

the profession against using, as being less powerful than the yellow, though why it is so I am unable to say, unless it be that the plant is collected either at a different season, or when not sufficiently ripe. But chemical analysis has convinced me that the green is weaker than the yellow; and I also know that at present the genuine yellow sort is very difficult to be had in London, and that a plentiful importation is speedily expected. I have reason to believe that the genuine leaf may be had in Liverpool, by applying to Mr. Clay, chemist, Bold-street, Liverpool. I am, your obedient servant,
THOS. JEFFREYS, M.D.

Great George-square, Liverpool, Feb. 4, 1845.

NOTE FROM DR. MORRIS, (YORK.)

To the Editor.—SIR: It was not until Thursday evening (the 30th of January) that I had an opportunity of seeing a letter of Dr. Laycock's, which appeared in THE LANCET of the previous Saturday, and was dated January 9. With respect to it I would observe, that some months ago, on Dr. Laycock's expressing himself aggrieved by my observations, I then voluntarily offered to publish his statements and my remarks, side by side, and leave the public to judge between us. This course I then considered, and am still of opinion, was all that was required of me: with it, however, he was not satisfied, and it was not carried out. We then agreed, and it was Dr. Laycock's own proposal, to submit the case to some mutual friend. Dr. Simpson kindly took the matter in hand, but, owing to his very numerous professional engagements, his decision was rather delayed; he, however, called on Dr. Laycock about the end of December, on this very matter, leaving a message for him, as he did not find him at home. I shall leave it to your readers to decide how far Dr. Laycock's mode of proceeding can be reconciled with any of the rules ordinarily observed in cases *under arbitration*; for both Dr. Simpson and I still considered the matter as under arbitration. May I request, Sir, that you will oblige me by inserting those few lines in THE LANCET at your earliest convenience. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

BEVERLEY R. MORRIS, M.D.

York, Feb. 3, 1845.

* * We trust it will not be considered that any occasion exists for publishing a rejoinder in our columns in relation to this controversy.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

MESMERISM AT NOTTINGHAM.—(Note from Mr. Attenburrow).—SIR: An anonymous communication, utterly devoid of truth, having appeared in THE LANCET of last week, respecting my practice and patients, I trust you will, in common honesty, insert this decided denial of the juggler-like tricks which *Vindex* assures your readers I constantly perform. Should he wish for correct information concerning my proceedings, he doubtless knows my residence, where I shall be happy to see him, *under his own name*.—HENRY C. ATTENBURROW. Feb. 5th.

PETITION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT MEDICAL BILL BY NON-MEDICAL INDIVIDUALS.—A correspondent at Oakham, who has authenticated his letter by his name, informs us that a petition against the re-introduction of Sir James Graham's Medical Bill, is now in course of signature by the inhabitants of the county of Rutland, and already bears the names of *clergymen, solicitors*, and many other highly respectable and influential members of society. He adds: "From the spirit and readiness with which these names have been subscribed, it has been proved to demonstration that the intelligent portion of the public are sensitively alive to the dangers with which this Bill threatens them, and that it rests only with *the profession* to produce such an overwhelming force of opposition as to render the passing of it impossible. This might easily be effected by representing the Bill in its true bearings upon the interests of the community to *the public themselves*. It is, however, not at present adequately understood by the public; and so little are medical affairs the theme of ordinary conversation, that many very intelligent persons are scarcely aware even of the existence of such a Bill as the Government Medical Bill. It requires no force of argument, no powers of rhetoric, to shew intelligent people the pernicious consequences of passing such a Bill, and I have no doubt that practitioners of respectable standing in their several localities might easily convene meetings of the non-professional public, and that they would be well attended, and would vote in favour of, and sign petitions condemnatory of the Bill. The beneficial effects of such proceedings, if adopted throughout the kingdom, are too manifest to require comment, and I trust that professional men

will not be too diffident in pressing what may *appear* to be only *their own* claims upon public attention, forgetting that, in reality, they would urge the public to a consideration of a subject which affects the community at large to a tenfold greater degree." We have seen a copy of the Rutlandshire petition, and a most judicious and excellent document it is.

LONDON COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.—At a medical meeting at Brigg, Lincolnshire, on the 31st of January, it was agreed, by members of the College of Surgeons present, to present a memorial to the council of the above College, strongly representing their dissatisfaction with the new charter, their disapproval of the system of admitting fellows under it; and more especially, the exclusion of practitioners of pharmacy and midwifery from seats in the council. The memorial also stated, that the subscribers view the institution of a College of General Practitioners as likely to weaken the influence of the College of Surgeons as one of the established institutions of the country; that the competition thereby set up for granting diplomas will, they have reason to apprehend, in time, injure its funds; and on these grounds they respectfully suggest the expediency of applying for such alterations in their charter as will not only, they believe, maintain the College in its present state of prosperity, but greatly enhance its usefulness to the profession for whose especial benefit it was originally founded. This memorial is now in course of signature.

MEDICAL BULLETIN.—To the Editor. SIR,—With regard to a paragraph thus headed, in THE LANCET of this day, p. 141, inquiring who is the medical practitioner in attendance upon the Earl of Mornington, I beg to inform you that it is Mr. Frederick Julius, a general practitioner, residing at Richmond, and whose name is given in the same number of THE LANCET, at p. 128, as that of one of the "Provisional Committee" of the National Association. In replying to this question, may I be permitted to conclude with another? How is it that the council of the College have presumed to insult the much-respected father of that gentleman, by omitting his name from among their list of Fellows—a gentleman who has practised during upwards of thirty years in Richmond, and reckons among his patients persons of the highest distinction? Your obedient servant, INDAGATOR. London, Feb. 1.

TRANSMISSION OF VACCINE LYMPH BY POST.—A correspondent ("A Country Practitioner") writes as follows:—The postmaster-general has lately issued an order for the different postmasters to detain all letters containing any glass or other article that is considered to be likely to injure any of the Post-office servants in handling the letters. That some regulation of the sort was called for, by the manner in which the facilities afforded by the Post-office had been abused, no one will deny; but I see no reason why this should extend to letters containing glasses of vaccine lymph; and, accordingly, I requested the postmaster of this place to write and ask the postmaster-general whether such was the case. In reply, he was directed to detain any letter suspected to contain any such article. But at once the folly and danger of placing any impediments in the way of vaccination will be seen by medical men, especially at a time when the small-pox is so prevalent; and I do not doubt that if the attention of the authorities were drawn to this subject by the Editor of THE LANCET, the "order" would be construed so as to except vaccine glasses. My supply of lymph has just failed, and I shall be put to great trouble, and shall experience considerable delay, before I can obtain more; and this, at a time when there are many children in my district requiring vaccination, and cases of small-pox exist all around it, in some places within two miles of its limits. Previous to the publication of the "order," I should have written to a friend in a large town, forty miles from here, and received a supply, probably by return of post.—Jan. 31, 1845.

REJECTION OF QUACK ADVERTISEMENTS.—The following admirable remarks on quackery and quack advertisements are to be found in the number for November, 1844, of a religious periodical, which is stated by a correspondent to circulate more than 30,000 numbers monthly, called *The Christian Witness*:—"We fell into the current, and followed the bad example of pre-existing religious periodicals; but reflection has led us to see our mistake, and we hasten to repair it, assured that we shall give satisfaction to all our readers, who properly estimate the true character of modern quackery, which is one of the vilest and foulest of all foul and vile vocations, and is sustained to an incredible extent by fraud, forgery and falsehood, and fraught with delusion, disease, and death. To publish their nostrums is to partake of their deeds; to receive their money is to share their spoils, and aid them in making war upon mankind. No vehicle renders them such assistance in the work of rapine as the *religious magazines*, which, among the thoughtless masses,