

he did not send for some other person, when he found he could not accomplish his duty. From what the father had said, when he came for witness, he suspected that the placenta had not come away and accordingly went to Barton in the parlour, and asked him the question. He answered he had not removed it, because he could not!

This being the whole of the evidence for the crown, The coroner, having cautioned Barton, who was in charge of the constables, asked him what he had to say in this matter.

Barton declined saying anything.

The coroner then summed up the evidence; and stated that, from the testimony of Mr. Graham, the surgeon, and the admission of Mr. Pigot, the death of the deceased had undoubtedly been occasioned in consequence of this young man having failed to bring away the "afterbirth." The question for the jury was, whether the neglect was of such a degree as to amount to a verdict of manslaughter against him. There had been many decisions where professional men had been made amenable to the law; but then that must be proved either criminal negligence or gross ignorance on his part. Certainly in the present case there had been a great degree of rashness and neglect of duty, for it was his duty to have remained with this young woman until the "afterbirth" came away. When he went home he told Mr. Pigot that all was well, and that the birth was an easy one. It was therefore for the jury to consider whether, having taken the duties upon him, Barton had exhibited a want of care or a want of proper skill, by either of which this female had died: if they thought so, then it would be their duty to find a verdict of manslaughter against him.

The jury consulted for some time, and returned as their verdict, "Manslaughter against Thomas Barton for gross neglect, and the jury also say that it is their opinion, that any medical man, by sending apprentices to attend to cases of labour, is guilty of great negligence, unless the apprentice is properly qualified to undertake such cases, and that it is the duty of all medical men, in any case where their apprentices have attended, to see the patient as soon as possible afterwards."

The coroner then made out his warrant, and Barton was fully committed for trial at Chester Assizes.—*Abridged from the Stockport Journal.*

#### A PRESCRIBING DRUGGIST IN DANGER.

An inquest was held on Saturday evening, before A. H. English, Esq., city coroner, on view of the body of Eliza Gay, a child about nine years of age, whose death occurred under circumstances which called for the investigation of a jury. The coroner explained to the jury that the cause of their being summoned was that the child had died after a long and lingering illness; and the question for their consideration would be, whether it had received proper medical attendance. It had come to his knowledge that the child had been prescribed for by a druggist of the town; and without wishing to question that gentleman's ability he would say that, for the public safety, it was necessary that none but duly legalised practitioners should interfere, even if death had been hastened by a day. It was supposed that the advice of Mr. Biggs had hastened instead of averting the death of the child; and it was therefore necessary for the protection of the public, as well as for the satisfaction of Mr. Biggs himself, that the present inquiry should be instituted.—Mrs. Gay, the mother of the child, was examined, and deposed that the child had been ill nearly two years, that Mr. Cox had attended her for the last week, but that previous to that period Mr. Biggs of Charles-street, had attended another child, which was since dead, and had also prescribed for the child on which the inquest was

now held. He sent some drops, which were to be taken ten drops three times a-day, and which were administered for the first two days. The child then seemed to get worse, and witness then gave her only five or six drops of the mixture per day. Before Mr. Biggs attended the child, she was under the care of Dr. Bowie. She took no advice from the time Mr. Biggs prescribed for the child, till, finding she was no better, Mr. Cox was called in. Mr. Cox inquired how long after the drops were given the gums became affected? to which the mother replied, that it was about a week. Witness did not consider there was anything the matter with the mouth of the child, till she observed her pull out five of her teeth on Saturday, the 25th ult., and one on Sunday the 26th. The child appeared to be in great pain all the time.—Mr. Cox, surgeon, was next examined; and deposed that he attended the child first on Sunday, the 26th, and found her suffering from an affection of the chest, with dropsy of the legs. The mouth, gums, and cheek, were in a state of mortification,—such as would be produced by taking mercury. I inquired of the mother if mercury had been given, she said she did not know; but informed me that Mr. Biggs had been attending the child, and also another which was then lying dead. I saw the child could not recover, and this I stated. From that circumstance, and from the general debility, I did not make a minute examination of the chest; not thinking it advisable, therefore, I cannot say whether there was sufficient disease of the chest to produce death. From the general symptoms, I should say that mortification of the mouth, cheek, and gums, was sufficient to produce death; but I cannot say whether it arose partly from that, and partly from a disease of the lungs. I prescribed such medicines as I thought necessary, and continued to attend the child till its death. I have examined the bottle containing the drops sent by Mr. Biggs, but cannot tell whether there was mercury in it or not. No proper prescriptions would cause the effect in a child's gums which has been produced in this instance.—Mr. Biggs, druggist, of Charles-street, being called by the coroner, said, he was not aware that he was not entitled to prescribe for the child, and that he would not shrink from answering any question which might be put to him. Mr. B. said he called himself an apothecary in this instance, as he practised before the act prohibiting unlicensed persons from practising was passed in 1815. He was 49 years of age next May, and was more than 21 years of age when he commenced practising in Bristol, on his own account. He attended the child, and prescribed for it on the 14th Dec.; but had not seen the child since, though he had promised to. Mr. Biggs's prescription-book being sent for, and the entry of the prescription proved, Mr. B. said the mixture was prepared accordingly. Mr. Cox explained that the compound did not contain any mercury, and that there was nothing in it at all likely to cause the appearances which were presented by the body, or to hasten the child's death.—The coroner having summed up, the jury returned a verdict of "Died by the visitation of God."—Mr. Cox, in answer to some observations which had fallen from Mr. Biggs, said, it was not only his opinion, but that of many others, that he (Mr. B.) was not a regularly-qualified practitioner; and that it was much to his interest that the inquest should be held.—*Bath and Cheltenham Gazette.*

#### ON RHEUMATIC DERMALGIA.

Ry J. H. S. BEAU, Physician to the Central Bureau of the Hospitals of Paris.

Neuralgia of the skin has hitherto been usually confounded with pains of the nervous trunks, muscles, &c. M. Piorry was the first who referred it to a separate head under the name of *dermalgia*. It frequently