

LICENTIATES BY THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF LOWER CANADA TO PRACTICE AS APOTHECARIES, CHEMISTS AND DRUGGISTS SINCE 1852.

Samuel Wright,.....	May 1852	Roderick McLeod,.....	May 1858
George W. Glass,.....	Oct. 1852	Henry Atkins,.....	Oct. 1858
John Johnston Beers,.....	May 1853	William C. Richardson,.....	May 1859
Thomas Pyne,.....	Oct. 1854	William Henry Eadon,.....	" 1859
John W. McLeod,.....	May 1855	Benjamin Gould,.....	Oct. 1859
Wolfred Brunel,.....	" 1855	Zéhpardin Fortin,.....	" 1859
John E. Burke,.....	Oct. 1855	James Pierre Peltier,.....	" 1859
Alexander G. Davidson,.....	" 1855	John G. Thomas.....	" 1859
Samuel Sturton,.....	May 1857	Edmond Giroux.....	" 1859
Hyacinthe Cuniffe,.....	Oct. 1857		

MEDICAL REMUNERATION.

A case of considerable importance to medical men in relation to the new Medical Act was heard last week at Guildhall. The action was brought by Mr. Merritt, a Surgeon of great respectability in the City of London, for the recovery of a bill for the attendance on the family of a stock-broker named Webb, a gentleman of good position and means. It appeared that originally Mr. Merritt had been in the habit of charging Mr. Webb a guinea for three visits; but on this gentleman removing nearer to Mr. Merritt's residence the fee was reduced to five shillings a visit. Mr. Webb, indeed, disputed that there was any understanding to that effect; the fact, however, was, that fee was charged. Another particular in the bill of charges deserves also especial notice. Mr. Webb's children had suffered from scarlatina, and Mr. Merritt had charged a distinct fee for attendance on each child. This claim was also objected to. It was argued on the part of the plaintiff, that each case required separate consideration and a distinct portion of time, and that the claim was therefore reasonable. Two medical gentlemen were called for the defence as regards the custom in these cases, but their evidence was by no means conclusive. The Judge brought under the notice of the Jury the recent changes in legislation, with especial reference to general practitioners practising as physicians and charging fees for attendance, the principal payment being for time and skill, and not medicines supplied. The fees, he observed, might vary from three shillings and sixpence to half-a-guinea. The Jury decided in favour of the plaintiff for the full amount. No case could be brought to test more rigorously the rights of general practitioners under the Medical Act. By allowing a fee to be charged for each child ill under the same roof, the principle of payment for time and skill is distinctly recognised—a decision of the utmost importance in its general bearings. The amount of fee—five shillings, chargeable to a respectable person, has been also, so far, confirmed. There were some charges for medicines, given on an emergency, or specially prepared; but these were rare, the account being one for attendance—a consideration to be borne in mind, as the Jury will probably be influenced in future cases in coming to a decision as to the equity of charges by estimating the value of the services given from the mode in which the charges are made.