slightest pain in the wound, and there is little appearance of inflammation; the wound looks healthy, and discharges a small quantity of pus.

Twenty-four hours after the operation, a very slight pulsation could be observed at the wrist, which has continued without an increase of force; the temperature of the arm has not been altered, and she has had no numbness or loss of power in it. The remarkable relief which she experienced in her breathing and in the throbbing of the tumour immediately after the operation, has been permanent; neither have the uneasy feelings in her head returned. She has continued to lie in the horizontal posture ever since the operation with perfect ease, and her breathing appears perfectly natural. She has also enjoyed a very refreshing night’s sleep, of which she had been long deprived. The anxious character of her countenance has entirely subsided, and there only remains that appearance which belongs to a person who has undergone considerable depletion.

The operation has not been followed by any febrile excitement; and although the pulse continues rather more full and frequent than natural, the skin has remained cool and moist, the tongue clean, and the bowels perfectly regular.

Charles Street, St. James’s,
Thursday, July 12, 1827.

ELECTION AT ST. BARTHOLOMEW’S.

To the Editor of THE LANCAST.

SIR,—Your last Number contains a letter, headed “Exculpation of Mr. Abernethy,” from Mr. Skey, in a postscript to which, he says, “the substance of the above letter was sent to Mr. Salmon on the 21st of June, a few days after the appearance of his Circular.”

I certainly received from Mr. Skey the same “Exculpation of Mr. Abernethy,” as he (Mr. Skey) has now submitted to the Governors of St. Bartholomew’s Hospital and the profession, through the medium of your highly serviceable Publication; and I am announced with no better mode of placing the matter at issue between Mr. Abernethy and myself, in its true light, than by requesting you will publish the letter Mr. Skey has alluded to in his postscript, with my answer thereunto, copies of which are annexed.

Since Mr. Skey has voluntarily taken upon himself to be Mr. Abernethy’s champion, he will perhaps show wherein the difference consists, of Mr. Abernethy permitting him to publish his recommendation written two years since,* and his giving him a fresh one—the sense and effect are obviously the same; and here I may fairly add, that from the manner in which Mr. Skey used that two-year-old document, no other impression could arise, or was intended to be conveyed to the governors, than that it had been written at the present period.

Mr. Skey having stated the substance of his conversation with Mr. Abernethy, subsequent to my application to that gentleman, he will, perhaps, be so good as to narrate what took place between himself and Mr. Abernethy prior to my application; in other words, inform us when he obtained his permission to publish the certificate in question.

It is my wish to forego any comment upon the first part of the last paragraph of the letter Mr. Skey transmitted to you—that Mr. Abernethy’s recommendation has been of the most essential service to Mr. Skey, no person can doubt.

I am, Sir,
Your very obedient servant,
FREDERIC SALMON.
30, Bucklersbury, July 10, 1827.

Copy of Mr. Skey’s letter to Mr. Salmon, alluded to by Mr. Skey in the postscript to his letter, to the Editor of THE LANCAST, July 7, 1827:

Southampton Row, June 21, 1827.

MY DEAR SIR,—In reference to a Circular issued by you on June 14th among the Governors of St. Bartholomew’s Hospital, conveying an impression of insincerity towards you on the part of Mr. Abernethy, I beg leave to state to you, that Mr. Abernethy assured me, so late as June the 20th, that he did not consider an election probable, and even expressed disapprobation at my canvassing; and, 2dly, that his testimonial, published in my Circular, has been two years in my possession. Believe me, my dear Sir, yours, very truly,
FREDERIC C. SKEY.
To Frederic Salmon, Esq.

Copy of Mr. Salmon’s answer to Mr. Skey:
— 30, Bucklersbury, June 21, 1827.

MY DEAR SIR,—I hasten to reply to your letter of this morning: if my Circular to the Governors has conveyed any incorrect impression, it is not any fault of mine; I simply placed before them facts, from which every one is capable of drawing his own inference.

* Was this ever published before? if so, when?
† Vide Mr. Skey’s Circular to the Governors.
What Mr. Abernethy may have said to you on the 20th, (yesterday,) cannot alter the circumstances alluded to in my Circular of the 14th inst., respecting which, he (Mr. Abernethy) has the power, if he wishes, of obtaining any explanation from me.

You yesterday stated, when we accidentally met in Gilspur Street, that you had had Mr. Abernethy’s recommendation of you (which you published) in your possession two years; you also added, that you used it, not with sanction, “that you had asked him for a certificate some days before I wrote to him,” and that he answered, “what more would you have than that I have given you already.”

I cannot, therefore, see in what respect I have committed any error; be assured of this, if you will show me wherein it consists, I will do all in my power to correct it. I am, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

FREDERIC SALMON.

To Frederic Skey, Esq.

THE FACULTY OF PHYSIC.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Sir,—Though little disposed for controversy, I feel it a duty not to overlook the unprovoked attack which your correspondent Mr. Simpson has, in a letter which appears in your Journal, made on the “Faculty of Physic.” This effusion was obviously penned under excited feeling; that it was also written in total misconception of the subject which he volunteered thus to discuss, I trust I shall prove even to his own satisfaction.

Mr. Simpson’s charges against the yet unavowed associates, when stripped of declamatory matter, are resolvable into two,—namely, that the object of the association is purely selfish, the plea of public good being mere “cant,”—and that it is a direct attack on the general practitioners. As Mr. Simpson has not condescended to adduce a single ground for either imputation, resting both on his own mere assertion, I am consequently saved all trouble of refuting either facts or arguments. To grapple with such an opponent is therefore no easy matter; yet though reduced to the necessity of proving a negative in opposition to gratuitous assertion, I shall not shrink from an exposition, which I trust will satisfy the profession, that Mr. Simpson’s philippic has been hastily conceived and as hastily inserted. Unsupported as are his allegations, I might, perhaps, leave them to their fate, regardless of this telum imbelle; but heedless readers, some of whom I apprehend may be found among yours, too often mistake bold assertion for proof, and construe silence, even under groundless accusation, into admission of guilt. Regard for truth, for the interest of my profession, and for the colleagues with whom I am associated, as a member of this abused faculty of physic, forbids me acquiescing in either assumption. I proceed to consider the foregoing charges; and first, the alleged selfishness of the associates. For perspicuity, I shall at once consider this as culpable selfishness, by which partial interests are sought to be advanced to the injury of competitors, or of the public; for Mr. Simpson is too enlightened to contend that the pursuit of self-interest is in itself a crime. If we admit with the philosophic poet, that “true self-love and social are the same,” then is self-love, abstractedly considered, a public virtue. The good of the whole must consist of the good of its several parts, and he who in pursuing private ends ministers to the public good, is a public benefactor—such pursuit can only be culpable when the welfare of others is compromised; this therefore, must be the charge which Mr. Simpson brings against the associated physicians. I might reasonably ask, what conduct on the part of the associates has subjected them to this harsh accusation; but I wave the right of making such demand, and am content to prove, that however groundlessly alleged, it admits of ample refutation. What do the associates profess? Merely to coalesce for mutual protection and support. What do they seek? Not to restrain others, but to be unshackled themselves. By what means do they contemplate the attainment of their objects? The following declaration, taken from their printed circular, abundantly proves that they meditate no encroachment on the rights or interests of others, and it ought to have protected them from the groundless charge of hostility to the general practitioner. “It is essential to the objects in view, that there should be no limitation to the number of any of the branches of the medical profession, excepting what is imposed by the demand; that there should exist complete emulation and unrestrained competition among their members; that the public should have a free choice of their medical attendants,” &c. I seek in vain, Sir, in the foregoing extract, or in any other declaration of the associated physicians, for that spirit of selfishness with which they are charged; does this clear and open avowal of principle evince hostility against any branch of the profession? Does it contend for exclusive powers to the injury of others? Does it aim either directly or covertly at provisions for restraining the public in their choice of medical attendants,