English towns. The fatal cases of whooping-cough, which had been 47, 36, and 37 in the preceding three weeks, rose last week to 53, of which 43 occurred in Glasgow, 4 in Edinburgh, and 2 in Greenock. The 34 deaths from measles had been 47, 36, and 37 in the preceding three weeks, rose to 53, of which 43 occurred in Dundee and 3 in Glasgow. Of the 8 deaths from diphtheria, corresponding with the number in the previous week, 5 occurred in Glasgow and 3 in Leith. The 8 fatal cases of scarlet fever showed a further increase upon the numbers in recent weeks, and included 6 in Glasgow. The deaths referred to the principal diseases of the respiratory organs, which had been 46 and 94 in the preceding two weeks, further rose last week to 107, and exceeded the number in the corresponding week of last year by 3. The causes of 61, or nearly 11 per cent., of the deaths registered in the eight towns during the week were not certified.

HEALTH OF DUBLIN.

The death-rate in Dublin, which had been 27'3 and 25'1 per 1000 in the preceding two weeks, further declined to 21'0 in the week ending May 25th. During the first eight weeks of the current year the death-rate in the city averaged 25'3 per 1000, the mean rate during the same period being 16'7 in London and 16'8 in Edinburgh. The 142 deaths in Dublin showed a further decline of 28 from the numbers in the previous two weeks, and included 3 which were referred to “fever,” 2 to whooping-cough, 1 to measles, and not one either to small-pox, scarlet fever, diphtheria, or diarrhoea. Thus the deaths from these principal zymotic diseases, which had been 9 and 13 in the preceding two weeks, declined last week to 6; they were equal to an annual rate of 0'9 per 1000, the rates from the same diseases being 1'8 in London and 1'4 in Edinburgh. The fatal cases of “fever,” of whooping-cough, and of measles showed a decline from the numbers in the previous week. The death-rate in Dublin averaged 23'9 per 1000 in the second and 33'1 per 1000 in the first quarter of the year, and 25'1 per 1000 in the preceding two weeks, and further declined from the numbers in recent weeks. Eight inquest cases and six deaths from violence were registered; and 53, or more than a third, of the deaths occurred in public institutions. The causes of 9, or more than 8 per cent., of the deaths in the city were not certified.

THE SERVICES.

ADMLRALT.-The following appointments have been made:—Fleet Surgeon Edward J. Sharood, to the President (dated May 29th, 1889).—2nd Volunteer Battalion, the South Staffordshire Regiment: John Kerr Butter, M.D., to be Acting Surgeon (dated May 29th, 1889).—1st (Pembroke) Volunteer Battalion, the Welsh Regiment: William Howel Lloyd, Gent., to be Acting Surgeon (dated May 29th, 1889).—1st Volunteer Battalion, the Durham Light Infantry: Surgeon J. Mitchell to be Surgeon-Major, ranking as Major (dated May 29th, 1889).—2nd Volunteer Battalion, the Hampshire Regiment: Surgeon A. K. Richards to be Surgeon-Major, ranking as Major (dated May 29th, 1889).—3rd Volunteer Battalion, the Hampshire Regiment: Surgeon A. K. Richards to be Surgeon-Major, ranking as Major (dated May 29th, 1889).—2nd Volunteer Battalion, the South Staffordshire Regiment: John Kerr Butter, M.D., to be Acting Surgeon (dated May 29th, 1889).—1st (Pembroke) Volunteer Battalion, the Welsh Regiment: William Howel Lloyd, Gent., to be Acting Surgeon (dated May 29th, 1889).—1st Volunteer Battalion, the Durham Light Infantry: Surgeon J. Mitchell to be Surgeon-Major, ranking as Major (dated May 29th, 1889).—2nd Volunteer Battalion, the Hampshire Regiment: Surgeon A. K. Richards to be Surgeon-Major, ranking as Major (dated May 29th, 1889).—2nd Volunteer Battalion, the South Staffordshire Regiment: John Kerr Butter, M.D., to be Acting Surgeon (dated May 29th, 1889).—1st (Pembroke) Volunteer Battalion, the Welsh Regiment: William Howel Lloyd, Gent., to be Acting Surgeon (dated May 29th, 1889).

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

REFORM OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND.

To the Editors of The Lancet.

SIRS,—As my correspondence with Mr. Stonham was addressed to him in his character as secretary to a small band of Fellows who had issued a belated circular relating to the first draft of a Bill to amend the constitution of the College of Surgeons, I assume that he is still their mouthpiece; otherwise, there is no material point in the letters which he has addressed to you that has not been sufficiently discussed already.

In the Lancet of March 23rd last, I gave an account of some phases of the constitutional history of the College, and proposed the following theses: (1) That, by the Charter of Edward IV. (1461), which first incorporated the Company of Barbers of London, from which the College has sprung, the Commonalty were empowered to elect yearly two Masters or Governors, and shared with the Masters the power of making assemblies of themselves, and of ordaining laws and ordinances; (2) that these powers and privileges, though confirmed by an Act of Parliament passed in the year 1540 (32 Hen. VIII, c. 42), were gradually usurped by a Court of Assistants, and proposed the present Council; (3) that this usurpation was from some cause allowed to receive the sanction of the Legislature in the year 1745; (4) that the present College is, presumably, the direct legal successor of the Old Corporation of Surgeons, inasmuch as the College administers the trusts, which were in the year 1745 vested in the Corporation of Surgeons by Act of Parliament (18 Geo. II, cap. 15); (5) that the Members of the present College were until the year 1843, when the order of Fellows was instituted, eligible to sit in the Council, to hold examinerships, and to occupy the office of Master or President; and (6) that this eligibility was taken away by the Charter of 7th Victoria, without the knowledge and consent of the commonalty.

My critics do not controvert one of these propositions, but give instead what purports to be a summary of the constitutional history of the College, but what is, in truth, a crude and inaccurate statement, obviously compiled from a selection of some phases of the constitutional history of the College. Instead of arriving at the conclusion that the present College is, presumably, the direct legal successor of the Old Corporation of Surgeons, they make the preposterous suggestion that the present Members of the College are, presumably, the direct legal successors of the Old Corporation of Surgeons, inasmuch as the present College administers the Old Corporation's trusts.

THOUGH I will not follow all their vagaries, some notice must be taken of the strange doctrine which promises to become the principal article of faith with the heterogeneous body of gentlemen who have constituted themselves the Fourth party in College politics. Taking advantage of past encroachments upon the corporate rights of Members, they make the preposterous suggestion that the present Members of the College are, presumably, the direct legal successors of the Old Corporation of Surgeons, inasmuch as the present College administers the Old Corporation's trusts, but correspond rather to Licentiates or Foreigners. Now the term “Foreigner” technically denotes “one not belonging to a guild,” and if we interpret this definition into the description of College given in the preamble of the Charter of 7th Victoria, it would appear that—"The Body Politic and Corporate of the said College at present consists of persons created Members of the said College (i.e., Licentiates, or Foreigners, or non-Members) by the first-mentioned Charter (1800) who are entitled to the privileges of Members of the Ancient Freemen, but correspond rather to Licentiates or Foreigners. The present College has therefore been established under the Common Seal of the College." So far as such a description is understandable by ordinary man, it is sheer nonsense. It is a significant indication of the states to which the opponents of the College have reduced the legal position of Members of the College. In order to arouse alarm at the prospect of an extension of the representative principle to a portion of the Members, they are again to cite a quotation of Macaulay's to the effect that large collections of human beings strongly tend to become a mob. Do they really imagine that any educated man will be taken in by this clumsy device? If Macaulay is to be
I wish, in conclusion, to do justice to the commendable exertions of the societies to which I have alluded, and to express the result of their appeal to the Fellows. They issued 929 circulars animadverting on a hypothetical Draft Bill, and requested the answer "Disapprove" or "Approve" to four statements. 898 reached official hands, and 91 were returned; and 898 reached their destination. The suggestion which appealed most directly to the jealousies and prejudices of the Fellows was that which alleged that by the supposed Bill the Fellows would be deprived of the right to be present at the ordinary Membership of the College, or at the admission to the examination when I accidentally learnt of the result. Upon this statement, and the fact of my own admission to the examination when I accidentally learnt of the result, the operation occurred the catastrophe which I look upon as the immediate cause of death. After this unhappy incident I was taken to the Northern Hospital after the assault, and I was summoned to see him the next day (Tuesday). I was told by the surgeon whom I saw in charge of him that he had a scalp wound and a fracture of the skull, but he was perfectly conscious, and begged to be taken home. This I refused. Again, on Wednesday, I saw him, and was again asked by him, as he wished to be brought out by a publisher who desired to use his business as a means of doing good. Indeed, this book and Dr. Duke's "Health at School" ought to ensure for their author the gratification of having his work, to which I believe they are entitled, and I should rest quite satisfied and content if this could in any way be effected.

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

W. R. GOWERS.