the most diligent search would frequently fail in procuring the medical writings of many of our best authors whose works have never been collected, but are scattered through the transactions of various societies. The great beauty of the proposed society is this—that, without trouble on the part of the subscriber beyond the simple payment of his guinea, four thick 8vo. volumes will be brought, as it were, to his very door, and he will thus have the satisfaction of seeing his shelves become annually richer and richer in the stores of medical literature. I was not aware that a proposition similar to my own had ever been made before; but I find from the remarks of Dr. Forbes, that “a prospectus, containing a proposal of the kind, was issued some years ago.” Perhaps its fate would have been different had the Parker and Camden Societies been established at the time.

I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

FERGUSON BRANSON, M.D.

Sheffield, August 22, 1842.

PROFESSIONAL ETIQUETTE.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—I am again obliged to trespass on your kindness, in reply to Mr. Elliot's letter of the 27th ultimo. That gentleman accuses me with being guilty of “wilful misstatements;” such a gross accusation I repel with contempt, and still assert that Mr. Elliot acted unprofessionally in enticing a patient from under my care. With respect to the evidence he brings forward, in an attempt to exonerate himself from blame, I altogether repudiate, and protest against it *in toto*, as being *ex parte*, and taken by incompetent persons—viz., Mr. Elliot's partisans. Pray, Gentlemen, would such evidence be admitted for one moment in a court of law, or by any set of individuals desirous of eliciting the truth? With respect to the patient's evidence, I cannot think he was fit to be interrogated, being, from the nature of the operation he had undergone, debilitated both in body and mind; and I shall prove he has visited on me what his ordinary acquaintances told him. * * * * *

Mr. Irving, the patient's father, on the 3rd instant, in the presence of more than one respectable person, gave me the following conclusive evidence:—

“I considered my son Mr. Reeves's patient till Mr. Elliot sent for, and told me that the stone might be taken away by dilating the canal, and, at any rate, that he could make a cure with less danger to life than the old method of cutting, and, where life was at stake, the safest plan should always be adopted. I never thought of consulting Mr. Elliot till he made the above promise to me; but I had talked about my son in a friendly way to the doctor of a club I belonged to, and asked whether he thought a cure could be made without cutting. By want of confidence in Mr. Reeves, I only meant as related to the question whether a cure could be made without cutting. I had been told by persons it might, by taking medicines. My son had an inclination to enter the infir-

mary, and Mr. Reeves frequently pressed me to decide about it, as he said the sooner I did so the better.”

It appears from the above that the boy had an unsettled inclination to enter the infirmary, and I pressed him to decide upon it, which argues a desire, on my part, to have retained the patient, free from the imputation of “kidnapping.” There are three physicians and three surgeons attached to the dispensary, ready to give gratuitous advice when required. But Mr. Elliot's uncalled for interference excluded any chance of the proper medical officers exercising their pleasing duty in the present instance.

I have authority to show that what is given, as said by me concerning Mr. Elliot, was the result of a conversation between the patient and Thomas Little, and that it was the latter, dwelling upon his opinion of Mr. Elliot's practice, told the lad he would be ruined if he went to him, as Mr. Elliot had signally failed in a late operation.

As to the statement made, that I told the boy Mr. Page would cut him at home—that two children had been cured of stone in the infirmary—that an operation on him would be attended with less danger than on children, and such like sentiments—I disclaim them, and avow that they are false. * * * * *

The accompanying letter, from Mr. Murison, surgeon to the dispensary, will show in what estimation Mr. Elliot's *ex parte* evidence is to be held.

I remain, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM REEVES, M.R.C.S.L.

Carlisle, September 5, 1842.

“Carlisle Dispensary, Sept. 5, 1842.

Dear Sir,—I have read your statement in the “Lancet” of August 13. I can corroborate it, inasmuch as I have repeatedly heard you tell the young man, Irving, that you would operate on him at home, but if he thought he would not be comfortable enough at home, that you would get him into the infirmary. I myself have frequently asked him if he had made up his mind as to whether you should perform the operation or not at his own house. The young man told me, in the presence of two other individuals, that Mr. Elliot told him he could cure him without cutting—that there were two stones in his bladder, and that he would surely die if he allowed himself to be operated on, and that Mr. Elliot read a statement to him, by which it appeared that seven out of eight operated on died.

I remain, Sir,

Yours very truly,

Taylor H. Murison.

To W. Reeves, Esq., surgeon, &c.”

* * We publish the letter of Mr. Reeves, having omitted one or two passages which are irrelevant to the subject; we decline inserting any further correspondence from either party.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. Churchill will shortly publish a System of Practical Surgery, illustrated with 220 wood-cuts, by Professor Fergusson, of King's College.