

forward with reference to that point, in the first paragraph of his letter.

In the second place, Mr. Daniell misunderstands and misquotes me when he says, "I object to the manner in which he has fixed it upon their notice," and forthwith proceeds to defend himself from a supposed charge of intrusion, which I am neither so obtuse nor so self-sufficient as to make. The charge I did make was—that in propounding his plan at Sheffield, he had made accusations against the Profession, as to their criminal neglect of the cry of the widow and orphan, which were much more general than upon enquiry would prove to be correct; and certainly not, as to the act of bringing the matter under the consideration of the Association, which he was most decidedly at perfect liberty to do. I may therefore reply in the words of the citizen—

"None Brutus none,"

hoping he will feel constrained to extend his quotation and say—

"Then none have I offended."

To the third paragraph of my letter, which, however superficially it may do it, bears upon the main question between us, viz., whether under the circumstances one general or several local institutions are most likely to accomplish the object we have in view, Mr. Daniell objects in toto, and contents himself with quoting Dr. Percival's opinion. Now, with all proper respect and deference to authority, I must beg leave to think and judge for myself; and, in opposition to a hypothetical opinion, which might be correct if the field were occupied, which is not the case, I entertain one formed from the experience I have had of a local institution for the last twelve years, which has been conducted with "dignity, regularity, and efficiency," and has administered *permanent* relief to the necessities of the widow and orphan, on a higher scale than the General Fund at present proposes to do. It has, moreover, from its limited extent, proved a bond of union, which, without entailing waste of time or money, has promoted harmony and philanthropy amongst men, who cannot afford to leave their professional pursuits for more than a few hours at a time; besides which each member knows, or might do so, by taking part in the transactions of the business, that should he or any of his family be unfortunately compelled to apply for assistance, their *just and equitable* claim will meet with ready attention from his sympathizing colleagues. It will be necessary to obtain accurate information from distant points, and also to get in subscriptions regularly. Does Mr. Daniell expect to secure these without local agents? I trow not. He knows full well that the great bulk of the Profession, like mankind at large, are not *active* in charity, but require to have the subject frequently brought under their notice by some one possessing a kindred spirit to his own.

Mr. Daniell appears to forget that, practically, associated responsibility, and individual responsibility, are very different things; and I have yet to learn that raising a question as to whether a committee have exceeded their powers or not, involves the slightest suspicion of the character of any individual member of such committee. Against such an opinion I must beg leave to enter my protest, though quite content to leave the question itself to the members of the Association.

The "Fund" has, however, been established, and Mr. Daniell considers it "sui generis." I am sorry I cannot even assent to this, for the simple reason that I find one, that has existed upwards of fifty years, in the full career of its usefulness, affording daily proofs of the blessings which flow from it. I would, therefore, remodel his question, and ask is there a heart in Christendom that would not rejoice at the increase and extension of such establishments? I, for one, certainly hail with the warmest gratification such a prospect, and sincerely trust that in seeking to promote their increase, and to secure their efficiency to the best of my ability, I am not putting an *obstacle* in the way. The subject is one sufficiently interesting in itself, and ought to be discussed without any admixture of personality. I, therefore, hope nothing I have said can be so construed; my object is the same as Mr. Daniell's, viz., to promote the well-being and happiness of every well-conducted member of our profession, and those belonging to him. I trust I am free from prejudice, and when he demonstrates the superiority of general over local funds, he will find me a ready "convert."

Hoping that the general feeling now excited will soon become a "conviction," and produce substantial proof of its existence,

I am, Sir, your obliged  
and obedient servant,  
GEO. SOULBY.

#### COMPOUND TINCTURE OF BENZOIN IN BURNS AND SCALDS.

A correspondent is desirous of knowing if any one of our readers have ever used the Compound Tincture of Benzoin in superficial burns or scalds. He states that he himself seldom employs anything else, and says that its easy application (with a camel's hair-brush,) and good effect cannot fail to recommend it to general use.

#### ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

Gentlemen admitted members on Friday, December 19th, 1845:—S. F. Gosling; G. Skrimshire; W. H. Garrington; A. Foote; R. S. Jackson; R. Boley; S. Bentham; G. Thomas; A. Henry; W. B. C. Christy; R. Graham; W. B. Parker; D. Ruck.

Members admitted to the Fellowship December 11th:—E. Copeman, Cottishall, Norfolk; R. Druitt, Curzon Street; R. N. Evans, Hampstead Heath; J. N. Heale, Staines; W. P. Ormerod, Ely Place, Holborn.

#### ERRATA.

In Dr. Hull's Letter on "The Law and the Lunatics," page 737, col. 2, line 4 from the bottom, for "sectish" read "selfish."

In page 738, col. 1, line 9 from the bottom, for "study" of the lunatic soul, read "science" of, &c., &c.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications have been received from Dr. Durrant; Dr. R. H. Powell; H.

*General Medical Annuity Fund.*—A Correspondent asks—"What are the circumstances which would render a Member eligible to be put upon the Superannuated List of the General Medical Annuity Fund"? Will Mr. Daniell favour us with a reply to this question.