

Now, sir, under similar circumstances, I should not hesitate to act precisely as I then acted. As regards the subsequent *post mortem* examination, far be it from me to speak in any way disparagingly of a professional brother; but I do think that the gentlemen connected with it ought to have been so far mindful of professional etiquette as to send me an invitation to be present. As regards my name not appearing in the *Directory*, I know that I furnished the person with it who came round this part soliciting orders for copies of the same; but, as I did not order one, I presume that is the reason why I am omitted. The statement, that I used "great force", and that the woman exclaimed, "You are cutting me to pieces," are altogether incorrect.

Again, Mr. Hancox was not sent for, to my knowledge, after I entered the room; and the case was finished before 4 P.M.

I am, etc., JOHN SMITH, M.R.C.S.Eng.

Coseley, March 15th, 1858.

[While we have much pleasure in inserting Mr. Smith's explanation of the events to which he refers, we have, as he will perceive, omitted from his letter some portions which were totally unnecessary, and might even act to his prejudice. On referring to our article of March 6th, we find that we only stated the facts as reported to us: of course, Mr. Smith's denial puts the matter in a different light. We have again searched for his name in the *Medical Directory* without success; but in the last published list of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, he appears among the members of that body. The letter of Dr. Nelson, which we subjoin, will help to remove any doubt as to the qualification of Mr. Smith. EDITOR.]

A QUESTION OF PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION.

LETTER FROM DAVID NELSON, M.D.

SIR,—I am requested by Mr. Smith, in my capacity of member of the British Medical Association, to testify to you that he is a qualified surgeon, residing about ten miles hence. Not only have I frequently met him in consultation, but I have seen his diploma framed and hung up on the wall of his study, as is the common custom of surgeons in the country, in order that it may be seen by all neighbours, professional or otherwise.

Besides these facts, I may add, that he was born, bred, and passed through his medical studies, in these parts, having sat to hear my own lectures at the Queen's College in 1851-52, and also acted as one of my clinical clerks while physician to the Queen's Hospital.

Taking all these facts into account, I must say that I think the conduct of your local correspondent, who must or ought to know such things, is highly blameable, and deserving of your censure. I have not the remotest idea as to who he may be, and only write now in bare justice to an old and esteemed college pupil.

I am, etc., DAVID NELSON.

Birmingham, March 16th, 1858.

A FICTITIOUS DIPLOMA.

LETTER FROM GEORGE E. DAY, M.D.

SIR—I have been requested by the University of St. Andrew's to beg that the following discreditable proceedings of a person falsely claiming to be a graduate of ours, may be made public through your pages.

Our Secretary recently received the following letter from one of the most eminent shipping houses connected with emigration to Australia:—

"SIR,—A Mr. O'Grady, now residing at New Market, in Fergus, Ireland, represents that he got a diploma as M.D. from your university in 1843. He has applied to us to go in the capacity of surgeon in one of the packets of this line to Australia; but, on presenting his diploma to the government medical officer, it was discovered that, in the body of the document, an erasure had been made, and the name 'Thos. O'Grady' inserted, it is believed, by the gentleman who says he is the person to whom the diploma was originally issued. Till this point is cleared, Mr. O'Grady cannot pass the government officer; and we shall feel greatly obliged if you will say whether, in the month of March or May 1843, a person of the name got a diploma, either as M.D. or surgeon, from the University of St. Andrew's.

"We think it only fair to Mr. O'Grady to say, that he explained the erasure by saying the name, as originally written in the diploma, was obliterated by accident, and therefore he put it in so that the document might be perfect.

"We are, sir, yours obediently," etc., etc.

253

On the receipt of this letter, our Secretary examined the minutes of the University, and found that no person named Thos. O'Grady had graduated at St. Andrew's since the year 1800. A person of the name of O'Grady presented himself for examination in the year 1844, but was rejected. It would appear, therefore, that Mr. Thos. O'Grady must have obtained a diploma belonging to some other person, who graduated in the year 1843, and, having erased the name, caused his own to be substituted in its place. It is gratifying to find that the zeal and energy of the government medical officer have at all events in this instance succeeded in leading to the exposure of a gross attempt at fraud.

I am, etc.,

GEORGE E. DAY.

St. Andrew's, March 23rd, 1858.

PAIN AS A SYMPTOM OF ULCERATION OF THE NECK OF THE BLADDER.

LETTER FROM T. EYTON JONES, ESQ.

SIR,—In the account of a case of lithotripsy and subsequent death, related, in the last number of your *JOURNAL*, as having occurred in the practice of Mr. Stanley, mention is made of the autopsy having disclosed enlargement of the middle lobe of the prostate gland, and ulceration of the mucous membrane, overlying the enlargement; yet I find no allusion made in the appended remarks either to the presence or absence of pain.

Now, as severe excruciating pain is one of the most prominent symptoms in ulceration of the neck of the bladder, I am surprised that some comment was not made on the fact either of the pain as a prominent diagnostic symptom (if present), or of the non-existence of the pain—a peculiarity so strange (if absent).

I am, etc., T. EYTON JONES.

Wrexham, North Wales, March 16th, 1858.

Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—Thursday, March 18th, 1858.

MEDICAL REFORM.—SALE OF POISONS.

LORD TALBOT DE MALAHIDE, in rising to put a question upon Medical Reform to Her Majesty's Government, observed that it was one of vast social importance, and in which not only large classes of professional men, but the public itself, were concerned. In his own opinion, acting from the information he had received, the medical profession were better prepared for legislation at the present moment than they had been for many years past; and there were several important questions of Medical Reform which ought to be taken up by the Government, especially those which had reference to giving greater security for testing the capacity of members of the different branches of the profession, and putting all those who possessed the necessary attainments in an equally favourable position, while they removed all artificial difficulties in the way of the most talented and experienced men obtaining the highest possible status to which they could attain in the profession. It was also desirable to provide as far as possible against the evil arising from incompetent men, such as quacks and impostors, carrying on their practices under the shelter of the profession. No doubt there would be great difficulty in legislating upon this subject; but he thought some attempt should at least be made to obtain these objects, though the medical profession itself were not quite agreed as to what should be done. He would take the liberty of asking what were the intentions of the Government upon the subject. Their lordships were aware that two Bills were introduced last Session, but neither of them under the direct sanction of the Government; and he thought that unless the Bills, notice of the introduction of which had been given this Session, had the support of Government, there was little chance of their passing.

With reference to the Sale of Poisons, their lordships were aware that a Committee inquired into that question last Session, at which many witnesses were examined; and although there was some division of opinion upon the subject, he thought that evidence enough had been given to enable them to bring in a Bill upon it.

The Earl of DERBY fully admitted the importance of the question to which the noble lord had directed his attention. He reminded him, however, that there always existed a class of cases in which everybody concurred that it was necessary