POOR-LAW MEDICAL REFORM.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I shall feel obliged if you will permit a copy of the accompanying circular to appear in your journal.

If Poor-law medical officers really suffer a grievance from hard work and poor pay, it seems to me that now is the time for increased energy and some little sacrifice. Let no man live for himself. Let him strive by his countenance and support to aid in obtaining a meed of justice. Let those who will not work actively themselves support those who do. For once, throw away all supineness and indifference, and with right hearty good-will stand forward and make the cause your own.

Many have given their time and money in order to benefit all, and on what plea can any man stand aloof and listlessly watch this struggle? If success should crown the efforts that have been made, let every man have the inward satisfaction of knowing that he has contributed to obtain that success, seeing that he must necessarily share in any benefit that may ultimately accrue.

I therefore commend these few words to the serious judgment of every medical officer in the service, and sincerely trust he may be disposed to act with promptitude and spirit. The sacrifice individually is small, but the stakes are great.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

March, 1860.

A POOR-LAW MEDICAL OFFICER.

"Poor-law Medical Reform Association."

SIR,—It is proposed that every medical officer of the Union should subscribe a further sum of ten shillings in support of the above Association.

If you should accede to this proposal, and will favour me with your subscription, I will undertake to forward it to the Chairman, who has laboured most energetically for the advancement of our interests.

I would further suggest that each medical officer should immediately petition the House of Commons to pass such resolutions or laws as will have the effect of ameliorating his position.

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

—, March 7th, 1860."

MR. HANCOCK'S OPERATION FOR GLAUCOMA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In a former number of your journal I made some remarks on Mr. Hancock's new operation for glaucoma, contrasting it with Von Graefe's operation by iridectomy. The case then reported by Dr. Sansom did not appear to have the pathological characteristics of glaucoma, and the somewhat premature announcement of its success made me consider it as another form of paracentesis of the cornea, which had the risk of hernia iridis as a disadvantage. I had besides, in my own mind, the apprehension lest the cicatrix formed by the division of the ciliary muscles might aggravate the tension in case of a récidive. But after having read Mr. Hancock's excellent lecture, published since in *THE LANCET* (Feb. 11th and 25th), where his views are more fully developed, and some successful cases reported, I must, in justice to that gentleman, state that the operation stands now on a different footing, and that we shall ask for it a fair trial here. If the cures should prove radical, Mr. Hancock will have rendered an important service to ophthalmic surgery.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Paris, March, 1860.

J. R. WOLFE, M.D.

THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND DR. OLIVER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you give insertion in the pages of your journal to the following correspondence?

In August last I applied to be admitted to the membership of the College of Physicians, in accordance with the public advertisement of that institution, professing to admit British graduates under certain bye-laws. In the following November I received a reply from the College, stating that the Censors declined to admit me to the membership, but assigning no reasons for the rejection. Several subsequent letters failed

to elicit any cause for so arbitrary a proceeding, especially as I had complied with all their regulations as supplied to me. It so happens, in my case, that the refusal is of no consequence and the membership wholly worthless, as I have retired from practice; but there are many of my professional brethren to whom a similar rejection will be of importance, and they may as well know what treatment they are likely to meet with, if not in favour with the Censors of the College of Physicians. I am advised that an application to the Queen's Bench would compel a very different proceeding.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Douglas, Isle of Man, March 26th, 1860.

J. R. OLIVER, M.D.

Royal College of Physicians, London, Nov. 26th, 1859.

DEAR SIR,—I beg to inform you that your application to be admitted a member of the College under the bye-laws of Feb. 16th has been submitted to the Censors, and that they, being of opinion that you are not eligible, decline to submit your name to the College for election.

I remain yours faithfully,

J. R. Oliver, M.D.

HENRY PITMAN, Registrar.

Douglas, Isle of Man, Nov. 29th, 1859.

DEAR SIR,—Your letter of the 26th inst. has been forwarded to me here. Will you have the goodness to inform me upon what grounds the College of Physicians refuse to admit me to the membership? I remain yours faithfully,

Henry Pitman, M.D.,
Royal College of Physicians.

J. R. OLIVER.

Royal College of Physicians, Dec. 3rd, 1859.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your inquiry why your application for admission as a member under the bye-laws of Feb. 16th has not been approved, I have no explanation to offer, but such was the decision of the Censors, of which it was my duty to inform you.

I remain yours faithfully,

J. R. Oliver, M.D.

HENRY PITMAN, Registrar.

Douglas, Isle of Man, Dec. 8th, 1859.

DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your communication of Dec. 3rd. You must excuse me if I press for an answer to my inquiries why the College of Physicians decline to admit me to the membership, in face of their own public advertisement. The very refusal implies an imputation on my professional character; and I respectfully submit to the Censors that the extract from the bye-laws of the College, as furnished to me, admits of no arbitrary or invidious distinctions.

I remain faithfully yours,

Henry Pitman, M.D.,
Royal College of Physicians.

J. R. OLIVER.

Royal College of Physicians, Dec. 10th, 1859.

DEAR SIR,—I regret that my former communication has not sufficed, but I am unable to furnish you with any other explanation of the refusal on the part of the Censors to refer your application to the College. It rests, as you will perceive from the bye-laws which I enclose, entirely with the Censors whether to refer the application to the College or not. I regret that the result of your application is so unsatisfactory to yourself, but it is not in my power to reverse it.

I remain, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

J. R. Oliver, M.D.

HENRY PITMAN, Registrar.

Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THURSDAY, MARCH 22ND.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIS Bill was read a third time and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, MARCH 23RD.

HER MAJESTY'S SHIP "QUEEN."

Sir J. PAKINGTON asked the Secretary of the Admiralty whether it was true, as stated in the *United Service Gazette* of January 21st, that the assistant-surgeon of her Majesty's ship *Queen* was refused a cabin at a time when four cabins were