

It contains the histories of some cases of Laryngeal disease, among them one (marked Case III) which required the operation of Laryngo-Tracheotomy. The patient had a suspicious tumor in the Larynx, which resisted the action of all topical applications, and threatened to asphyxiate him. Dr. B. took a lively interest in the case, and held some informal consultations with Dr. A., in which its nature and treatment appear to have been discussed. Dr. A. remarks in his modest report of the case,—“My friend, Dr. B., who had seen, at my request, the patient at a former consultation, consented to divide with me the responsibility, and to aid me with his experience and skill in performing the operation,” &c., &c. It would seem that Dr. B. took offence at this ordinary mention of his part in the proceedings, for he wrote a pamphlet in which he claimed for himself the whole credit of the operation, and accused Dr. A. of dishonesty in suppressing this fact. Dr. A. answers, in a pamphlet now before me, that it was not his intention to make it appear he had taken the chief part in the operation; that it was distinctly understood between him and his patient's friends on the one hand, and between him and Dr. B., on the other, that the latter should “do the cutting,” “so as to give me” (Dr. A.) “free scope for observing the course, position, extent and nature of the tumor, and to direct such a course as the progress of the operation might demand.”

Appended to Dr. A.'s pamphlet is a report of a case of poisoning by eating partridges. The case created some stir at the time, and was reported in the *N. Y. Sunday News* for March 1st, 1868. The account opens much in the style of the popular novel of twenty years ago, with, “The other evening, while the distinguished surgeon, Dr. B. was taking his dinner at his residence,” &c., &c., “a violent ring was heard at his door bell,” &c. His presence was immediately required at the Fifth Ave. hotel. Two gentlemen had been poisoned in some mysterious way. He went and divined the cause of the dangerous symptoms to be prussic acid. Having a genius for any emergency, he arrived at this conclusion by a rapid process of induction, taking its start from one of the curiosities in the natural history of the partridge. “He knew,” says the writer in the *News*, “that the winter had been unusually severe, and that where these birds abound, large quantities of snow had covered the ground and deprived them of their natural food, and unless they approach farms and feed from the stacks of grain, they resort to the laurel tree, and eat from it the laurel berries, which contain large quantities of

prussic acid.” This report pictures Dr. B. rushing melo-dramatically out of the hotel into the drug store, hurriedly procuring the proper antidote, returning breathless to the sick room, and, by its timely administration, snatching the two gentlemen from the jaws of death. Behold! says the *News*, what a wonder has been wrought “by the science of this not only distinguished physician and surgeon, but master of *Materia Medica*.” A communication appeared in the *N. Y. Citizen*, for March 14th, 1868, over the signature of Dr. B., in which he indulged the vulgar taste for sensations by a detailed description of the case. . . .

Now the strange part of this veracious history is, that Dr. A. states he had a similar summons on the same day, to the same gentlemen, at the same hotel; that it was he who diagnosed poisoning by prussic acid, treated them, and restored them to health; that it was his knowledge of natural history which shed light on the possible origin of the poison from the laurel-berry, and, more astonishing than all, that Dr. B. did not see them till after the trouble was all over. So say the patients themselves and the witnesses that stood by. . . .

There is just now a pilgrimage of Cesculapians to Washington. First in time and order, is the convention of teachers from the various medical schools of the Union, now assembled there to discuss the vexed question of preliminary qualification for students. The following proposition, being that of the Cincinnati convention, of 1867, was first taken up. It proposes that every student applying for matriculation in a medical college, shall give satisfactory proof that he possesses a knowledge of the common branches of an English education, and of the elements of the natural sciences, together with a sufficient knowledge of Latin and Greek to “understand the technical terms of the profession.”

On Prof. Moore, of St. Louis, moving to admit all after “common education,” a discussion arose, some affirming it to be “wrong” to exclude students from schools of medicine because they are not classical scholars, seeing that “in many instances our best physicians are without classical education.” Others with Prof. Hammond, advocating the cause of the classical languages, on the ground that no one can be a scientific physician without a knowledge of them. Finally, the war of words was brought to a close by the adoption of the following preamble and resolutions, proposed by Prof. Logan:

As this Convention has failed to secure the assent of a majority of the regular medical colleges of the United States to the system of improvement in medical education recommended at the last session, and as it is the opinion of the Convention that the