

ASSOCIATION INTELLIGENCE.

NORTH OF ENGLAND BRANCH.

THE spring meeting of this Branch will be held in the Library of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Infirmary, on Thursday, April 27th.

Gentlemen who are desirous of reading papers, introducing patients, exhibiting pathological specimens, or making other communications, are requested to signify their intention to the Secretary at their earliest convenience.

G. H. PHILIPSON, M.D., *Honorary Secretary.*
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 14th, 1876.

BORDER COUNTIES BRANCH.

A MEETING of the above Branch will be held at Moffat, on Friday, May 5th, 1876.

Gentlemen intending to read papers are requested to give early notice thereof to one or other of the Secretaries.

STEWART LOCKIE, } *Honorary Secretaries.*
JOHN SMITH, }

SOUTH WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE BRANCH.

THE spring meeting of this Branch will be held at the New Inn, Pontypridd, on Thursday, May 18th, 1876. Further particulars in circulars.

Gentlemen desirous of reading papers, etc., are requested to signify their intention to one of the Secretaries by the end of April.

ANDREW DAVIES, } *Honorary Secretaries.*
ALFRED SHEEN, M.D., }
April 11th, 1876.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF 1876.

SIR,—Those who know the history of the opposition made by Brighton to the proposed meeting of the Association will be surprised at the letter of Dr. Lanchester in your last issue. I forbear to comment upon the tone and temper of that letter, and the animus which dictated the charges contained in it; but, as a "Brighton man" and a member of the Branch Council, I beg the opportunity of space in the JOURNAL to reply to those charges.

The attack made upon us by Dr. Lanchester is of a double kind: first, as to the general character of our opposition, and, secondly, as to the part taken by the Brighton members in the proceedings of the late meeting of the Branch Council.

With regard to the former, two different and opposing allegations are made as to the cause of our hostility; thus we are said to "have a grievance against the Committee of Council for not having invited local men to deliver any of the addresses"; and the public are asked to believe that that circumstance is the source of our dissatisfaction. Again, we are told that "from the first we have been bitterly opposed to the Association's coming at all, because Sir Cordy Burrows was the proposed President".

It is curious, to say the least of it, that Dr. Lanchester should not have perceived that these propositions have not only nothing to do with one another, but that the dates involved render them positively antagonistic, and that one or both of them must, therefore, be false; it is more curious still that he should have committed himself thus, knowing as he does that both assertions have been constantly denied and repudiated in the various debates of the Branch Council at which he has himself assisted; but it is perhaps most curious of all that he should have ignored so entirely facts which have to his own knowledge been as constantly put forward as our real and sufficient ground of action.

This strange reticence on the part of Dr. Lanchester makes it necessary for the information of the profession generally shortly to state once more the actual and true cause of our opposition to the proposed meeting. It is that we see very grave faults in the organisation, the management, and the policy of the Association itself; in the dictation of Dr. Lanchester, we have grievances of this capital order, and we refuse to condone them by an invitation which would be equivalent, in

the eyes alike of the profession and of the Association, to a striking act and demonstration of public approval.

In presence of reasons like these, the wanton discourtesy with which the local profession has been treated by the Committee of Council in reference to the addresses need not be discussed; a proper explanation, if there be any such, or, in the absence of it, an apology, would at once set the matter right, so far as it is a mere question of etiquette and the propriety observed by gentlemen, though our opposition to the meeting would not be in any way affected thereby.

So much as to the general question. We now come to the conduct of the Branch Council, and the part taken by "Brighton men" at its late meeting. Will it be believed, after Dr. Lanchester's charges of treachery, undue influence, and I know not what more, that the Brighton members had nothing whatever to do with the matter? Will it be credited that, when he penned his protest, Dr. Lanchester knew that the meeting was not called by us, but, on the contrary, that it was assembled against our strongly expressed wishes? That the resolution which has given him so much offence, and which he charges us with having "sprung" upon him, was proposed and seconded by gentlemen of great and deserved influence and consideration in the Branch, but neither of whom resides in or near Brighton? That eleven members voted for the resolution, while only four "Brighton men" were present? and that it would equally have been proposed and carried without any assistance from us at all?

Yet those are the simple facts, and the Branch may judge from them both of the quality of Dr. Lanchester's unwarrantable charges and of the propriety of his proposal to hold another meeting on the score of the unfairness of the "Brighton men" in the proceedings of the last.

I beg to remain, sir, faithfully yours,
R. BRANWELL.
Brighton, April 10th, 1876.

COLLEGES OF PHYSICIANS AND MEDICAL DEGREES.

SIR,—The accompanying letter from Mr. Hussey to Dr. Wyllie was forwarded to me.* I do not believe that any of our Colleges of Physicians are entitled to confer medical degrees. The question was decided in the case of the Irish College and University of Dublin a few years ago by the Master of the Rolls, who decided in the favour of the University, that the letters M.D. were a "trade-mark" belonging to the University, and the College was prohibited from using the University trade-mark.

It happened, by a curious coincidence, that the next case in the Rolls Court was an action, *Kinahan v. Bolton*, to restrain the defendant Bolton from branding his whiskey with the letters L. L. (Lord Lieutenant), which letters had become the trade-mark of the plaintiff by usage. The Master of the Rolls decided both cases on the common law relating to trade-marks, and compelled the defendants in both cases to pay costs.

As a Fellow of the Irish College of Physicians, I protest against the principle involved in this controversy, viz., that the title of physician is inferior to that of graduate, so far as professional merit is concerned. If the University graduate in medicine be also a graduate in arts, he may fairly take precedence of a physician; but if he be a graduate in medicine only, he is entitled to no precedence before a physician.

I am, etc.,
SAMUEL HAUGHTON, M.D.,
Fellow of the King and Queen's College of Physicians.
Trinity College, Dublin, April 7th, 1876.

NAPLES AND ROME.

SIR,—Permit me to call the attention of your readers and the public generally to the present dangerous condition of most of the hotels in Naples. Having been in Italy for the last two months, some facts of no small importance to the travelling public have been forced on my attention. Few English or Americans leave Italy without paying a visit to Naples. The attractions of that lovely spot, the desire to explore the exhumed remains of Pompeii, and to see the art collections and deeply interesting relics of old Roman life stored in the museum of Naples, to ascend Vesuvius and sail across the lovely bay to Capri, tempt thousands of our countrymen to gratify their taste for art and fine scenery at the cost of a danger little known or understood except to the initiated few. The plain truth is, that many of the hotels in Naples most frequented by Englishmen and Americans, are nests of typhoid fever of a most malignant type. The drainage is notoriously bad, and the water-supply, if that be possible, is worse.

* The greater part of the letter to which Dr. Houghton refers was published in the JOURNAL for April 1st, page 437.