

nacter or profession, nor have paid much respect to our patients. Several soldiers who had sought an adjoining pit with an officer were slain."

The life of Larrey was frequently exposed to the most eminent hazards upon the field of battle. At Waterloo, he was taken prisoner, and was on the point of being shot, after having been robbed of his watch and purse, when he was recognised by a Prussian surgeon, and his life saved.

We wish, moreover, to remind the officers of the executive department of the army, that while there are many points of antagonism between their duties and those of the medical department, there are also some points of parallelism, and such as ought to suggest a sympathy and fraternity of feeling. If bravery is a quality of excellence in those who call themselves the "fighting men," when have medical men, either in or out of the army, shown themselves cowards? Napoleon always called his medical officers "my brave surgeons," and we believe that no class is less amenable to the charge of cowardice than medical men generally. They are trained in a Spartan school, under, if we may so term it, a law of ethics which allows no man to turn his back upon danger. Whatever may be the peril, they are expected to go wherever their services are needed. They make no great ado about it; nor are their names often mentioned in the official reports; and still less often are they breveted for soldierlike conduct; yet they go, wherever they are called, quietly about their business, alone or in small detachments, in rain and in snow, by night and by day, on the march and on the bivouac, through watchfulness, and fastings, and fatigue, into the midst of malaria, contagion, and battle.

We challenge any man to-day to point us to an educated physician who has fled at the approach of pestilence, or who has hesitated to enter the trenches, or to face the batteries, if required to do so, in the performance of his legitimate duties. Even when the strict letter of his instructions forbade his exposure, the medical officer has seldom been backward to accept any duty which the exigency seemed to impose upon him.

The conclusion of this interesting lecture is occupied in the consideration of the authority which should be vested in the Army Medical Corps. There can be no question that the Medical officers of an army should exercise a complete control over their own department. To what extent this is permitted now in the British army, we are not able to say, but during the Crimean War, if our memory serves us rightly, such was the subordination of the Medical department of our army, that although the necessary medicines were known to be in store and on land, and although our sick troops were perishing, the red tapeism which prevailed permitted them to remain where they were until Florence Nightingale broke through the routine and the door together. There can be no doubt that everything connected with the Medical department of the army should be vested in that department exclusively, and with it no interference whatever should be permitted. The author's remarks upon this subject are so apposite, and the systems of the French and English armies in this respect so well contrasted that we take the opportunity of quoting the following observations:

We conclude then, that to the medical officers ought to be intrusted the complete control of the medical department, because upon the preservation of the health of the troops depends in a great measure the success of every expedition; because no others than medical men are, by their education and habits, qualified to perform this duty; because no one else is competent to decide upon the proper location of a hospital, its construction, ventilation, or general arrangement; no one else can determine what is necessary for the sick, in the way of diet, clothing, medicines, etc.; no one else knows when rooms are overcrowded, and are in danger of becoming pestilential, or when patients can be removed with safety. In short, because officers of the executive de-