

estimate is pretty near the rule of charges for the visits of a general practitioner in London, exclusive of medicine; and I believe that there is no respectable surgeon that would think of charging a labouring man the highest amount of the scale. When we cannot take low charges from the poor, I believe the rule is to decline the practice. Whoever heard of a man sitting down in Mount-street, Lambeth, practising as an apothecary, (for Mr. O'Shea did not prove, although he asserted, that he was practising as a surgeon,) and talk of charging 5s., 10s. 6d., and 21s. for a visit? Verily he who wishes to catch large fish, must not ply the hook and line in shallow water. I rather think in this instance that it was the patient who made the visits, and not the surgeon; and perhaps Mr. O'Shea calls this system of communication an attendance.

I trust, Sir, that you will do me the justice to give insertion to this letter in your valuable periodical, in order to let the profession know that my evidence in Mr. O'Shea's case was perfectly disinterested, and according to my own conscience; and that when I appear as a witness by favour or compulsion, I trust that I shall always give my testimony unbiassed, and without reference to country, or favour, to creed.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,
Wells-street, St. James's, Wm. SMITH, M.D.,
Aug. 15th, 1848. Surgeon and Apothecary.

* * For obvious reasons we publish only a portion of this letter.—Ed. L.

MR. O'SHEA'S WAR AGAINST QUACKERY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

MR. EDITOR,—As often as unprofessional conduct presents itself in the ranks of medicine, so often do I think it my duty to scout it; and having given Mr. Beck, poor-law medical officer, the benefit of the character written in his own window, it is but just to hold up, according to his deserts, Mr. Sewell, Apothecary, one of our guardians of the poor.

Permit me to introduce to your notice a copy of a "bill," framed, glazed, and printed on a green ground, and conspicuously set forth in the window of the said Mr. Sewell's shop, 59, Lower Marsh, where it is also evident that some competition exists in the Persian sherbet trade, &c.

Copy of Bill.—"The Cordial Balsam of Syriacum; the Concentrated Deterative Essence; the Purifying Specific Pills; the Silent Friend, of Messrs. Perry, &c., &c."

Mr. Sewell is a licentiate apothecary since 1827. He does not appear to be a member of the College of Surgeons, but he is an older bird than Mr. Beck.

(Mr. O'Shea proceeds here to give details of a case of instrumental labour, which ought to have been attended on the parish account, and he ends his letter as follows:—)

I addressed a letter on this monstrous case to the guardians, showing how cruel it was, both to private practitioners and the poor themselves, not to have such cases provided for; but they never had the courtesy to acknowledge my communication: however, that I did not expect. . . . I only tried to secure relief for the poor. I am tired of the subject, and suppose you are tired of me, Mr. Editor; I shall therefore take my leave, having separated the goats from the sheep.

Yours, much indebted,
M. K. O'SHEA.

Mount-street, Lambeth, Aug. 15th, 1848.

ON A CASE OF SUCCESSFUL TREATMENT OF HYDROPHOBIA BY CHLOROFORM—AND THE LAPSE OF TIME BETWEEN INOCULATION AND MANIFESTATION OF THE DISEASE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Mr. Ackerley having published a case of hydrophobia in THE LANCET, (ante, p. 122,) would you kindly permit me to ask him one or two questions concerning the case, the answers to which may, I think, be useful to the profession? We must all thank Mr. Ackerley or any other gentleman who throws even the smallest modicum of light on the treatment of such an awful disease as hydrophobia; and I am sure Mr. Ackerley will excuse my remarks when he considers that, if he is sure of his facts, he has communicated perhaps the first well-authenticated case of hydrophobia successfully treated. I would first ask Mr. Ackerley if he is quite clear about the time during which the virus appears to have been latent? He says, "between ten and eleven years;" if this be so, it renders his case still more interesting. Dr. Copland, in his "Dictionary of Practical Medicine," gives the average time for the maturation of the virus as from six to twelve months;

the late Mr. Youatt, who perhaps saw more of rabies than any one else, gives it as from three weeks to six months; Hunter thought that all credible cases must have occurred before the eighteenth month after inoculation; Dr. Urban gives one case where the stage of incubation was four years; Dr. Bardsley, one where it was twelve years! And as these cases are particularized on account of their rarity, so when, as in Mr. Ackerley's case, this stage lasts for ten or eleven years, it is desirable that the most minute details should be placed on record, in order to establish it as a good authentic case for reference. To use Dr. Copland's words—"In these [such cases as the above] the question is, whether the disease has been actually inoculated at a period so far back, or has there occurred a re-inoculation at some intervening period? The solution of the doubt as to the possible duration of this period is one of importance as respects the fears of a person who has sustained this most distressing injury."

It would be interesting to know the history of the cat, whether it died rabid, whether it bit any one else, and with what result. Also, whether the patient could have been ever bitten, or any sore place ever licked, by any animal since the bite of the cat. I must apologize to Mr. Ackerley for troubling him with these questions, but he will see that satisfactory answers to them will make his case perfect *ab initio*.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Birmingham, August, 1848.

E.

SUGGESTIONS RESPECTING A CASE OF RUPIA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—With respect to the case of rupia given by your correspondent S. P. Y., in your last number, a fuller and more complete history, moral and physical, is requisite, before a decided opinion can be formed respecting it. From the brief sketch, however, made, I consider it to be a case of secondary syphilis complicated with scrofula; and the indications of treatment I should conceive to be the following,—to improve the tone of the system, and to establish the menstrual secretion. For this purpose I would recommend the iodide of iron in a dose of five grains three times a-day, with a pint of either the decoction of dulcamara or of the decoct. sarzæ comp. daily.

Should the iodide of iron, as sometimes happens, disagree, I would try the following mixture:—Citrate of iron, a drachm; iodide of potassium, eighteen grains; tincture of cantharides, two drachms; compound tincture of cardamoms, two drachms. Mix. A sixth part to be taken an hour before breakfast and dinner daily.

The following pills to be taken at bedtime twice a-week:—Chloride of mercury, three grains; pill of aloes and myrrh, four grains; extract of colchicum, two grains; powdered capsicum, one grain. Mix.

The iodide lotion No. 2, as recommended by Lugol, would, I conceive, be the best external application to the scrofulous ulcers.

If the primæ viæ be disordered, as is, I apprehend, the case, I would recommend a powder consisting of powdered calumba, a scruple; and of rhubarb and sesquicarbonate of soda, of each twelve grains, to be taken every evening.

Half a drachm of the compound spirit of ammonia, in half a pint of warm milk, may be injected into the vagina twice a-week.

I would recommend a warm bath, with bran infused in it, every other night; and the diet, without being stimulating, should be nutritious.

If not counteracted by moral causes, or something very unfavourable in the external circumstances of the patient, such as a malarious residence, her case, I conceive, would yield to a perseverance in the above plan of treatment.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, your most obedient servant,

Sloane-street, Aug. 21, 1848.

J. KINNIER, M.D.

DEMAND FOR A NATIONAL PHARMACOPŒIA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In looking over the Minutes of Evidence before the (late) Committee on Medical Registration, I was struck with the reply of Dr. Seymour to question 1446, in which he states that the last Pharmacopœia was published "six or seven years ago," and, by implication, that the French Codex appeared at a still more recent period.

It is well known that the last London Pharmacopœia was issued in 1836, and the Paris Codex in 1837. I chiefly refer to this inaccuracy as indicating the slight importance attached