

shop or act in the art and mystery of an apothecary in Ireland until he shall have been examined as to his qualification and knowledge of *the business* by "the governor, deputy governor, and directors of the Apothecaries' Hall of Dublin." The Dublin Hall had no powers given to appoint any examiners other than those named above or to examine in medicine as the London Society has. (c) The London Society has power to inspect apothecaries' shops and inflict fines; the Dublin Hall has not that responsible duty entrusted to it; that was imposed on the College of Physicians of Ireland and was regularly performed by it up to the date of the passing of the Act constituting the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland. (d) A candidate rejected by the Dublin Hall can appeal to the College of Physicians; this right has been repeatedly exercised. No such supervision is conferred on the Royal College of Physicians of London. With respect to the London Hall, the President and Fellows of my College held, when the subject of admitting the Dublin Hall to participate with College of Surgeons in forming with them a conjoint examining board was under discussion, that the fact of the Hall being subordinated to the College in these and other matters by the provisions of the Apothecaries' Act (Ireland), specially with respect to the right of appeal in the case of a rejected candidate, rendered it inexpedient to agree to such a combination.

Further, there was a legal difficulty as to the fee for the joint Licences; the Apothecaries' Hall of Dublin is bound by the Act to charge "the sum of ten shillings and no more" for its certificate. That sum would not pay the cost of the examination, but if the Hall charged a larger sum the College would be conniving at an illegal act; further, candidates would have objected to pay such for a Licence very few desired to hold and the great majority refused to go in for. There was, further, a legal difficulty with regard to the provisions of the Apothecaries' Act. By it the governor and directors of the Hall are bound to enforce an apprenticeship of seven years on all candidates for their Licence. As a matter of fact, they have allowed this to fall into abeyance, but the College of Physicians could not be a party to any evasion of the law. These were the reasons which in 1889 mainly influenced the President and Fellows to decide not to agree to admit the Apothecaries' Hall of Dublin to take part in the scheme for the establishment of an examining board under the provision of the Act of 1888, and all these still exist. Further, I stated that since 1889 matters of public notoriety had occurred with reference to the Apothecaries' Hall which had confirmed the College as to the correctness of its decision. The Apothecaries' Hall of Dublin was established by the Legislature solely with the view of protecting the public from the injury which follows the use of impure or adulterated drugs, and it was the duty of the board of directors to prevent the sale of such in Ireland; but instead of doing so, and while admitting that "drug contracting in Ireland to be in about as corrupt a state as possible and a matter of disgrace to public bodies," it is openly stated by the *Medical Press and Circular*—and the statement has not been contradicted—that "the Apothecaries' Hall of Dublin has descended from its high estate to join in the discreditable scramble for union contracts, adopting the same tactics as the rest of the commercial crowd who fatten at the expense of the ratepayers and the sick poor," and after comparing the gross price of 74 articles which would be supplied by an English firm with the price offered by the Apothecaries' Hall of Dublin it adds: "We are obliged to conclude that the 'Hall' has entered the lists as one of the ruck of drug traders who deal with boards of guardians and is willing to adopt their methods. We do not know that we could say anything worse" (*vide Supplement Medical Press and Circular*, Sept. 23rd, 1896).

I read extracts from this article to the Council and it was having these in my mind that I concluded by saying that, in my opinion, the Apothecaries' Hall of Dublin was not a body any of the medical corporations having due regard to its reputation ought to combine. That opinion I cannot alter. I leave it to your readers to decide if I should do so and whether my conduct in stating the views of the College I represent when called on to show cause why we refuse to join with them is "most unprofessional, totally uncalled for, and highly discreditable" to me. I am willing to abide by the verdict of my profession.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

LOMBE ATTHILL, M.D. Dub.

## SUBCUTANEOUS INJECTIONS OF MORPHINE FOR WOUNDED MEN.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The utility of morphine injections in saving suffering during the removal of wounded men seems so obvious that you may think it unnecessary to insert this letter, but some years ago I was a good deal struck by the account given me by my friend Professor Bitz of Bonn of the use which he made of subcutaneous injections in the Franco-German war while engaged in superintending the removal of the wounded. He went about armed with a bottle of morphine solution and a hypodermic syringe, and before a man was removed he gave him a subcutaneous injection which put the man to sleep, prevented any pain during removal, and lessened shock, so that the patient was in a better condition for operation when he arrived at the hospital in the rear. It sometimes happens that measures of treatment which are perfectly obvious may occasionally, under the stress of circumstances, slip from an operator's mind, and I think it worth while to trouble you with this letter on the bare possibility of preventing pain from such cause.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Stratford place, W., Dec. 14th, 1899. T. LAUDER BRUNTON.

## A QUESTION OF LUNACY FEES.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I have recently had a difference with the Chertsey guardians in reference to the payment of fees for the certifying of lunatics and I should be very glad of your opinion in the matter. I was asked some while ago by the relieving officer if I would attend at the union on a certain date in order to certify seven cases of lunacy. I am not a parish doctor and was called in in a private capacity. I certified the cases in due course and was afterwards informed that the guardians had decided to pay me half a guinea for each case. This I would not accept as I should never dream of certifying for less than a guinea and that is little enough for such responsibility. They, however, refuse to pay more because they were all certified at the same time and tell me I have my remedy. I may say that I entered into no contract beforehand and the question of fee was never mentioned. I should be most glad of your opinion in the matter as I think it is of great importance to the profession.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

J. L. ALLEN HOPE, M.R.C.S. Eng., L.R.C.P. Lond.

\*\*\* Our correspondent should approach the Justice who was concerned in the certifying of these cases. The amount of fee payable to a medical man in these circumstances is left by statute entirely to the discretion of the Justice, and the guardians have no option but to pay whatever sum he makes the order for. The fee usually ordered by the Justice varies from half-a-guinea to two guineas. It is only fixed as low as half-a-guinea where the certifying medical man is the medical officer of the workhouse and he sees the case in the course of his daily visits and as part of his daily routine at the workhouse. When an outside medical practitioner is employed who has to make a special visit, sometimes more than one visit, the fee payable is always one or two guineas. The argument advanced of "reduction on taking a quantity" hardly applies in such circumstances because the responsibility in each individual instance is the same however many alleged lunatics there may be. The sum of two guineas is frequently paid to an outside practitioner when there is only one case; and however many cases there are it should not be less than one guinea each.—ED. L.

## ACUTE INFECTIVE ARTHRITIS AND CELLULITIS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I wish to draw attention again to the erroneous treatment generally practised in "acute rheumatism," persistence in which I can only attribute to the natural disinclination medical men have in renouncing the dogmas of their clinical masters and book authorities. A most interesting case was published by Dr. D. B. Lees and Dr. F. J. Poynton