healed, and the hips greatly easier, but so stiff from long-continued disease that they would scarcely admit of any motion whatever. The constitutional treatment was varied and adapted to the symptoms and constitution of the patient. He passed some months in the workhouse at Hexham, his health improving; but although he got about on crutches, the hips remained extremely stiff. The final result of the operation was successful."

With respect to the history of the substitution of excision for amputation at the ankle, the author remarks:—

"The Moreaus were the first surgeons who introduced the operation of removal of the bones of the ankle as a substitute for amputation. They removed the astragalus and ends of the tibia and fibula in two cases, and the patients did well. But none appear to have followed their example till a little more than two years ago. The great surgeons who have published their experiences within the last few years do not encourage the practice of excision of the ankle-bones. Thus we find that Mr. Liston never excised any of these bones, and his opinion of excisions generally is, that 'when the soft parts are much diseased, when the disease is not limited to the articulating surfaces, or when the patient is reduced to a low state by hectic,' they are not admissible. Again, it appears that though Mr. Fergusson has performed partial operations on the os calcis with success, yet he has never removed the entire bone. He relates a case, in which he scooped out the whole of its cancellated structure; 'the cavity healed slowly, and ultimately filled up.' Mr. Fergusson's opinion of excisions is, that 'such operations are, under any circumstances, extremely difficult, and in most instances more dangerous to the patient than amputation at the ankle or in the leg.'

"This being the state of opinion with regard to these operations, Mr. Thomas H. Wakley, in 1847, performed his operation of excision of the astragalus and os calcis, and with success. His case was published in *THE LANCET*; and soon after, in August, 1848, Mr. Greenhow performed excision of the os calcis, as he believed, for the first time. When, however, the report of his first cases appeared, Mr. Hancock made known his case, which had been operated on a short time before, but had turned out unsuccessfully. Mr. Page operated in October, 1848."

In the cases detailed above, the strength of the patients had been much reduced by the constant discharge of matter from the diseased structures, and from their being constitutionally scrofulous. In healthier subjects recovery would have been quicker, and the chances of success more certain.

The mode of operating, as described by Mr. Greenhow, was as follows:—

1. Incisions were made from the inner and outer ankles, meeting at the apex of the heel; and then,
2. Others extending along the sides of the foot, the flaps being dissected back, so as to expose the bone and its connexions. These being divided, the bone was removed, and the astragalus and cuneiform bones carefully examined. Where necessary, the saw was used, and then the flaps were brought together and secured by sutures, plaster, and a bandage. It was found better not to remove any integument, as was done in the first case."

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON AND ITS GRADUATES.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR,—As you have been so good as to pay attention from time to time to the interests of the University of London, and, in connexion with those interests, to the proceedings of what is called the graduates' committee—I beg to direct your notice to the announcement in the papers of a general meeting of the graduates, to be held in a few days; and as on a late similar occasion the meeting more resembled a bear-garden, with cat-calls in imitation of the Coal-hole and Jessop's, than an assemblage of gentlemen, I do earnestly hope, that all subjects likely to create disunion among the graduates will be avoided.

Though we do not withhold the meed of praise from the graduates' committee for being the first to open communications

with the senate, still this must be outbalanced by censure for their errors, arising partly from want of experience and partly from want of judgment, in attempting to dictate terms to a senate under whose guidance the University has made such vast strides as in a few years to have earned an European celebrity.

Well would it have been had the committee left convocation an open question for the present, and attended to more weighty matters; or had they been determined to push it, cost what it may, they might have remembered the memorable words of the chancellor, that the welfare of the university must depend upon the acquirements of the graduates. Had this been fully acted upon, they would have proved, prior to quarrelling, that convocation would be as beneficial as it is depicted. I have therefore taken the trouble of reading a Letter, by a member of the Oxford Convocation, published by Hatchards, from which it appears that a similar beau-ideal body has been mainly, if not entirely, the antagonistic power to every liberal measure at the university to which he belongs.

Should convocation be granted, one of two things must occur—either the members to take part in the proceedings will be too numerous for any useful and practical purpose; or should a small number be elected by the great body of the graduates, we shall not know whom to choose; and as in most cases it is the greatest talker and demagogue that succeeds, we shall doubtless be ridden over rough-shod by some divine or legal Caligula;—surely, then, it will be advisable to let the committee die a natural death, or, if needs be, prevent their doing harm by cutting off the supplies.

May I, in conclusion, allude to a few simple objects which should be kept steadily in view:—

1st. The erection of a building suitable to the present position of the university, for holding examinations, conferring degrees, and containing a good general library and museums. This, when once fairly started, would command the support of the different professions and the public, and would ere long be endowed with fellowships by the opulent and liberal citizens of London.

2nd. The admission of candidates to examination without the farce of certificates, save of moral worth.

If by so doing it is feared the various colleges and schools affiliated to the university should receive detriment, it might be remedied by giving an extra day's examination to the last description of students.

Surely, Sir, for a university to require its candidates to obtain information at only certain institutions, is as great a piece of absurdity as for a railway company to pass a by-law, that no one should be allowed to hold their scrip unless the money was obtained from some specific mine; neither can that university be called free and unfettered which, springing into existence in the nineteenth century, is compelled to rule the colleges committed to its charge by the leaden sceptre of protection.

3rdly and lastly. The university has now been founded fifteen years,—has it not yet produced men worthy of being nominated examiners?

Satisfied of the benefit which must result from the *LANCET* taking notice of the subjects brought under discussion, I must plead their importance as an apology for the length of this communication,

And remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

SENEX.

THE COLLEGE OF SURGEONS AND ITS FELLOWS.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR,—As you seem to regard the question of the College Charter as nearly settled, I think it is high time that the position of the junior members of the College under the proposed amendment should be taken into consideration.

You have always contended that a great injustice was done to the members when about six hundred were selected to be made Fellows, or, in other words, to be placed in a class higher than the rest. This every one must admit; but, Sir, how much greater is the injustice now proposed to be effected! What will be the position of the members who have been admitted since the date of the charter, when the whole of the profession is divided at that period and all those who were members before it are to be Fellows in rotation without examination, and those who have since become members are to remain in an inferior class?

If, Sir, it is a hard case to have one man in fifty placed above you, is it not much harder to have five out of every six? There are probably by this time between two and three thousand members of the College who have been admitted since the charter was granted. These men, Sir, passed their examinations with the distinct understanding, though not with any absolute guarantee on the part of the Council, that they were to be on an equality

with at least nineteen-twentieths of the members of the profession; now, Sir, the Council of the College are proposing and you are supporting the proposition which is to place them *alone* in a lower class.

It is but a mockery to say that surgeons in actual practice have sufficient leisure to prepare for such an examination as that for the Fellowship; surgeons in want of a practice may do so, but those who are really actively engaged have too much on their minds and hands to permit them to do so.

You may perhaps say that those who were not members when the charter was granted have no claim to consideration; but, Sir, you are aware that the passing the examination is not the commencement of the course of study, but it is a proof of having already been engaged at least five years in the pursuit of professional knowledge.

Had the Council of the College, when the charter was granted, made known their by-laws relating to it, and created the members *then, instead of now*, fellows, placing all who had commenced their studies on the same footing with those who had completed them,—that is, providing that all on attaining a certain standing as members (provided they could show that they had commenced their studies prior to the date of the charter, or rather the publication of the new regulations) should become fellows without examination, then, Sir, those who entered upon their studies at a later period would have known in what position they would be placed, and might have shaped their course accordingly, and no injustice would have been done to them.

And now, Sir, if the College authorities obtain a new charter, or what is equivalent to it, an amendment of the old one, they ought in common fairness to place all those who have now commenced their studies, or shall have done so prior to the date of it, on the same footing as the old or new members, otherwise a great injustice will be done, and much ill-feeling must still prevail against that body, whom we all would wish to see the head and home of the profession. This is the course which has always hitherto been adopted by the College, and it has always been found to work well, being founded on justice; but there can be no justice in making a distinction between the member who became one in 1843 and him who became one in 1844, or any subsequent year.

Apologizing for troubling you with these remarks,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Chichester, April, 1851.

H. MARCH GRUGGEN.

THE PERVERTS OF THE COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I agree with every sentence set forth in the article on Globulism in *THE LANCET* of the 26th inst., and I cannot but think, that if the Council of the College of Surgeons be desirous of devoting that noble institution to the ends of science, it cannot consistently allow any fellow or member a place in it, who forfeits the oath of allegiance he has taken to the College, by practising homœopathy; and for the sake of consistency, the council should take immediate measures to remove all such practitioners. I presume the names published are those of men who have altogether deserted legitimate practice, and pursue that of homœopathy only; but what would you do with the man who pursues at the same time legitimate practice, homœopathy, and hydropathy, or any other pathy by which he can get money, setting everything at defiance that savours in the most remote way of science; such are, in my opinion far worse than he who, up to a certain time, has practised in a legitimate way, and then shifts entirely to the side of quackery and humbug? The latter sails under one colour, but the other under any that may suit his purpose. Surely such a man, if *not* removed from the *membership*, ought not to have the fellowship conferred upon him, although he may have been a member for the period proposed. I do therefore hope that the council will take care to exclude all such from the fellowship, the acquirement of which should not depend, entirely, upon the number of years a man has been a member, but should form, as far as possible, an honorary distinction. It appears to me absurd to allow a man, because he has been a member a certain number of years, (but who has openly declared his inability to perform any operation in surgery, and who at the same time practises homœopathy;) to be a fellow,—in point of fact he has not the most remote claim; clear and satisfactory proof should be required by some means, that every member who may on account of years be eligible, is so in every other respect also. I may possibly be blamed for advancing such an opinion, but

although I have been a staunch advocate, with others, for the alteration, that the Council of the College of Surgeons now appears willing to concede to its members, I am at the same time most desirous of supporting the true dignity of the College. It affords me (as it must do all others, who have been most strenuously fighting for the changes recently proposed by the Council) pleasure to find that the differences which have so long existed are fast approaching to an amicable adjustment. I am perfectly convinced it will tend to elevate the standing of the College of Surgeons, as well as that of its members, at the same time be of great public service.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

Croydon, April 30, 1851.

GEORGE BOTTOMLEY.

SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF MEDICAL MEN IN LONDON AND ITS VICINITY.

THE annual dinner of this Society took place last Saturday, 26th April, at the Thatched House, St. James's-street—the president, Sir Charles Mansfield Clarke, Bart., in the chair.

In proposing "Prosperity to the Institution," the CHAIRMAN said he not need tell those who were members, that this Society is mainly supported by itself and by the profession—not by the public. Yet to this there are some exceptions. The widow of the eminent sculptor, Sir F. Chantrey, has sent 10*l.* 10*s.*; the Bishop of London, 10*l.*; the trustees of the Cholmondeley Charity have voted a third grant of 50*l.*; a gentleman from Lynn sends 33*l.* The Lord Chief Baron Pollock and William Dover, Esq., who were present, had each given 5*l.*

CHIEF BARON POLLOCK, in returning thanks for the visitors, said, that the medical and legal professions had one branch of study in common—namely, medical jurisprudence—involving important questions of succession, and even of life and death. The public, no doubt, were more indebted to the medical profession than they felt, or had the gratitude to acknowledge. To them was entrusted, and safely entrusted, the health of wife and children, and the honour of families. To them the veil of domestic privacy was lifted. And though for their services all are entitled to gratitude and reward, yet some ministered largely to persons wholly unable to give due remuneration; and it was deeply to be regretted, that where the public service of the poor is concerned, their recompense is cut down to the lowest possible scale which competition and the contract-system can dictate. This is disgraceful and discreditable to a great nation: it is also very bad economy. No man in this profession he believed was less selfish, more ready to devote himself to the service of others, than their excellent chairman, or afforded a better example of such disinterestedness being rewarded by esteem and competence.

Sir CHARLES CLARKE also returned thanks in an appropriate speech.

Dr. A. J. SUTHERLAND returned thanks for the corporate bodies of the profession. The Society of Apothecaries gave an annual donation of fifteen guineas to this Society. He hoped the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons would follow so good an example.

Mr. WARE, V.P., returned thanks for the vice-presidents, treasurers, and directors.

Dr. WM. MERRIMAN, acting-treasurer, mentioned the case of a lady, with a very large family, whose husband had been suddenly cut off by cholera, but who by his membership had happily left her entitled to a provision, small, indeed, but decent, for herself and her children. He read a list of donations, amounting to about 200*l.*; and announced a legacy of 1000*l.* from the late Mr. Thomas A. Hewson, who was for many years a member of the Society.

Mr. WALSH, the secretary, in reply to an allusion to his active discharge of onerous duties, and the small sum received by him as the "paid officer" of the Society, said, that in such a cause, not to work heartily, quite irrespectively of the amount of pay, was simply impossible. The Society's usefulness could not be overrated.

Mr. PROPERT was called to the chair after Sir Charles Clarke had left it, and returned thanks for a compliment paid to him by Dr. Conolly, for his great exertions in founding a new institution for aged members of the profession and their families. The support and encouragement he had received were exceedingly gratifying. He had just received a grant of land well situated for a building; and in all applications for residence, he should be disposed to give a preference to members of this Society.

The music, under Mr. Turner's direction, was much commended, and cordial thanks were offered to the stewards.