

constitutions; but at many stations there is no reason why an European should not enjoy *tolerable* health, at least for a time. He cannot, however, from the heat and its attendant annoyances, enjoy the comfort he would in a temperate climate. Much, however, will depend on the kind of duty the assistant-surgeon has to perform. If marched about a very great deal, if sent on active service, and exposed to the sun, night air, and miasm, if sent into the navy, and obliged to serve in one of the small brigs or schooners, he will most probably find his health suffer. Much depends on himself, his habits, diet, temperance, and care in not unduly exposing himself to the midday sun or miasmatic night air. In India, there is no climatisation. As a rule, persons seem to enjoy the best health during the first few years of residence, and gradually the constitution seems to deteriorate and break down.

I have now endeavoured to give a faithful account of the Indian service, as it affects the majority of those who enter it. I trust those now hesitating regarding their course in life may thus be enabled to arrive at a right conclusion. Let no one, however, enter the service with the idea of returning if they do not like it. Many do so enter, but few realise the idea. Home associations and opportunities are lost; their capital is invested in the East; and possibly they have insensibly adopted habits consequent on a roving life, which will not aid them in forming a practice.

The following is not overdrawn regarding a medical man's vocation in any part of the world, and certainly is applicable to life in India:—"When it is considered how much a surgeon must necessarily be exposed to the inclemencies of climate; how many comforts he is compelled to renounce; how many dangers, both by night and day, he must encounter; how many hardships he must endure; how soon his constitution is liable to be impaired by the fatigue and sudden changes which are inseparably connected with his employment,—it must be confessed that many situations are superior to that which he fills."

I am, etc.,

AN INDIAN OFFICER.

London, March 1859.

#### INDIA MEDICAL SERVICE.

SIR,—In relation to the condition of the medical service of the Indian Army, letters have appeared lately in journals both medical and non-medical, all betraying a spirit of discontent. Will you permit me, through the medium of your columns, to express my opinion that, unfortunately, there is but too good ground for complaint?

Many years ago, a young medical officer joining the Indian Army was believed to be entering a lucrative service, with easy work to perform, and with the certainty of a good retiring allowance after the expiry of a short number of years. These advantages will not be found to belong to the service of the present day. With regard to pay, excepting in the case of a few very fortunate individuals, it is barely sufficient to cover the expenses of living in the most moderate manner. The work, considering the long distances to travel between the different stations, and the bad climate of India, is, I fancy, more laborious than that in most occupations in this country. The retiring allowances from Government are very small indeed: those obtained from the funds are all paid for; and, considering the high rate of mortality in India, are paid for, excepting in the case of Madras, at most exorbitant rates. In addition, promotion is very slow; and the number of those honorary rewards so highly prized in military services is very small indeed. Medical appointments in the English service are at present, in my humble opinion, far, very far, preferable to those in the Indian Army.

I am, etc.,

INDIAN.

London, March 1859.

#### CASE OF MEDICAL ETIQUETTE.

SIR,—Will you excuse the liberty I take in asking your opinion, and that of my fellow-associates, upon the following circumstance?

A and B are two surgeons residing in the same village. A is called at night to an accident. He dresses the wounds of the injured man, and sends him home in a carriage, promising to attend at his request on the following morning. The person injured is in the employ of a family to whom B is the medical attendant. B, hearing of the accident, drives to the residence of the family unsolicited, and awaits the arrival of the casualty. He removes the dressings A has applied, knowing that he has

applied them, and takes charge of the case, calling upon A as he returns home, to say that he has done so, and that he considers the case his.

Should B have acted in this manner without first consulting with A? Has he acted in an unprofessional and ungentlemanly way?—or does the fact of his being the usual attendant on the family shield him from blame?

I have only to add that, as I am not personally interested in this matter, I enclose my card.

I am, etc., MEDICUS.

March 22nd, 1859.

[It seems to us that the nature of B's connection with the family rendered it his duty to ascertain, on hearing of the accident, whether his professional services would be required; and that he acted quite correctly in repairing to the residence of the patient. But, beyond this, the report of his conduct, as given to us, wears an aspect of *hauteur* towards A, which we cannot commend. Unless A had been a man utterly unworthy of confidence, we scarcely see what necessity there was for removing at so early a period the dressings which he had applied. B's course should have been, to leave A's work alone, unless for urgent reasons; to call on A, thank him for his assistance, and explain to him his (B's) position as the medical attendant of the family. A would then, of course, have relinquished the case into the hands of B. EDITOR.]

#### POOR-LAW MEDICAL REFORM.

LETTER FROM R. GRIFFIN, Esq.;

SIR,—May I ask the favour of being allowed, through the medium of the JOURNAL, to correct a mistake in the pamphlet (No. 3) recently issued, on the *Grievances of the Poor-law Medical Officers*?

On looking over the pamphlet, I find there is an error throughout the column No. 41, page 17; Nos. 34, 35, 36, and 40, having been added together, instead of Nos. 36 and 40 only. Any gentleman desirous of having a printed slip to paste over the incorrect number, has only to forward a postage stamp and his direction, and he shall have one. In all other respects, I believe the tables to be correct.

I am, etc.,

RICHARD GRIFFIN.

12, Royal Terrace, Weymouth, March 17th, 1859.

#### CORONERS' INQUESTS AND MEDICAL FEES.

LETTER FROM J. NESS, Esq.

SIR,—In the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of March 12th are two letters respecting coroners' inquests. Being one of the few coroners who are of the medical profession, I think it right to answer the inquiries therein contained, as far as I am able.

In Mr. George Terry's case, I am decidedly of opinion that medical evidence ought to have been obtained. The practice of coroners generally, before the passing of the Registration Act, was to inquire only whether the deceased came to his death from violence, or "by the visitation of God" from natural causes. The Registration Act made it imperative to inquire into the particular cause of death. The twenty-fifth section provides "that, in every case in which an inquest shall be held on any dead body, the jury shall inquire of the particulars required to be registered concerning the death", one of which particulars is the immediate cause of it. To enable the jury to arrive at a correct conclusion, medical evidence is often absolutely necessary; and it is the usual practice of coroners, when a medical man has been called in to see the deceased, to summon him to the inquest. The remuneration of the medical practitioner for his attendance upon the deceased is altogether distinct from his fee for evidence, and certainly ought, if the deceased has any effects, to be paid by his representatives. Whether such payment can legally be enforced, I do not undertake to decide; but I should much regret to hear that any medical man had refused to attend in a case of emergency until he was quite sure of being paid for it.

In the case stated by Mr. H. Terry, I think an inquest ought to have been held. The statute, *De Officio Coronatoris*, 4th Edward I, Sec. 2, enacts that "the coroner shall make inquiry of them that be suddenly dead". The rule generally acted on is, to hold inquests in all cases where persons, in their usual state of health, die suddenly, without medical aid. The danger of departing from this rule is sufficiently shown by the numerous cases of poisoning in Essex and Norfolk, and the

systematic poisonings of Palmer, which were long undetected, no inquests having been held, in consequence of the magistrates of those counties having issued instructions to the constables not to give notice to the coroners, except when crime was suspected; and the coroners were informed that, if they held inquests in such cases, their fees would be disallowed. Perhaps the coroner had the fear of such disallowance before his eyes in Mr. H. Terry's case. The power assumed by the magistrates of disallowing the coroner's fees is exercised arbitrarily, and upon no settled principles; it operates injuriously on the public weal and the utility of the coroner's office; and leads to unseemly disputes, from the assumption that he has held inquests unnecessarily, for the sake of putting a fee into his pocket. A Government Commission is now sitting to take evidence respecting coroners' fees; and I have reason to believe they have come to the conclusion to recommend that the coroners be paid by salary. If this mode of payment be sanctioned by the legislature, and the cases in which inquests should be held are more particularly defined, it will be a great improvement upon the present system, and will necessarily raise the office of coroner to its proper dignity, and greatly increase its public utility.

I am, etc., J. NESS.

Helmsley, Yorkshire, March 15th, 1859.

## Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—Friday, March 18th, 1859.

### SALE OF POISONS BILL.

This Bill was committed *pro forma*, and ordered to be reprinted.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Friday, March 18th, 1859.

### POOR RELIEF (IRELAND).

Lord NAAS obtained leave to bring in a Bill to amend the laws in force for the relief of the destitute poor in Ireland, and to amend an Act of the 14th and 15th years of Her Majesty, providing for the better distribution, support, and management of medical charities in Ireland. His object was to prevent children under five years of age being relieved in workhouses.

## Medical News.

### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, DEATHS, AND APPOINTMENTS.

\* In these lists, an asterisk is prefixed to the names of Members of the Association.

#### BIRTHS.

- DILL. On March 19th, at Brighton, the wife of \*R. Dill, M.D., of a son.  
 HEFFERNAN. On March 9th, at Sandgate, the wife of Dr. Heffernan, Surgeon 1st Battalion 11th Regiment, of a daughter.  
 HUBBARD. On March 19th, at Market Bosworth, the wife of John W. Hubbard, Esq., Surgeon, of a son.  
 LLEWELLYN. On March 8th, at 9, Mount Place, London Hospital, the wife of Evan Llewellyn, Esq., Surgeon, of a son.  
 MEADOWS. On March 18th, at 9, Cavendish Place, Cavendish Square, the wife of A. Meadows, M.D., of a son, still-born.  
 REID. On March 17th, at Hazelwood, Banffshire, the wife of Daniel Reid, M.D., of a son.  
 WILLIAMSON. On March 22nd, at Rochester, the wife of George Williamson, M.D., Staff-Surgeon, Fort Pitt, of a son.

#### MARRIAGES.

- HEATHCOTE—THOMPSON. Heathcote, Alfred Spencer, Esq., 60th Royal Rifles, to Mary Harriet, third daughter of \*Charles M. Thompson, Esq., Surgeon, of Westerham, at Dehrah, North West Provinces, on February 5th.  
 SKINNER—HILTON. \*Skinner, Thomas, M.D., of Liverpool, to Hannah, eldest daughter of Henry Hilton, Esq., of Harpurhey, Manchester, at Harpurhey Church, on March 17th.

#### DEATHS.

- HINE, John, Esq., late of the Bombay Medical Establishment, at Budleigh Salterton, aged 82, on March 18th.  
 KNOX, Alexander, M.D., late Surgeon of the Military Prison, Aldershot, at 4, Derwent Villas, Hammersmith, on March 5.  
 MILTON, William Mayler, Esq., Assistant-Surgeon Royal Artillery, at 3, Wells Street, Gray's Inn Road, on March 10th.  
 MOORE. On March 21st, at 35, Montague Place, Russell Square, aged 31, Henrietta George, wife of Charles H. Moore, Esq., Surgeon.  
 RIACH. On March 13th, at Plymouth, Margaret, wife of J. P. Riach, Esq., K.L.S., late of the Bombay Medical Service.  
 SCOTT, William, Esq., Surgeon, of Thornely, Durham, from concussion of the brain in consequence of being thrown from his carriage, on March 13th.  
 SNAPE. On March 20th, at Middleton Road, Dalston, aged 31, Eliza, wife of William H. Snape, Esq., Surgeon.  
 TERRY. On March 19th, at Woodchurch, near Tenterden, Kent, Catherine, the wife of Edward Bachelor Terry, Esq., Surgeon.  
 WILKINS, H., Esq., Surgeon, of Bristol, aged 59, on March 16.

#### PASS LISTS.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS. MEMBERS admitted at the meeting of the Court of Examiners, on Friday, March 11th, 1859:—

- BRIDGER, John, Cottenham, Cambridgeshire  
 CLARK, George, Newcastle  
 COX, Henry, Gray's Inn Lane  
 CUTBERTSON, Wm. Harrison, Lower Dorset Street, Dublin  
 DUKE, Stephen, Chichester  
 FLETCHER, Joseph Lyon, Manchester  
 HAMILTON, John Butler, Lower Mount Street, Dublin  
 HEMPHILL, James Patton, Myroe, co. Derry, Ireland  
 HOOPER, Clarence, Wootton Bassett, Wiltshire  
 ILBERTON, Frederick, St. John's Street, Manchester  
 ROBERTS, Anthony Tucker, Old Cavendish Street  
 SAVILE, Robert, Nafferton, near Duffield, Yorkshire  
 STEWART, Charles John, Montague Place, Kentish Town

Monday, March 14th:—

- BRIGSTOCKE, Richard Wish, Milford, Pembrokeshire  
 CARTER, Robert, Dublin  
 COOKSON, John Fowler, Preston, Lancashire  
 GIBB, Robert Cummings, Newcastle-on-Tyne  
 LYEL, Benjamin Bell, White Horse Lane, Stepney  
 MAHONY, John, Sandymount, co. Tipperary  
 M'DERMOTT, James Lemesney, Kinsale, Cork  
 MORDUE, Robert Dixon, Newcastle-on-Tyne  
 NELL, George Michael, Negapalam, East Indies  
 O'HARA, Daniel Murray, Hannalistown, near Belfast  
 READ, Reginald Bligh, Jewin Street, City

Wednesday, March 16th:—

- GEOGHEGAN, George Edward, Rathmines, Dublin  
 MCKEEVER, John, Cape of Good Hope  
 OWEN, George, Machynlleth, Montgomeryshire  
 RINGER, Sydney, Norwich  
 ROBERTS, Francis, Nelson Street, Dublin  
 SCOTT, John Alexander, Baymount, Clontarf, Dublin  
 WILL, George Elmsley, Friendville, Aberdeen

At the same meeting of the Court:—

- PALMER, John Linton, of H.M.S. *James Watt*, passed his examination for Naval Surgeon. This gentleman had previously been admitted a member of the College: his diploma bearing date February 5th, 1847.  
 Friday, March 18th:—  
 BLOOMENTAL, Theodore, Newington Place, Kennington Park  
 CÉSAR, Richard Thompson, Cork  
 CARNELL, Clement John, Tunbridge  
 RIVINGTON, Walter, Upper Holloway  
 STARLING, Edward Augustus, Bishops Stortford, Herts  
 WINNING, Robert, Bedford  
 WINSLOW, Henry Forbes, Montague Place, Russell Square

Monday, March 21st:—

- ANGUS, John, Greek Street, Soho  
 BLAKELEY, Thomas, St. James's Place, Bermondsey  
 BLOWER, William, Bedford  
 BURROWS, William Adeock, Islington  
 DAVIES, David, Ashby Street, Northampton Square  
 EVE, Richard Wafford, High Street, Deptford  
 FENNELL, Edward Henry, High Street, Southampton  
 GELL, Alfred Scott, Felling, near Newcastle-on-Tyne