical practitioner of the said parish. But not content with this, they compel these practitioners to contribute to the payment of their opponent! Such conduct on the side of the Committee Men is revolting in the extreme, and proves them to be utterly unfit for their present situations. Had the clergy discountenanced the abominable job in favour of the parish surgeon as inconsistent with humanity, honesty, delicacy, and fair dealing, it would not have taken place. But instead of having been the enemies of this base and unchristian measure, they have been its supporters. The clergymen of parishes should as much as possible keep aloof from worldly affairs, by which means they would add to the dignity of their high functions. Were divines to act on these principles, they would be a blessing in their parishes, as the parishioners would be able to make them umpires in cases of difficulty. We entirely concur in this parish with the editor of *THE LANCET*, whose powerful aid we solicit at the present moment, as to the inutility of dispensaries, which appear to have been instituted, not for the relief of the poor, but for the convenience of the rich, who, by subscribing a guinea annually, very often save themselves fifty. Medical men, from laudable and humane motives, are induced to give gratuitous aid to these institutions, as also with a view of making themselves known in a way likely to be advantageous to their practice, but in which latter they are, generally speaking, greatly disappointed, as they are regarded by the community as mere substitutes for the parish surgeon, who takes the kernel and gives his brethren the shell.

Where is the lawyer or the divine who steps forward to offer his gratuitous assistance to the poor? Under these impressions, we would earnestly recommend to the medical men of all dispensaries to require to be paid for their medical and surgical assistance, and, in case of refusal, to tender their resignation, by which means the medical men of these parishes would obtain their fair proportion of support from the parishes in which they reside (as well as divines and lawyers resident in the same), and of

which they are deprived by the institution in question.*

I am, Sir, yours,

CHIRURGUS.

Kensington, July 29th, 1831.

COLLIER v. SIMPSON.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR,—A paper war is like a barrel of beer, when first broached, sparkling, fast-flowing, and not devoid of goit; but when the subject, like the barrel, becomes nearly exhausted, the residue is vapid, mawkish, and nauseating: each successive draught brings us nearer to the *grosser material*; and from the flat contradictions of the one, as from the muddy dregs of the other, we turn away with unequivocal disgust.

Requesting your insertion of the subjoined refutations (brief enough I hope), allow me to add I shall not again trouble you until your correspondent writes, and you are unfortunate enough to publish another batch of "Simpsonisms" injurious to the professional reputation of

Your obedient humble servant,

G. F. COLLIER.

32, Spring Gardens, Aug. 9, 1831.

Refutation, No. 1.

"I saw the child Minter a few hours before death, and did not see any of the symptoms usually attendant upon excessive salivation.

"T. WRIGHT, Surgeon.

"Hammersmith, Aug. 8, 1831."

Remarks.—If the statement of Messrs. Dale and Wright be not sufficient, I will call upon Mr. Surgeon Gibson, R.N., who is now in Scotland, and who saw the child on the same day that Perfect (Simpson's landlord) visited him. Is not this a satisfactory refutation of the landlord's extensive ulcers, denuded gums, fetid breath, and dark matter dripping out of the mouth? It is evident this Perfect would have made a capital witness for a thick and thin justification. I wonder he did not add, that he saw a coffin and a sexton drop out of the

* I perceive on the list of Committee Men, Colonel Williamson of the Asylum. Assuredly it becomes us to conclude, that he will not defend the man who has violated his word of honour, and swerved from his solemn engagement. The same observation applies to Mr. Burgess and Mr. France. Certainly these two will not support a dishonourable deviation from an agreement. But more of this anon, should the obnoxious arrangement not be altered. The medical men of the parish aim at nothing but justice, to which all are entitled, and which they will no doubt obtain through the indignant voice of their fellow parishioners, when the tricks and jobs of the pest-house come to be duly placed before them.

boy's mouth. When Gibson sees this, I will thank him to drop me a few lines on the subject. I beg you and your readers to recollect that Simpson's landlord went to see all the "mercurial phenomena," *after his tenant had received the writ.*

Refutation, No. 2.

"Simpson's druggist says it was Thursday night that we had the opiate compounded at his shop."

Remark.—This is directly opposed to Mr. Dale's evidence, to Sir H. Halford's evidence, to Mrs. Minter's evidence, to the daughter's evidence, and to my own notes, and the error in the date was satisfactorily explained. It was a quarter past twelve o'clock on Tuesday night, or, rather, on Wednesday morning.

"Simpson's druggist says, three bottles and not two."

Remark.—The woman, Hannah Minter, stated on oath that the first bottle was had on the Sunday, and the second, which was the last, on Tuesday, and her evidence coincides with the *relative capacity of the spoon and bottle, as compared with the hours of exhibition.* But admitting, merely for argument's sake, that this woman had deceived herself and her medical attendant, and that, as Wright the chemist states, the opiate was substituted on Thursday night, and that Sir H. Halford, Dale, the Minters, and myself, are wrong, it would make very little difference, for of the three bottles the "poor woman" has one now in her possession, and took it with her in court, and will let Wright have it back at half price; and even then, the quantity of the corrosion would amount to one grain (by their own showing) in *four days and six hours*, a practice which I am equally prepared to defend.

Refutation, No. 3.

Mrs. Minter's Statement, extracted from the Evidence taken by Plaintiff's Solicitors.

"I fed my child, from time to time, throughout his illness with chicken-broth after each dose of the medicine, which Mr. Simpson called rank poison, and I could see the inside of his mouth every time. My child's teeth were not loose; he had no thick matter running from his mouth; he had no sores in the mouth; nothing but pure water ran out of his mouth, and when that stopped my child got worse. His tongue was not swollen, nor was his breath stinking."

Hannah Minter's Statement, extracted from the Evidence.

"There were no sores in the mouth, no swelling of the tongue, no thick discharge

from the mouth; teeth were not loose; breath was not stinking"

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have seen in THE LANCET Mr. Perfect's statement of the appearance of the child Minter's gums and fauces. Injustice to Dr. Collier, I beg to add that at my two visits no appearances even of excessive salivation were observed by your obedient humble servant,

EDWARD DALE.

23, Holborn Hill, Aug. 9, 1831.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL.

STRANGULATED HERNIA—OPERATION—DEATH.

WILLIAM RUSSELL, ætat. 66, was admitted at 11, this morning (Tuesday, Aug. 2nd), with an inguinal hernia on the right side. On examination there appeared a tumour extending from the abdominal ring down into the scrotum, about seven inches, the latter part being much distended. There was no tenderness in the abdominal region. He complained of nausea, but had had no vomiting; his bowels had not been opened for two days. A little anxiety of countenance.

The patient said that he had been the subject of rupture on the same side during four months, and that whenever the bowel came down, he had never experienced any difficulty in returning it. Last night, however, he took off his truss in the water-closet, and his bowels having been for some time in a costive state, he was straining rather violently, when on a sudden he found a tumour of the present size, which would not yield to any of his attempts to "push it back." This was about five o'clock p.m., and having sent for the surgeon who usually attended him, that gentleman, after an ineffectual attempt to reduce the hernia, advised him to come to the hospital.

The taxis was now had recourse to in vain, and the patient was then put into a warm-bath, and having been bled, whilst in it, to syncope, the efforts at reduction still proved ineffectual. Mr. Stanley, who had been sent for, arrived in about two hours, and after learning the history of the case, proceeded to make a further trial of the taxis, but with the same effect as before, when, finding that the patient was willing to undergo an operation, the immediate performance of it was determined on.

Operation.—The patient having been placed on the operating table, Mr. Stanley commenced the incision just above the external abdominal ring, carrying it down-