demand an explanation, under penalty of refusing their testimonials for the future. We are utterly at a loss to conceive how, having exerted themselves in the case of the Taunton pastry-cook, who obtained his diploma by a twelve-months' curriculum, they can refuse to move in the case of OSBORNE, in whose schedule there are only nine months' attendance on lectures free from the grave suspicion of fraud. We have been informed, on credible authority, that the Council, aroused by the exposures which have been made during the past year, have lately consulted legal opinions as to their possessing the power to expel members who have conducted themselves unworthily, and in defiance of the oath taken upon entering the College. No doubt, powers of expulsion ought to exist, and ought to be exerted. Members who have acted in a manner unbecoming the dignity of their calling, or who have obtained their diploma by false pretences, ought to have their names expunged from the College lists. Up to the present time, the only expulsions of this kind have been, the three celebrated chirurgical knights, who were knighted by mistake, or something worse; and lastly, this chirurgical confectioner, J. D. BLAKE. Truly the number might be very much increased, to the great honour and comfort of the profession.

THE Council of the Institute, driven ignominiously, by an universal reprobation, from their advertised objections to the MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL, dated May 3, have issued another proclamation, bearing date May 27. In their advertisement, No. 1, they objected to the Bill,

"That it would give increased facilities for practising medicine to the chemists and druggists which the interests of the public require should be suppressed or controlled."

These "increased facilities" (!) were, the summary trial and punishment of all parties practising medicine without the possession of a certificate of their being on the Register as legally-qualified practitioners. We give this clause of the Bill (21) upon this subject entire, as the answer, one which must be convincing to every honest mind.

"And be it enacted, that any justice of the peace acting in and for the county, city, or place in which the offence has been committed, or any magistrate appointed by virtue of an Act passed in the second and third years of the reign of her Majesty Queen Victoria, intituled, 'An Act for regulating the Police Courts of the Metropolis,' or one of the justices of peace courts of Scotland, may hear and determine *any complaint charging any person with practising medicine without a certificate as aforesaid*, on the oath of one or more witnesses, or by the confession of the accused party, and shall award the penalty or punishment herein provided for such offence. And in every case of the adjudication of a pecuniary penalty under this Act, and of non-payment thereof, it shall be lawful for the said justice or magistrate to commit the offender to any gaol or house of correction within his jurisdiction, for a term not exceeding *one calendar month* when the sum does not exceed *forty shillings*, and for a term not exceeding *three calendar months* when the sum does not exceed *ten pounds*, the imprisonment to cease on payment of the sum due."

In the advertisement, No. 2, the Council of the Institute break new ground. They now object that—

"Fourthly,—The 27th Clause provides as follows:—

"That nothing in this Act contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to prejudice or in any way to affect the trade or business of a chemist and druggist in the buying, preparing, compounding, *dispensing*, and vending drugs, medicines, and medicinal compounds, wholesale and retail; but all persons using or exercising the said trade or business, or who shall or may hereafter use or exercise the same, shall and may use, exercise, and carry on the same trade or business *in such manner, and as fully and amply, to all intents and purposes, as the*

same trade or business was used, exercised, or carried on by chemists and druggists before the passing of this Act."

"Thus, should the 'Registration Bill' become law, every chemist and druggist would be exempt from the operation of this law, and from any penalty whatever, provided he can show that he carries on his business, not as the business of a chemist and druggist was 'carried on before the passing of the Act of 1815, but as it is conducted at the present day. The members of our profession can form their own opinion as respects the chemists and druggists, whether they do or do not practise both at the counter and by visiting patients at their own houses."

Now, we will merely remark of the clause here quoted, that it is an exact copy of the clause in the Act of 1815, relating to chemists and druggists. If the conduct of chemists and druggists is different at "the present day" from what they were "before the passing of the Act of 1815," what a censure is this upon the conduct of the Society of Apothecaries, of which the Council of the Institute is but the mouth-piece? Armed with their Act, the whole responsibility of the illegal difference between the chemist of this day and that "at the counter and by visiting patients at their own houses," lies at the door of this Society. We give the clause of the Apothecaries' Act of 1815, which relates to chemists and druggists.

"Provided always, and be it further enacted, that nothing in this Act contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to prejudice, or in any way to affect the trade or business of a chemist and druggist, in the buying, preparing, compounding, dispensing, and vending drugs, medicines, and medicinal compounds, wholesale and retail, but all persons using or exercising the said trade or business, or who shall hereafter use or exercise the same, shall and may use, exercise, and carry on the same trade or business *in such manner, and as fully and amply, to all intents and purposes, as the same trade or business was used, exercised, or carried on by chemists and druggists before the passing of this Act.*"—Clause 28.

Thus it will be seen that the Registration Bill, like the Act of 1815, provides only for the carrying on of the "trade and business" of the chemist and druggist, and not "counter and visiting practice;" that they are to be allowed to pursue, as heretofore, not any illegal practices, but "the trade or business of a chemist and druggist in the buying, preparing, compounding, dispensing, and vending drugs wholesale and retail." Yet, though these facts are patent to all, the Council of the Institute insult the common sense of the profession by asseverating, in one advertisement, that the Bill gives "increased facilities" to the practice of medicine by druggists, and in the second, that were the Bill passed, "every chemist and druggist would be exempt from the operation of the law." What will advertisement number 3 set forth? Surely

"The force of falsehood can no farther go."

MEDICAL REGISTRATION COMMITTEE.

EDWIN LANKESTER, M.D., F.R.S., CHAIRMAN.

THE Committee still continues its labours. During the past week they have received numerous communications from various parts of the country, cordially approving of their proceedings. Objections which had been published by corporate monopolists were brought before the last meeting: as these objections were evidently intended to mislead, and, if possible, prevent inquiry into the real merits of the Bill, the Committee determined on issuing the following advertisement:—

"The Committee beg once more to call the attention of the Medical Profession to Mr. Wakley's Registration Bill itself, and earnestly entreat that they will not be misled by garbled statements as to its details. It has been stated, by interested parties, that this Bill 'does not provide for uniformity of education;' but the Committee would call attention to Clause 23, in order to refute this charge. In the second place, it is asserted that this Bill will permit chemists and druggists to act as medical practitioners. The Committee deny this, and refer to Clause 14 of the Bill, which states, that if any person

'shall act as a physician, surgeon, or apothecary, in any part of Great Britain or Ireland, without being duly registered,' such person shall, on conviction before any magistrate, forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding five pounds, &c. The Committee feel convinced that no legal sophistry could interpret this clause as one that would permit the chemist and druggist to act in the capacity of a medical practitioner. By Clause 20, also, it is provided that every unregistered person who shall pretend to be either physician, surgeon, or apothecary, or shall take any name implying that he is registered under this Act, may be convicted before any magistrate in a penalty of ten pounds."

A Sub-Committee, consisting of Messrs. J. D. Jones, M. K. O'Shea, and Ed. Bowman, members of the National Institute, appointed on Thursday last, presented the following Protest, signed by sixty-three members of that body. The Sub-Committee stated, that having had only three clear days to collect names, their numbers were but small; but they had no doubt, such being the unanimous opinion of those who had signed the Protest, that hundreds of signatures might be added; and they hoped that all members of the Institute who agreed in the justice of the Protest would immediately give them authority to add their names by addressing them at the Freemasons' Tavern immediately.

"We, the undersigned, members of the National Institute of Medicine, Surgery, and Midwifery, take upon us thus publicly to repudiate the Address published by the Council of that body, against the Medical Registration Bill now before Parliament, having neither been asked nor consulted upon the merits or demerits of the measure. Also, to deny the right of the Council to issue an Address of such paramount importance to all its members, without endeavouring to elicit their views upon the subject. If they possessed the means of knowing the individual opinion of the body for the election of the Council, they surely possessed the same means of ascertaining their views upon a measure where they one and all were so deeply interested.

"Feeling that the Council had, by its precipitancy, pledged itself to oppose a measure, the success of which the members at large were most favourable to, we are anxious that the members of the legislature, and more particularly the Committee now sitting in the House of Commons, should know that the opposition of the Council of the National Institute is not that of its members.

"John Dalston Jones, 1, Queen's-road, Dalston; Michael Keating O'Shea, 17, Mount-street, Bridge-road, Lambeth; Edward B. Bowman, Middleton-road, Dalston; Edgar Cockell, Junior, Queen's-road, Dalston; James Edward Mathew, Church-cottage, Beauvoir-square; Esquire Dukes, Acton-place, Kingsland-road; George Gould, 19, Kingsland-crescent; George West, 2, Hackney-road-crescent; William Grimwood King, 7, Thurlow-place, Hackney-road; James Smart, Cambridge-heath, Hackney-road; George Frederick Giles, 4, Clifton-place, Hackney; William Callender Tidy, Cambridge-heath, Hackney; Henry Gervis, Triangle, Hackney; William Huxtable, Wells-street, Hackney; Edward Larwill Humphries, Courtney-terrace, Kingston; Frederick Canet, Holly-street, Dalston; John Chambers, Trafalgar-place, Hackney-road; J. E. Pattison, Brunswick-place, Islington; Henry Charles Robinson, Caledonia-place, Pentonville; Peter Mageniss, Hamilton-place, New-road; Charles Packer, 12, Pitfield-street, Hoxton; Wm. P. Baker, Bow; William Bayes, Angel-terrace, Pentonville; James Self, Mile-end-road; Wm. Garbutt Taylor, Enfield; William Kelso Wright, North Brixton; James Townley, Harleyford-place, Kennington; David Taylor, Harleyford-place, Kennington; Henry Meredith Townsend, 75, Newington-causeway; Wm. Hay, 23, Park-square, Leeds; Richard S. Penkivil, Sampford Peveril, Tiverton; John Augustus Lloyd, Bath; Edward Parker, Rickdale, Liverpool; Thomas Inman, Liverpool; Wm. Hitchman, Cirencester; James Holmes, Cirencester; Edw. Jas. Shearman, Rotherham; Frederick Geo. Wm. Muller, Haswell, Durham; John Christie Seeham, Durham; Wm. E. Coyte Bishop, Easington, Castle Eden, Durham; Robert Fidler, Northumberland-street, Liverpool; Henry W. J. Ellis, Crowle, Lincoln; P. S. Ellis, Crowle, Bantry, Yorkshire; Joshua Barlow, Fairfield-street, Manchester; W. Briggs, Manchester; Samuel Beecroft, Hyde, Manchester; Jonathan Shaw, Hyde, Manchester; William E. Grindley Pearse, Marsham-street, Westminster; W. H. Cooke, York-road, Lambeth; R. L. Hooper, London-road, Southwark; Wm. Eales, 23, Parliament-

street; Fred. Tucker, Ryde, Cheshire; William Tucker, Cheshire; Robert R. Clay, Wandsworth-road; Alexander M'Gregor, South Hetton, Durham; Wm. Philson, Hitching, Herts; George Leany, Maidstone, Kent; Wm. Bird Herapath, Bristol; George John Parker, Bristol; J. P. M'Donald, Bristol; Robt. M'Pherson, Bristol; Jas. S. J. G. Parsons, Bristol; Edward Evans, Stones-end, Bow."

The following letters are specimens of the answers received by the Sub-Committee to applications made on the subject of the Protest, from gentlemen whose names appear on the list of the Institute; the Sub-Committee have no doubt that there are a great number of gentlemen similarly situated:—

"GENTLEMEN,—I should feel great pleasure in allowing you to append my name to the Protest, but I think I cannot consistently do so, as, although I appeared in the list of members of the National Institute of Medicine &c., I have not paid the annual subscription required, and, under all circumstances, I do not think I ever shall pay it, consequently I have no claim to be considered a member of that body.

I am, Gentlemen, yours truly,

Lincolnshire, May, 1847.

M. FRANKS.

To Messrs. Jones, Bowman, and O'Shea."

"GENTLEMEN,—I this morning received your letter, enclosing a Protest against the Council of the National Institute of Medicine &c., opposing the Registration Bill now before Parliament, for my signature, and in reply, beg leave to say that I was a member of the National Association of General Practitioners, but have never subscribed to, or considered myself a member of, the present Institute. I think I, therefore, cannot sign the Protest fairly; moreover, I have been quite as much disgusted with previous acts of the Council, as with the present opposition to Mr. Wakley's excellent Registration Bill. Approving as I do of it, I lost no time in sending a petition for presentation to our excellent county member, Mr. Evans, with an earnest request that he would support the Bill in his place in Parliament.—I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your most obedient servant,

Derbyshire, May, 1847.

JOHN NICHOLSON, M.R.C.S.E.

To Messrs. Jones, Bowman, and O'Shea."

SELECTIONS FROM THE PETITIONS

IN FAVOUR OF THE MEDICAL REGISTRATION AND MEDICAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL, AND AGAINST THE CONDUCT OF THE CORPORATIONS IN OPPOSING THE MEASURE.

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled,—

The humble petition of William Mark Powell, residing at No. 2, Claylands-place, Clapham-road, in the county of Surrey, member of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, and member of the London Society of Apothecaries, sheweth,—

That your petitioner is anxious that the Medical Registration and Medical Law Amendment Bill, now before your honourable House, should be enacted into a law, for the following reasons:—

That the medical profession of this country is composed of members licensed by different medical institutions having different standards of education and efficiency; that of these members, some are licensed by the English colleges, some by the Scotch, and some by the Irish. That all these said members practise as apothecaries in England and Wales, though none but those holding the diploma of the London Society of Apothecaries have a legal right to do so. That the London Society of Apothecaries have not only totally failed in maintaining the privileges of their members, which are constantly invaded by persons holding only the diploma of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, and by the licentiates of Scotch and Irish institutions, but that they have also failed to protect the public from the evil practices of uneducated quacks, possessing no diploma whatever, who infest London and other large towns, to the great scandal of the high art of medicine, and to the great suffering of their unfortunate victims—a crying evil, which the London Society of Apothecaries, in a certain Address, published by their authority, and bearing date 10th December, 1846, deplore, but confess to be out of their power effectually to amend, from want of funds and a more summary power of proceeding against offenders. That, therefore, a compulsory Registration, which shall at once distinguish the qualified and educated practitioner from the unqualified and ignorant pretender, and a power of summary