Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

- AIR.**—On the 28th ult., at Lorrimer-square, S.E., the wife of A. Cummings Air, L.R.C.P.L., M.R.C.S.E., of a son.
HAY.—On the 26th ult., at Lyme Regis, the wife of R. F. Hay, M.R.C.S.E., of a son.
DUNLOP.—On the 25th ult., at Carlton-place, the wife of James Dunlop, M.D., Professor of Surgery in Anderson's University, of a son.
JAMIESON.—On the 23rd ult., at Ravensdowne, Berwick-on-Tweed, the wife of W. Allan Jamieson, M.B., of a son.
TAYLOR.—On the 29th ult., at Queen-street, Scarborough, the wife of John Wm. Taylor, M.D., of a son.

MARRIAGES.

- LYLE—WORMALD.**—On the 31st ult., at St. George's, Doncaster, Robert Lyle, M.D., of Newcastle-on-Tyne, to Isabel, eldest daughter of John Wormald, Esq., of Ousebank House, Cawood, Yorkshire.
TACON—PATTERSON.—On the 31st ult., at Holy Trinity Church, Hounslow, Gude Wallace Tacon, M.R.C.S.E., to Henrietta Caroline, daughter of the late Captain F. T. Patterson.

DEATHS.

- JOHN.**—On the 23rd ult., at sea, on board H.M.'s Ship "Tamar," Walter John, M.R.C.S.E., Assistant-Surgeon Army.
KEYWORTH.—On the 23rd ult., Henry Keyworth, M.D., M.R.C.S.E., late one of the Surgeons to the York County Hospital, aged 57.
MCARTHUR.—On the 26th ult., from disease of the heart, Alex. McArthur, M.D., Staff Surgeon-Major, of Woolwich.
PRITCHARD.—On the 31st ult., at Oakley-square, St. Pancras, of cancer of the breast, Elizabeth Rosalie, the wife of William Pritchard, Esq., of the Royal Veterinary College.
SHAW.—On the 30th ult., at Attercliffe, Bernard John Shaw, B.A., M.R.C.S., late of Caius College, Cambridge, son of the late John Shaw, Esq., Surgeon, of Attercliffe, aged 24.
SIMPSON.—On the 23rd ult., Thos. Simpson, L.F.P. & S. Glas., of Middlesbro'-on-Tees, aged 32.
WRIGHT.—On the 25th ult., at March, Cambridgeshire, Edward Seymour Wright, M.R.C.S.E., aged 27. Friends will please accept this intimation.

THE LANCET MEDICAL BILL.

By DR. CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

It would not seem likely at first sight that we should find an insensibility to the best thought and most vigorous life of the day in those learned professions whose claim to honour lies especially in intellectual activity, in freedom from the bonds and chains of dulness and prejudice, and in familiarity with the chief of those problems which concern mankind. And yet, strangely enough, we do find this so, or find it at any rate in some considerable measure. On the other hand, it turns out that a free play of intelligence and an adequate conception of the real needs of the time in which we live is found rather among those who busy themselves with lower matters—who, Antæus-like, are continually refreshed by rough contact with the harder facts of life. Not in ancient Universities, not within the walls of dignified corporations, but in the streets of commercial cities—in London, Birmingham, Lancashire, and West Yorkshire,—it is that we find that quick adaptation of formal change to continuous and insensible development upon which our honour and our prosperity depend, and without which, indeed, no noble and effective action is possible. The claims of the Church profess to be, and are certainly, beyond the limits of discussion. But what do we see when we turn our eyes to Law and to Medicine? We find them still under the yoke of mediæval guilds—guilds which were founded on principles which have long ceased to have any truth or meaning, but which principles they still in great measure defend—guilds which within their own sphere the mercantile classes have long ago deprived of place and power, if not of life, but which in the learned professions have but gained greater power and higher place by a long impunity. So heavily laden is the Bar by these oppressive corporations, so indifferent has wealth made them to all attacks from within or from without, and so dead are they to all sense of their own responsibility, that they have gone near to ruin the profession they represent. Tall poppies may grow in any soil; but the mass of that profession has only been saved from contempt by its honourable but quite accidental association with modern literature. Medicine is in somewhat better case. True it is that her guilds were founded on mediæval conceptions, which, now-a-days at least, are particularly absurd, and which they, nevertheless, have done their best to perpetuate; but, on the other hand, the fortunate lack of very large endowments, and, I hope I may add, the more scientific character of our mental discipline, have given a check to the medical guilds, and from time to time have forced upon them the acceptance of some responsibility. Were I at liberty to extend this paper, it would be easy from the instances of the professional guilds to give force to the increasing belief that permanent endowments are at least as likely to be dangerous as to be useful to a community, the necessary assumption in all such cases being that their influence is at least as likely to be injurious as to be wholesome; nay more, that unless incessantly and jealously watched, and their movements compelled from without at every turn, they are sure to be out of harmony with modern requirements, and to dam the stream of contemporary thought. This is not the occasion for so large an inquiry, and I shall confine

myself, therefore, to one point, one of great importance at all times, and one of pressing importance to us now.

Every intelligent person admits that the present state of our profession, as administered by the Guilds and Universities and by the Medical Council—which is still but Snug the joiner whatever voice it assumes—is intolerable; that fortunately our corporations are too weak to succeed in a policy of defiant inaction like that of the legal corporations, and that now the time has not only come when some radical change ought to be made, but when some fairly extensive change is actually possible. The one and the important principle, then, which I wish to urge—one which lies at the root of the matter, and which in our legislation we must obey or defy, but which we cannot evade—is the modern principle of government by the many. In medical as in social politics there are three parties—the Conservative, whose principle is government by the few; the Liberal, whose principle is government by the many; and the Radical, whose principle is no government at all. Among ourselves, Radicals are, I think, few in number; Conservatives are, I fear, many in number, and many of my best friends are of them; but the Liberal party has, I hope, the majority, and this is the party which is now seeking to reorganise the profession. The fight, then, lies between the two latter parties, and their division is utter. Irrational compromise may be, perhaps must be, a consequence; but no rational compromise is possible. If reform is to proceed on any distinct ground, it must be based upon the ancient principle of government by the few, or upon the modern principle of government by the many, and those moving in the former direction can have no part nor lot with those who move in the latter. Clear and simple as is this resolution of the quarrel, and having, as I believe it has, the additional advantage of being true, we may fairly complain that neither party sets its own work straight before it, but fights blindfold. How are we to excuse those who pretend to be of the reform party, and yet whose first proposal is to invest the enemy with power which he never had before; who invest the Conservative party in the persons of its most powerful organisations with a sacred renewal of all its pre-eminence; who secure continuance to the divine principle of government by the few, and who utterly cast out all hope of victory for the human principle of government by the majority. A new governing body, consisting of an artful consolidation of the power which the corporations now possess would be a tyranny ten times told. The surprise and disappointment which I felt on hearing of the last proposal of the "Reform Committee" have moved me so strongly that I am impelled to express these feelings in the hope that I may not stand alone. I do not blame those who have drafted this unfortunate proposal, nor do I speak indignantly of those who are justified in using what power they have to further their own ends. But I shall have a sensation of this kind for the mass of the profession, if they, who have already spoken boldly and unequivocally in favour of direct representation, and who must have intended that direct representation to be a reality, now allow themselves to be made use of as large bodies of electors are too often made use of, and their votes secured for ends other than their own; for, if the Association Bill pass into law, the new Medical Council must be thenceforth governed by a constant majority identified with the corporations and universities, the few direct representatives will be in a powerless and humiliating position, and the government of the profession will be handed over for another long term of years to the minority. As a member of the British Medical Association, as a member who has joined it heartily hoping to find in it an adequate expression of self-government, and a means of giving to a noble and intelligent profession the power which is its own, I protest against the sale of our birthright for such pottage.

There are two difficulties which weigh, no doubt, with many persons as they weigh with me. We say to ourselves, How honourable, how cultivated are the men who occupy the official seats in the corporations! To many of us they are personal friends, even dear friends. Shall we not trust them? This is an old trial, and requires now, as always, one inexorable answer, which is that upright, cultivated men are quite as likely, perhaps are even more likely, to be wrong than right upon questions of public policy, and the only means of progress is for each elector to set his own way clear before his face, and to vote not for the sake of any friendship or for the sake of any associations whatsoever, but strictly on those principles which he believes to be right. In this sense only is the old adage found true, "*Vox populi, vox Dei.*" Personal considerations must then be set aside. The next difficulty is a more serious one, and cannot perhaps be evaded. We hear of "their due rights" being preserved to the medical guilds. Now what are these due rights? The due rights of anyone are *in ultimâ ratione*, I suppose, those which he can legally get, and I have as yet failed to discover any other light in which the "due rights" of the bodies in question can have any existence. The pretence that they have been even abreast with contemporary requirements in medical education is tacitly given up, and the time is come when, were it worth while, the tables might be turned, and an accusation plausibly sustained against them, that for many years past they have been dry trees, and doing all the injury which is done by cumbering the ground. But I have no wish to enter upon any grounds of accusation, nor fortunately is it necessary. The magnificent museum in Lincoln's-inn-fields is, I believe, the only thing of which the corporations have to be proud (unless it be the narrow conservation of their internal policy), and this gives about as much claim to the College of Surgeons to govern the profession as the British Museum gives to its trustees to sit in permanence on the London School Board. A great medical school, like that of Guy's Hospital, in enlightened activity and in results, has done more to advance medicine and medical education than all the corporations put together, with Oxford and Cambridge at the head or at the tail of them.

Again, we have fortunately no little evidence that the intentions of some at least of the medical corporations, and these the most powerful, are of the most reactionary kind. Their own internal constitutions are as backward as is their position in respect of medical education. So far from being on liberal principles—I speak to liberals—they are conceived and carried on in a spirit so utterly at variance with them that I believe one great ground of their opposition to direct representation lies in their instinct, true enough no doubt, that one of the first results, direct or indirect, of a reformed Council would be to break down their narrow and exanimate system of internal government, and to claim for the profession at large the control of the management of their own societies. That this reform should have been so long delayed is one more curious instance of the persistency of forms when all their use and meaning have fled. The only farther consideration which need delay us here is this obvious one. Why should we now represent the corporations in the Council when the first movement of reform must be to extend their own voting constituency within? When they are governed by the majority of their own members, they must cease to have any rights other than the majority of the profession think well to give them; they will have, indeed, no separate rights at all. But in this case to represent them separately will be to give a surgeon, let us say, two votes for Council elections—one his

intelligible direct vote, the other an unintelligible indirect one filtered through the College of Surgeons. Here is a useless trouble and a useless expense, to say the least of it, not to speak of any confusion it may create in the way of mental diplopia.

The following principles have so far, then, been established, or taken as proved:—First, and cardinal, that the many is the well-ascertained basis of modern government. Secondly, that upright and cultivated men in official positions are as likely to be wrong in their views of policy as other men are, and are more likely in so far as they are successful men, whose success has been gained upon the system they defend. Thirdly, that the medical corporations have no claim whatever in reason to be represented in the Medical Council; that, on the contrary, for clearness' sake, it would be far better for both sides, for reformers and conservatives alike, to say what both sides really mean—namely: Here are certain bodies having great power and influence, which they intend to exercise in opposition; these bodies are too powerful to be set at defiance, and must therefore be conciliated. The question is thus narrowed to the intelligible issue of how much one side must give, and how much the other side will take. Having cleared our minds in this way, let us see whether THE LANCET Bill gives us a better scheme than that of our own Association. In the belief that it does the present lines are written. The Bill does not go far enough, as I shall presently show, but the whole Bill reads well, and bore examination so well that I took a legal opinion upon it. The very able lawyer to whom I submitted it also expressed himself on the whole so favourably that I could not longer hesitate to advocate it. It is curious that the Editor of THE LANCET should have found it necessary to call his very temperate and conciliatory measure a "bold Bill." I can scarcely suppose that anyone who has read the weary reports of past debates can fail heartily to support the proposal to retrench the number of representatives to twelve. This step surely needs no urgent advocacy. The next important modification to be considered is the distribution of power within the twelve. Here THE LANCET proposal seems to me to give way too much, and to propose a smaller reform than we may fairly hope to carry. The Medical Council, being bound by statute, need not contain any Government nominees, but I am far from objecting to their presence. It may be said, however, that the medical profession is constantly tempted to take a "tribal" view of the questions before it—a temptation which representatives of the public would counteract. But for this purpose what is needed is not voting power, but the presence of some one person whose words would have weight and influence with the eleven educated and able men who hear them. One Government representative would fulfil this purpose as well as four; let us even grant two such assessors as reasonable. As the Government is the Government of the United Kingdom, there is not that need of taking these assessors from the separate divisions of the kingdom, which is, on the other hand, so important in direct representation. My purpose in drawing attention to this point is in order to provide for that which I consider to be essential in all and any Bills—namely, that a *working majority remain with the direct representatives*. THE LANCET Bill falls short of this; indeed, as the Government nominees are likely to be taken from the ranks of eminent men committed by every association to the medical authorities, the presence of four of these with four representatives of corporations will give a *working majority against the representatives of the profession at large*. This is to me fatal to any hope of real reforms; and the objection is overlooked, I fear, by the Editor of THE LANCET in his introductory remarks. I am even sorry to see from his words—"Moreover, to the extent of one-third it is to be elected by the profession itself, who will thus be made to feel an interest in its doings and its efficiency"—that he fails really to grasp the truth that the profession must not only "feel an interest in" their own affairs, but must feel that they hold them in their own hands. This will give them a true sense of their own dignity, and, what is more important, of their own responsibility.

I would strongly urge the Editor to consider whether we cannot get as much as this: that the twelve members of the Council shall consist of two Government representatives, three representatives of corporations—one for each division of the kingdom,—and seven direct representatives, three from England, two from Scotland, and two from Ireland. I think this might be obtained, as it is based on principles which no Liberal Government can deny—namely, that of placing the power with the many, and not with the few.

All the other clauses of the Bill seem to me not only carefully drawn, but comprehensive and adequate to the ends required. The difficulty of precedence in date between corporate and State examinations is well met in Clause 14; and Clauses 7, 8, and 34 effectually dispose of the scarcely ingenious because clearly frivolous objection, that the difficulties of electing direct representatives of the profession would be insuperable. Anyone who has voted for members of Convocation in Oxford or Cambridge must be aware that the alleged difficulty of collecting votes from a large and scattered constituency is not worth much regard.

Leeds, Jan. 30th, 1871.

Notes, Short Comments, and Answers to Correspondents.

"MIXED CLASSES."

WE understand that some individual of the male sex at Edinburgh has commenced an action at law against Miss Jex Blake on account of statements alleged to have been made by her at a late public meeting. In former times a man who brought such an action would have been laughed out of court, as deservedly as a baffled fortune-hunter whose action was for breach of promise of marriage. Now, however, we cannot but feel that the case stands upon rather different ground. It is quite possible that the "advanced" ladies of the period may find that the positions they seek will not be wholly enviable when attained. The masculine pillow is set with many thorns, from which the fairer sex has been hitherto exempt; and if women have to pay for being doctresses by sustaining actions at law for libel, we very much doubt whether they will profit by the change.

Sir H. Thompson's paper shall appear in our next impression.

DR. WHITMORE AND MR. H. HODSON RUGG.

WE have seen with much regret an intemperate and most improper letter which has been addressed by Mr. H. Hodson Rugg to the *Borough of Marylebone Mercury*. He writes to attack Dr. Whitmore, the laborious medical officer of health for Marylebone, for alleged neglect about the removal of a child attacked by small-pox. It is very easy to believe that the calls upon Dr. Whitmore's time and energies have lately become almost more than he could meet, although it is well known how earnest and indefatigable he has been. It is possible that the events referred to by Mr. H. Hodson Rugg may have occurred as he relates them, and that somebody was to blame. If that somebody was Dr. Whitmore, anyone who might be injured is at liberty to apply to the vestry; and any member of the medical profession who has a well-founded grievance may find space for its ventilation in our own columns or in those of other medical journals. But for a medical practitioner to write nearly a small type column of abuse against Dr. Whitmore, and to send his effusion to a suburban general newspaper, is such a piece of gross impropriety as we trust we may never again be called upon to record. Even if the letter had been fair and courteous, it is obvious that Dr. Whitmore, as a responsible official, would have been unable to reply to it. We shall but speak the general sense, not only of the profession, but also, we believe, of all the intelligent classes of the borough, when we assure Dr. Whitmore that the sympathies of his brethren and of the public will be fully with him. His recent work speaks for itself. The conditions under which one medical man can be justified in assailing another in the columns of a newspaper must be rare indeed, and on this occasion they have neither been fulfilled nor approached.

Omicron.—1. He has no legal right to practise medicine.—2. Certainly, he is practising without a sufficient licence, and lays himself open to penalties. *Mr. Arthur Birch* (Kensington).—It is not our practice to do so.

VACCINATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In your issue of December 24th, a letter appeared from a correspondent who signed himself "Justitia," in answer to one which you kindly inserted from me on the above subject. I wish to make a few remarks on this letter, which I should have done (with your permission) the following week, but was prevented from want of leisure.

"Justitia" begins his letter by protesting against my suggestion that every surgeon who wishes should be a public vaccinator. His reason is, because he considers the vaccination to be "the" sinecure of the Poor Law. I fail to see his argument, that because a gentleman likes to take an appointment which he admits does not carry a fair remuneration, therefore he is to claim as a right any better paid one in connexion with the same as a "make up," more especially if public good can be done by an alteration which could not detract much from his pocket, and place much into another's. In my own individual case, I can confidently assert it would make little or no difference, and I can assure your correspondent he labours under a great mistake if he imagines I wrote my letter actuated by any personal motive. I have for years entertained but one opinion on these matters—viz., that the grand aim should be towards making the *poor* a little more independent, by allowing them to select their medical attendant. Should we like to be obliged to go to a person we much disliked? This could be done somewhat after the manner provident dispensaries are conducted—viz., upon application for medical relief, let the officer give the applicant a ticket, placing the name of the surgeon selected upon it, which shall be the order for his attendance; let the ticket represent so much value, and at stated times let them be paid by the authorities. By some plan of this kind the parochial work would be done, for obvious reasons, more cheerfully by the practitioner, and the pauper would be more satisfied. Why is the latter *not* to be considered?

"Justitia's" line of argument is rather peculiar. In one breath he claims the office of vaccinator as an appendage to his Poor-law appointment, whilst in another he repudiates the connexion by stating vaccination "is not considered parochial assistance." What is it? I think these remarks savour more of wishing "all the water in his own ditch" than any that I have made. Respectable private patients in this district never think of going to the public vaccinator. Quite the reverse. I deny that the public vaccinator procures better vaccine than the private operator; for it is often impossible for him to know the *private history* of the patients, &c., whereas the private practitioner always possesses this very important information. If "Justitia's" assertion is correct, it must be owned that this would be a strong reason in favour of my idea of allowing all to become public vaccinators.

With regard to the reasons why vaccination is *not* properly carried out (which is admitted by your correspondent), I am sure the one I state is far more real than any other. I ask any impartial person whether it would not be preferable to get over the great dislike to vaccination (which it is no use to say does not exist) by some mild measure if possible, rather than by prosecutions, &c.? Depend upon it, the poor will not be driven, but they are to be led.

Yeovil, January 20th, 1871.

E. C. GARLAND.

P.S.—I could give many instances in proof of what I stated in my last letter with regard to the careless manner vaccination is too often carried out in many districts, and which can never be discovered by the present mode of inspection.

MEDICAL RELIEF BY LOAN.

THE Amersham guardians have requested to know from the Poor-law Board whether the relieving officer has power to grant an order for medical relief on loan. The question before the guardians was the propriety of "giving" medical relief to a man, having a wife and three children, whose earnings were 15s. a week, he having a broken leg. We should have scarcely thought it necessary to refer to the Poor-law Board in such a case.

Dr. Sparks.—Yes.

THE communication of *Dr. Meadows* (68th Regiment) has been received.