

ute anatomy of the kidney was warmly discussed by Dr. Southey and Dr. Johnson.

In addition to these three most prominent societies there are numerous others, such as the Obstetrical, Medical, Microscopical, Epidermiological, Harveian, and Hunterian societies, which do good work in their respective fields. The London medical men are hard workers, and by recording their cases, do much toward advancing medical knowledge. There seems to be plenty of material always ready for the meetings of these innumerable societies, and, indeed, not infrequently papers announced have to be postponed, on account of being crowded out by the discussion of previous papers, which have excited unexpected interest and debate. The President of the Clinical Society informed me that they had on the list far more papers than could possibly be read during the present season; and, from the subjects and authors of these articles, I know the material was of no mean character. Trusting that this short sketch of the London societies may interest your readers, I remain, (Dr. ROBERTS, in *Med. & Surg. Reporter*.)

TOLERANCE OF OPIUM BY AN INFANT.—Dr. J. L. Little reports (*American Jour. Obstet.*, April, 1878) a case where paregoric in small doses was administered to a child three weeks old for the relief of suffering caused by an inflammation of the knee-joint. The child gradually bore larger and larger doses; the paregoric was changed to tincture of opium, and this again to Magendie's solution. Soon the child obtained such a tolerance of this drug that, in a couple of months, from half a drachm to a drachm a day was necessary to quiet it. This state of things continued until the amount consumed by the child, then less than eight months old, was two ounces of Magendie's solution in twenty-four hours. The dose was gradually diminished at the rate of about three drops per day, and, at the time of making the report, but ten drops were given at bedtime. The child's appearance improved very much; it was intelligent, and weighed eighteen pounds.

THE SECRET RECEPTION OF FOUNDLINGS.—Dr. Marjolin has just communicated a paper to the Academy of Moral and Political Science, having in view the demonstration, from philanthropic considerations and arguments, medical observation, and statistical deductions, that the *tours* or reception-boxes for foundlings should be re-established. These *tours* existed during the ancient *régime*, and an Imperial decree regulated them in 1811. Infants were then received and brought up by the State without any inquiry being made concerning their parents; and their number by 1833 had risen from 68,000 to 134,000 per annum, causing an expense of 10,000,000 fr. Public opinion then became aroused against them; and by a change in the law the *conseils-généraux* were authorised to

refuse or diminish the payments for this purpose, while for the *tours* it was attempted to substitute relief given to mothers at home on condition that they suckled their infants, or these last being received into the hospitals after inquiry concerning the position of their mother. M. Marjolin adduces reasons and figures to show that since the abolition of the *tours* infanticide and abortion have been continually on the increase; while the imposition of the duty of suckling on abandoned women is evaded, or made the pretext for the commission of slow murders, which are most difficult of detection. The child saved from these dangers, and provided for by the public, will at twelve years hence cost but 2000 fr., or twice the price of a cavalry horse. It is an error to state that a large number of foundlings become inmates of prisons, for statistics show that natural children brought up at home are those to whom the accusation applies.—*Rev. Scientifique*, June 8. *Medical Times & Gazette*, June 15.

MR. AUGUSTUS SALA, the accomplished *litterateur*, bears warm testimony, in the *Illustrated London News*, to the liberality of the medical profession. He says:—“All the stingy people in London seem to have come to the front for the purpose of abusing the doctors because they do not always give dates and items in the accounts which they furnish to their patients, but make instead a certain charge for ‘medical attendance.’ I own myself that I am somewhat prejudiced in the matter. I have had in my day a great deal to do with doctors, and I have found them, as a rule, the noblest, the most humane, and the most charitable of mankind It strikes me very forcibly that, so far from being ‘fleeced’ by the general practitioner, we are often apt (unconsciously, of course) to fleece him by cruelly deferring the payment of his bill. Why should we make him wait six months or a year for his due? He has his rent and taxes and his butcher and baker to pay, as we have, and very frequently his carriage to keep. Is he to eat lint and stethoscopes, or sustain nature by the hypodermic injection of morphia or the external exhibition of collodion? We should pay our doctors promptly, and then we should know what they are charging us for.”

THE HEART'S WORK.—Dr. Guyol, of Paris, after careful calculation, estimates that during sixty years of life the heart pulsates 2,269,800,000; during a life of eighty years, 3,007,040,000; in one hundred years, there are 3,792,550,000 pulsations.—*The Doctor*.

NO STIMULANTS.—The other day a physician, to a patient enquiring, “What ought I to take, or to do when my feelings of exhaustion come on?” replied, “Go and lie down like any other beast.”—*The Doctor*.