

beg to tell him that he was no right whatever to the title. A medical man, as I take it, is one who has the right of attending upon all cases of sickness, no matter of what nature, whilst M.R.C.S. is clearly defined by law as one to attend upon surgical cases, and none other, therefore cannot have anything to do with the term *medical*.

Could not the matter be set at rest in something like the following manner (if nothing but legal proceedings will settle it)? Let all surgeons be prosecuted who attend medical cases, and all apothecaries who attend surgical cases. We should soon see who has the greatest cause for complaint.

In conclusion, would it not be far better if those members of our profession who are so fond of law, would join the London or some other Registration Association, and assist in putting down really unqualified persons who live as parasites upon us, instead of going into courts of law to prosecute regularly qualified medical men—it may be from jealousy.

I am, etc., SURGEON AND APOTHECARY.

October 18th, 1859.

THE QUALIFICATIONS OF A GENERAL PRACTITIONER.

SIR,—Being an ignoramus regarding the qualifications which it is necessary to be possessed of to be styled a “general practitioner” since the passing of the Medical Act, will you, or any of your correspondents, have the kindness to inform me whether I am right or wrong in adopting the subscribed conjecture? The possession of any one medical and any one surgical qualification entitles the holder of both of them, to be denominated a general practitioner, that is, legally qualified to practise both medicine and surgery in any part of Her Majesty's dominions. For instance, an M.R.C.S. and a L.R.C.P. Edinburgh, is quite as legal as M. or L.R.C.S. and L.A.C.; or, an M.D. and M.R.C.S. is legally qualified to practise both medicine and surgery. So that, in point of law, or public appointment, any medical diploma or degree obtained from any legally constituted bodies in England, Ireland, or Scotland, will answer the same purpose as the L.A.C., so that it may no longer be considered indispensable to be L.A.C., provided always that a medical qualification exists instead.

I am, etc., CHIRURGICUS.

October 1859.

[Our correspondent is correct. EDITOR.]

THE EMPLOYMENT OF MERCURY IN TRAUMATIC INFLAMMATION OF THE EYE.

LETTER FROM I. HARRISON, ESQ.

SIR,—In the *Lancet* for May 15th, 1858, Mr. Alfred Poland states: “It would hardly be credited, that, in the year 1858, mercury was administered for penetrating wounds of the eye, yet he was sorry to say such was the case.”

In the *BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL* for October 22nd, 1859, the reporter of a case in University College Hospital says: “To watch a case of traumatic iritis treated by mercury, is a sufficient cure for any one afflicted with the prevailing scepticism of the day, as to the powers of that drug in arresting inflammation.”

Will any one reconcile these diverse opinions, and tell us which practice is the right one?

I am, etc., I. HARRISON.

Reading, October 24th, 1859.

INDIA MEDICAL SERVICES.

SIR,—The India Medical Services appear doomed to wait in vain for any real improvement being made in their condition, in order to place them on an equality with their brethren in the English army.

In England, it has been almost universally acknowledged that the late Warrant is insufficient to remedy the evils it was intended to reform; and it has now been, I believe, returned from India by the Government there, as not really liberal enough. Still there is not a whisper of anything more being probably done for a much injured class of men. In spite of the remonstrances of the three services, in spite of the number of candidates for appointments falling short of the number required, and in spite of the return of the Warrant from India, will the Government at home remain deaf to the voice of justice?

Hoping that you will grant us your powerful aid to procure for us reform when it is so much needed; namely, in the condition of our medical funds, in our slow promotion, and in the inequality of our retiring allowances compared with those of military officers; and trusting that you will excuse me for again troubling you on the subject of our service.

I am, etc., ASSISTANT-SURGEON INDIAN ARMY.

October 1859.

INQUIRY INTO CERTAIN CASES OF DEATH.

LETTER FROM F. J. BROWN, M.D.

SIR,—As a preventive measure that would guard against the evil effects of speculation on human life, I propose that the medical officer of health for the district should make inquiry into the cause of death of every individual dying in his district, that might be insured in a burial-club or in an assurance office. Machinery would be necessary to carry out such a measure. It should be made imperative upon the executor or person eligible to draw the money, to report the death to the medical officer within twenty-four hours. Respecting payment for the inquisition, this ought to be made out of the county rate. The nature of the inquisition should be left to the medical officer. He should visit the dead body in every instance, and see the medical attendant; and in suspicious cases he should make a *post mortem* examination and an analysis. Where there is no medical officer now, one should be appointed; thus the whole country would be mapped out into sanitary districts, and provided with a staff of medico-legal officers.

I am, etc.,

FRED. J. BROWN.

Chatham, October 20th, 1859.

UNREGISTERED POOR-LAW SURGEONS.

LETTER FROM RICHARD GRIFFIN, ESQ.

SIR,—If you think the following correspondence will interest your readers, it is at your service for publication. I regret to perceive that the Poor-law Board make no promise of refusing to confirm the appointments of non-registered medical men. Would not a *quo warranto* lie against them? If so, it would be far better to obtain one, than to prosecute the individuals who have been elected. I wish the London Medical Registration Association would turn their attention to the subject of illegal Poor-law medical appointments.

I am, etc., RICHARD GRIFFIN.

12, Royal Terrace, Weymouth, Oct. 15, 1859.

I. Mr. Griffin to the Poor-law Board.

Weymouth, Sept. 27th, 1859.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,—Fearing the Medical Act may have escaped your recollection, I take the liberty to draw your attention to one of its provisions, which enacts “that, after the first day of July, 1859, no person shall hold any appointment as physician, surgeon, or other medical officer, in any union workhouse or poorhouse, or parish union, unless he be registered under this Act.” The reason for my now pointing out to you this section is, that during the last four months, certain gentlemen, whose names are hereunto attached, have been elected union medical officers, though they were not at the time registered, nor have they registered up to the 24th of this month. The importance of this Act to the community at large is so great, that I feel sure, if you have inadvertently confirmed these appointments, you will insist on these gentlemen immediately registering, or, in default, resigning; and that, in future, you will not confirm any medical man to his office, if, at the time of his election, he is not registered.

I have the honour to be, etc.,

RICHARD GRIFFIN.

The Poor-law Board.

Names of gentlemen not registered.

Name of Union.

O. Ward	Easthamstead
George Corneley	Headley.
Albert Carter	Gloucester.
H. Shirley	Guildford.
Richard Smith	Barnstable.

II. The Assistant-Secretary of the Poor-law Board to Mr. Griffin.

Poor-law Board, Whitehall, S.W., Oct. 15th, 1859.

SIR,—I am directed by the Poor-law Board to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo, in which you draw