fainting during delirium tremens. Chloroform has been used successfully in this town, and I am not aware that in the present case it is suspected that death ensued by the inhalation of chloroform. Looking at the whole circumstances of the case, I should say that the man had died under a combination of delirium tremens and the fumes of chloroform. I should not like to say that he had died from chloroform, for I have great doubts whether he would have lived if he had not inhaled the chloroform. He might have died if he had not had the chloroform administered. From the evidence he only appears to have been under its influence for ten minutes, whilst I have seen patients bear it for an hour, during a long and tedious operation. If I was asked to report the nature of the deceased's death, I should say delirium tremens.

By a Juror.—I should not have hesitated to employ chloroform; but I shall be more cautious after this case.

Mr. Teale said the deceased had been labouring under bronchitis for several days.

Mr. Smith.—Well, that will account for the redness of the mucous membrane, but not for the appearance of the lungs.

Mr. Price said that if he had not heard the evidence, but had formed his opinion merely from dissection, he should have said that by the application of some powerful means vital action had been suspended for a short time. The appearances existing were the same as are to be found in fatal cases resulting from chloroform given in too large a quantity. But he was very much inclined to the opinion of Mr. Smith as to the existence of a combination of causes. He could not solely attribute the appearances to delirium tremens. In the case of a person labouring under delirium tremens there is a tendency to syncope, and, therefore, too large a dose would prove fatal, whilst the same quantity of chloroform administered to a person in health would not have the same effect. Chloroform ought to be used with very great caution. He never had used chloroform, and should not, in delirium tremens, without consultation. He thought death was produced by delirium tremens and chloroform, but he should, in giving the cause of death to the registrar, say, "delirium tremens," for it was the primary disease, and all that could be said was that if chloroform had not been administered he might have lived a few hours longer. Under the excitement the deceased was in at the time, he was not surprised at his dying suddenly under the influence of chloroform. The administration of chloroform in these cases is a proposed—not an adopted practice.

By a Juror.—A teaspoonful of chloroform was an usual dose.

The jury felt desirous of having additional medical testimony, and other medical gentlemen being in the room at the time of the inquest, it was proposed that one should be called to give his opinion.

The coroner objected on the ground that it would be putting the borough to further expense; and he did not think additional medical evidence required.

Mr. Teale said that Mr. Samuel Hey had had a similar case under treatment, and had adopted the same remedies; and, as it would better satisfy the jury and himself were he to be called, he should have no objection to bear the expense.

Mr. Samuel Hey, surgeon, said he had been present during almost the whole of this examination; and after hearing the evidence of the practice adopted, said that he should have pursued a similar course. I have, he added, given chloroform in as extreme a case of delirium tremens as his, and with success. I used more than Mr. Teale—two spoonfuls at one time. In cases of convulsion, it is successful; and from the evidence, I should undoubtedly have administered chloroform. It is given to the patient as the last chance.

By a Juror.—The case mentioned he had under treatment many days, and opium and other things had been given as far as prudent. The patient was extremely violent, and had a kind of epileptic fit. After chloroform had been given, the patient slept for two hours; and upon waking he had a dose of brandy-and-water given, and fell asleep, and continued in that state for twenty-four hours, when he awoke perfectly recovered. Mr. Teale also saw this person. It was justifiable to use chloroform in this case, even supposing the patient had died under it, for he could not have lived a couple of hours longer had it not been used.

The Coroner said—the witnesses, other than medical men, were not capable of giving an opinion as to the real effects of chloroform. This inquiry did not impute blame to any gentleman; for Mr. Teale evidently administered the chloroform with the best intention. He had applied the usual remedies; they failed, and he, as a last resort, gave chloroform; and if he erred in judgment, they could not take cognisance of such mistake. The case rested on the post-mortem examination. Chloroform was something new in science, and, therefore, was not an adopted practice. He concluded by saying, that in his opinion no blame attached to Mr. Teale, and the only verdict which they could come to was, that the man had died of delirium tremens.

The verdict of the jury was that "Death had been caused by delirium tremens, and that no blame whatever attached to Mr. Teale, who appeared to have adopted the proper and necessary remedies."

The inquiry lasted three hours and a half.

**Medical Intelligence.**

**THE MIDLAND COUNTIES' RAILWAY AND MR. SANDS COX.**

The following observations by the Editor of the *Birmingham Journal* on the letter which is annexed to them, from Mr. Sands Cox to the Chairman of the Midland Railway Company, are inserted here on account of their truth and justice. It may naturally might be supposed that we, as professional brethren, be biassed in Mr. Cox's favour; but when we find the same sentiments expressed by the Editor of a general newspaper, they fall with double force and severity:

"It has often been a subject of remark, that associations of men commit acts of injustice which no individual member of the body would be guilty of. This arises
partly from the tendency of man to shift the responsibility from his own shoulders; partly from an idea that amidst the multiplicity of objects against which public indignation will be directed, he will escape censure; and partly from a popular delusion that the blame of the transaction, like the dividend of a railway company, is shared by all, and the amount that falls to each individual offender is so infinitesimally small that it is really not worth while to have any qualms of conscience about the matter. The Directors of the Midland Railway, all of whom are undoubtedly honourable men in their individual position and relations, seemed to have shared these delusions, when the subject of which the following letter treats was discussed and determined upon. The communication tells its own story:

'Temple Row, Birmingham
October 27, 1849.

Gentlemen,—So long an interval had elapsed without application having been made to me for the costs of the action by which I sought to recover from you my charges for operating upon and attending the poor man Higgins, that I had flattered myself you were at length convinced of the injustice of increasing the loss I have already sustained by rendering my professional services on the occasion before referred to at the instance of your Superintendent at Birmingham. I was, therefore, much surprised to receive, during the past week, a peremptory demand for these costs from your attorneys. I should have paid the demand long since, and have endeavoured to dismiss the matter from my mind, hardly as I must ever have thought myself dealt with, if I had not, in common with all my friends, entertained a strong conviction that you cannot be fully aware of the circumstances under which I am called upon to pay these costs.

The circumstances are briefly as follow:—I was called up in the middle of the night to attend Higgins, whose leg had been crushed in so shocking a manner by a railway carriage having passed over it, that the surgeons on the spot declined the responsibility of treating the case. I was sent to Whitacre by your Superintendent in a carriage attached to a luggage train for that special purpose. I amputated the poor man's leg above the knee, and made two subsequent journeys to Whitacre to superintend the after treatment, (on both occasions freed by a written order of your Superintendent,) and I was successful almost against hope in saving the poor man's life. Higgins afterwards brought an action against the Company to recover compensation for the injury he had sustained, which action was compromised in Court; and in discussing the terms of the compromise, it was understood between Higgins's counsel and the counsel and attorneys for the Company, that the Company were to pay for surgical attendance, provided the charge were reasonable; but this term of the arrangement was purposely omitted in the memorandum endorsed on the briefs, because the gentlemen who held Higgins's brief did not consider him liable for the surgical charges, and, therefore, thought that no indirect admission of any such liability ought to be introduced into the memorandum. I have seen letters from Higgins's counsel which fully bear out this part of my statement. The Company having afterwards declined to pay my charges, I brought an action to test the liability, and the Judge and Jury who tried the case expressed a strong opinion in my favour on the merits; but a case being reserved on a legal question, the dry point of law was given against me in the Court above. It was held that your agent had retained me without sufficient authority.

Now, Gentlemen, if on this state of facts it is your deliberate will that I should be put to further loss, I will pay the money at once on receiving a notification to that effect from your Secretary. But I submit to you that I attended Higgins on what I believed, and had every reason to believe, to be your summons, for how could I suppose that a gentleman who had the power to send me by a special carriage was wanting in authority to retain me?

That the Company have had the benefit of the surgical aid rendered to Higgins, as he must unquestionably have died but for that aid; and in that case his widow and children would have had a heavy claim against the Company beyond the sum paid to Higgins.

That in losing my charge for attendance on Higgins, and in paying my own costs, the hardship of my case is sufficiently great without further aggravation.

But I wish it clearly to be understood that I do not make an appeal ad misericordiam: my condition of life does not render it necessary that I should incur that degradation. I have forborne to pay your costs up to the present time, solely because I cannot bring myself to believe that you demand them with a full understanding of the injustice of the claim, and because every person with whom I have conversed on the subject has expressed a similar opinion. If you will only satisfy me by a line under the hand of your Secretary, that you are in full possession of the facts and merits of the case, and that with that knowledge you require me to sustain a further loss, I will bring the matter to a close by at once paying your demand.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM SANDS COX.

To the Chairman and Directors of the Midland Counties' Railway.'

"This letter was addressed to the Board of Directors who met at Derby last week, and it is said, though the assertion seems libellous, and therefore we decline to state it on our own responsibility, "peremptory instructions were given by the directors to enforce payment of the costs, without delay, and they have since been paid by Mr. Cox." Now, we will venture to say (assuming that this extraordinary statement is correct,) that not a member of the Board of Directors would have been guilty of the like deliberately scandalous injustice if the occurrences related in the letter had had reference to him individually. The facts of the case are honourable to Mr. Cox's humanity, to his professional skill, to his firmness in enforcing his claim in the teeth of a wealthy company; and if the pecuniary loss be somewhat great, it is more than equalled on the
other side by the odium that must attach to a proceeding at once so flagrantly unjust, and contemptibly mean—that is, supposing this depth of associated morality has been fathomed. If the transaction be as it is here represented, then is there added to the already black catalogue of railway sins, an item which is legally permissible, and morally disgraceful.''

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

At a meeting of the Council of Queen's College, held on Tuesday last, the Right Hon. Lord Lyttelton, Principal, in the chair, the following communication was received from the Royal College of Surgeons at Edinburgh:

"October 17th, 1849.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Royal College of Surgeons at Edinburgh, to inform you that they have this day resolved to grant the same privileges to the Queen's College at Birmingham, in relation to their Board, which have hitherto been enjoyed by the Universities of the United Kingdom; that is to say, the medical lectures in your College will be received as qualifying for examination before this College, provided they shall be conformable to the regulations of this College, as regards the duration of the courses, and all other particulars, and that certificates of regular attendance, in conformity with chap. 4, sect. 8, of the regulations of the College, shall be produced by those who apply for examination.

"Sir, your obedient servant,

"John Scott, Secretary.

"To the Dean of the Faculty, Queen's College, Birmingham."

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

Gentlemen admitted Members on Friday, November 9th, 1849.—George Fowler Bodington, South Colfield, Warwickshire; Walter Hook Bolton, Carrickmines, co. Dublin; William Bratt, Stratford-on-Avon; George Pext Dunn, Ledbury, Herefordshire; James Howell, St. Clere, Carmarthenshire; Ralph Holt Kaye, Ratcliff Bridge, Lancashire; Henry Nuttall, Syston, Leicestershire; John Robinson, Midhurst, Sussex; Thomas John Warburton, Beley, Staffordshire; Alexander Williams, Army.

Gentlemen admitted Members on Friday, November 16th, 1849.—Messrs. Thomas Petit Wright, Chatteris, Cambridgeshire; John Anderson, Old Kent Road; Herbert Taylor Reade, Quebec; Edward Egan, Dublin; Armstrong Todd, Dublin; Benjamin Webster, Morley Lodge, near Leeds; James Shepherd, Northallerton, Yorkshire; William John Tennant, Dublin; and Edward Golledge Pitt, Brunswick Place, City Road.

SOCIETY OF APOTHECARIES.

Gentlemen admitted Members on Thursday, November 8th, 1849.—Frederick John Dyer; David Henry Monckton, Brenchley, Kent; Thomas Bolland Powell, Knaresborough; Edward Rutley Ray, Milon, near Sittingbourne; Alfred Scotchburn, Driffield, Yorkshire; Robert Smith, Mumby-cum-Chapel, Lincolnshire.

Gentlemen admitted Members on Wednesday, November 14th, 1849.—Richard Allanson Gaskell, St. Helen's, Lancashire; George Alfred Sheppard, Worcester; David Purdie Maclean, Burton, Westmoreland; Lionel Smith Beale; Philip Henry King, Grantham, Lincolnshire; James Wannes Saunders, Aylsham, Norfolk; William Henry Welsh, Eccles, Lancashire.

OBITUARY.

November 13th, at Northampton, William Percival, Esq., Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, and a Member of the Council of this Association. Mr. Percival was for upwards of twenty-nine years one of the Surgeons to the Northampton General Infirmary; which appointment he resigned owing to declining health, a few weeks before his decease. He was deservedly held in high estimation, both by his professional brethren, and by the public. James Mash, Esq., also a Member of the Council of this Association, has succeeded to the appointment of Surgeon to the Northampton General Infirmary.

BOOKS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.


The Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science, November, 1849.

The Monthly Journal and Retrospect of the Medical Sciences, November, 1849.


London Journal of Medicine, November, 1849.

Cholera Gleanings; a Family Hand-Book, enabling readers of all classes to judge for themselves of the great error into which governments were unfortunately led, by men looked upon as infallible guides, who very strenuously maintained the Cholera to be a disease during which "The living shall fly from the sick they should cherish." By Dr. Gillkrest, Inspector-General of Army Hospitals, &c. &c. Gibraltar. 1848.


TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications have been received from Mr. Wills, Mr. John Burrows, Dr. Davies, Mr. Humphry, Mr. King, Mr. Pawiss, Mr. Giraud, Mr. Greenhow. We have received a letter from a "A member of the Provincial Association, and of the Bristol Microscopic Cholera Committee," but too late to refer it to the proper quarter in time for the present number of the Journal. [Ed. J., Worcester.] It is requested that all letters and communications be sent to J. H. Walsh, Esq., Forcett Street, Worcester. Parcels and books for review may be addressed to the care of Mr. Churchill, Princes Street, Soho.