

1. When did the signs of phthisis first appear;—before or during the period of pregnancy?

2. Was hæmoptysis a symptom?

3. In how many months after the first appearance of the symptoms, and at what period after delivery, did death occur?

4. Has abortion (and at what period) occurred during the progress of phthisis; and has the patient died in any case before the full period of pregnancy?

5. Has labour been difficult in any case during the progress of phthisis; and was the child vigorous and full-sized?

6. Was the secretion of milk in due quantity; and when did it diminish or cease?

7. What was the effect of suckling—1st, upon the mother; 2nd, upon the child?

8. In *post-mortem* examinations were tubercles observed in the lungs of the child?

9. Where the auscultatory signs have been traced, what has been their progress during pregnancy?

10. Has any case occurred in which *unequivocal signs of phthisis existed at the period of conception*, and in which the symptoms have been *decidedly kept in check during the entire period of pregnancy*, manifesting themselves immediately after parturition, and going on uninterruptedly to a fatal termination?

Any other particulars not mentioned in these questions will be gladly received.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

T. HERBERT BARKER, M.D.

Bedford, February 17, 1852.

## THE NEW MEDICAL BILL.

To the Editor of the *Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal*.

SIR,—In answer to your repeated requests for individual expressions of opinion respecting the "New Medical Reform Bill," I give you mine, individually unimportant enough, but worthy of publication, if they express, as I believe they do, the feelings of a very large body of medical men. I am sorry to see divisions and discussions on minor matters, or assertions that the new Act "will lower the profession."

What is the present standard of professional character, that such fears are entertained of its being lowered? Are there not names on the list of the College of Surgeons who advertise, who homœopathise, who will fawn and lie to gain a patient, or blacken the character of a professional brother. Are there not men whose ignorance is notorious, who have spent their years in idleness and drunkenness, yet who, after a careful grind, struggle through College and Hall; and are not the town and country crowded with a large and increasing class of irregular practitioners, who, having failed to pass their examinations, or even having only acquired a smattering of medical knowledge, from spending a few years behind a druggist's counter, deal with the lives of their fellow-creatures as ignorant unprincipled adventurers may be supposed to do. We want, Sir, a law that will separate us from all these,

and ally us to a class of our profession who are an honour to England, and whose skill and honourable bearing, whose benevolence to the poor in their private practice, and whose expenditure of time and trouble in public charities, is unequalled by any other body of men in England, or, I believe, the world.

An Act of Parliament that provides for the expulsion from our body of men who have forfeited their character, that by frequent registration shows who *do* belong to us, and that provides an easy way of punishing those who practise without a qualification, and, lastly, that gives an examination not more difficult but more practical, must raise the profession; and we ought, in the spirit of its proposers, to consider whether, by the alteration of any parts, it can be made more effectually to answer objects all have in view. Allow me to urge for these reasons a sacrifice of pet schemes and theories, and an unanimous approval of the chief features of the "New Medical Bill."

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

ALEX. H. PATERSON.

Altrincham, February 18, 1852.

To the Editors of the *Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal*.

GENTLEMEN,—I am desirous of offering my warmest thanks to the framers of the Medical Bill, for the zeal and judgment displayed by them, and in addition to the gratitude of the profession, which is eminently due to them for the service they have rendered, I trust they may be further rewarded by the measure quickly passing into a law.

I would submit the desirability of increasing the admission fee to practise to above £10. None of our medical corporations are wealthy in a pecuniary view, although the fee in some of them is higher than this, and I doubt very much whether all the good objects contemplated in the bill could be effected without a larger fund than could thus be raised.

I strongly approve of the annual renewal of the certificate and of the appropriation and amount of the fee by which the certificate is to be obtained.

The strictest possible penal measures should be adopted to prevent those from practising who have not obtained the licence to practise. It is not a proper argument against this that the Apothecaries' Company have failed in this object. Their law proceedings have hitherto been expensive, unwieldy, and of doubtful success, while the fine has been much too large. Moreover, the Company have brought disfavour on such efforts by generally selecting for their victims those who, although not possessing their licence, have in many cases received a regular professional education, while they have permitted the uneducated quacks and druggists to realize fortunes unmolested. The fine should be under £5, and the delinquent should be summoned before a magistrate by any informer, and summarily convicted. If this could not be carried out, the least that may be done is to fine any unlicensed person who *visits and prescribes* for a patient, while no debt contracted in such manner should be recoverable at law.