

flaring diplomas to decoy and cheat the public into the belief that they are perfectly qualified to cure disease.

Now, this is all, to say the least of it, but assumption, partaking, truly, a good deal of morbid apprehension. I wonder at it; for Dr. Webster is one of the last men in the world that I could have imagined would have viewed the influences of an improved system of education upon such an intelligent class of men in so unfavourable a light.

I entertain hopes of better results from the passing of the bill, for I foresee that, instead of making knaves and impostors of the chemists and druggists, as Dr. Webster apprehends, it will elevate their position, and make their trade a scientific pursuit, as it already is in the hands of many very superior men amongst them. And more, it will secure to the public, at the humblest shop, accuracy and safety in the preparation of medicines, upon the efficacy of which life itself may be depending.

Of *domiciliary visits to patients* by chemists to treat disease, I have no apprehension. Such a practice is known to be incompatible with success in the trade of the chemist and druggist, and, as is truly remarked by Dr. Webster, none of those who are prosperous in that business attempt it. "*Counter practice*" is quite a different thing; it is but temporary, and never extends to the regular and continuous treatment of any disease involving danger to life or limb; and, upon reconsideration, I hope that Dr. Webster will see that it would be beneath the dignity of the profession to notice it with the hostility of the restrictive clause that he suggests.

The doctor points to the restriction upon the French *pharmaciens* as a model for us to follow in restraining the chemist and druggist from carrying on *counter practice*. But it should be recollected that in France medical men are not allowed to supply medicines to their patients, nor to derive, directly or indirectly, any profit from the sale of the medicines they prescribe.

In conclusion, I would express a hope that the profession will allow the bill to progress through Parliament without offering any opposition to its provisions that may be open to imputation as selfish or factious, for there is nothing in the measure that compromises in any way the interests of any class of medical practitioners.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your very obedient servant,

GARRETT DILLON, M.D. Edin.

Spanish-place, Manchester-square, April, 1852.

BETHLEM HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Allow me to thank you for the publicity you gave, in your valuable paper of Saturday, the 1st instant, to a meeting of Governors of Bethlem Hospital, held at Bridewell on Monday the 26th ult., also on the previous Monday.

Now, Sir, it is perfectly correct they did meet, but pity is it they did not meet until compelled by evidence given on oath before the Commissioners in Lunacy—that evidence having been printed, and a copy sent to the Governors of Bethlem Hospital.

Now, Sir, on April 21, 1851 (now about twelve months back) I wrote to Sir Peter Laurie concerning my own daughter, who was to my sorrow an inmate of Bethlem Hospital, (fourteen days only,) and I am happy to say Sir Peter answered my letter in the most prompt and courteous manner; from that day commenced my inquiries into the system pursued towards the poor unhappy inmates of that establishment. I was asked if I could bring any "direct evidence" (which was almost an impossibility); still I was determined to persevere. I did so day and night. I spared neither money nor time, and, thank God, I at last succeeded. I did procure "direct evidence" as to the treatment of my own daughter and others. I again waited on Sir Peter, and informed him of such. I was then told I could not have an inquiry on the following Friday (Fridays being the Board days) nor the following week—nor the week after, (which was three weeks.) I then laid the several cases before the Commissioners in Lunacy, who examined each witness on oath—that evidence is printed; and after the expense, the trouble, and throwing myself on a bed of sickness through anxiety and broken rest, I wrote to the Commissioners to oblige me with a copy of the evidence I had placed before them, and on the 14th ultimo I received a letter in answer to my application, signed by the Secretary, informing me "the Report had been only *privately* printed as a *confidential* document, [the italics are his own,] and that no copies will, for the present, be circulated beyond the Committee of Governors, for whose exclusive use and consideration, and by whose direction, and as a matter of convenience, and not with a view to publication, the Report and evidence have been put in type. Should they hereafter be laid before Parliament, or printed for general circulation, you shall have a copy."

I beg to say, Sir, they could not then prevent my procuring a copy. But I think it very hard treatment to me, after twelve months' unknown trouble, and to me (a poor man) an enormous expense, after doing a public good in fighting the cause of those poor fellow-creatures whose wrongs might never have been redressed, had I not have brought them to light—I say, Sir, I think it hard, and, also, unfair, I should be denied a copy of the gross mismanagement and acts of cruelty which have been proved on oath to have been perpetrated in an institution in which we should hope to find every kindness was practised.

I hope, Sir, you will, in justice to me, and also the public, insert this letter, or such portions of it as you in your superior judgment may deem proper.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. J. HYSON.

Lower Kennington Green, May, 1852.

UNIVERSAL VACCINATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you permit an old correspondent to offer a few remarks on a subject which has of late engaged a large share of the attention of the profession—viz., vaccination?

I am glad to find the question of its protective influence so much debated, because I believe it will eventually tend to a permanent and satisfactory settlement of the matter. This is much to be desired, for as long as the medical profession is in doubt respecting the efficacy of vaccination, how can we expect the public to feel confidence in it? Small-pox has appeared in my district much less frequently than formerly, and has been very limited in its ravages. This I attribute to vaccination.

I have the greatest confidence in the protective power of cow-pox; and I believe, if it be properly performed, the subject of it is rendered free from susceptibility to small-pox for life. I admit cases to occasionally occur where small-pox shows itself after vaccination, and so does small-pox occur twice, now and then, in the same person, but these are only exceptions to the general rule. My mind has been strongly impressed with the efficacy of vaccination, from cases which have come under my own observation. The following, among others, have occurred:—

C. M—, unvaccinated, (having wife vaccinated and four children unvaccinated,) went to Salisbury, in which city the small-pox was raging, returned home, and sickened with small-pox. In a week afterwards, one of the children was attacked. At this juncture I vaccinated the remaining three, and although they all slept in the same room, and one or two in the same bed, with the small-pox patients, they escaped the disease.

Within a few doors of this family lived — D—, unvaccinated, aged sixty, and wife, vaccinated. The man caught the small-pox, and wife (aged fifty-eight), although sleeping with her husband, was not attacked.

In another village, small-pox broke out in an unvaccinated family. All had the disease, and one died, but the children next door, under the same roof (vaccinated), escaped, although much exposed to contagion.

Such cases as these must tend, Sir, to establish one's faith in vaccination.

I had cow-pox at two years of age, and have been of course repeatedly exposed to small-pox, but without taking the disease.

The point, however, to which I would particularly call your attention, is the difficulty of extending the practice of vaccination. On this important subject I will offer a few remarks in the next number of your journal.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

L. OWEN FOX.

Broughton, Stockbridge, Hants, April, 1852.

THE FOUNDERS OF THE MEDICAL BENEVOLENT FUND.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—At the forthcoming dinner of this charity, which is to take place on the 20th instant, under auspices the most favourable, so far, at least, as high names can render aid, I trust due justice will be done to the memory and services of its original founders and officers. It seems to be either forgotten or unknown, in the present day, that the late excellent Dr. Baron was, for several years after the commencement of the Fund, then established in connexion with the Provincial Medical Association, the treasurer, and Dr. William Conolly acted as secretary at the same time, until his other avocations obliged him to relinquish a task of so much labour. Thus Gloucestershire has the real