of Apothecaries; and Mr. Pennington, Mr. Bird, and Mr. Ancell, were on the committee, as representing the National Institute. When questions were put to the vote, they were not put to the vote *per capite*; each question was put to the College, or to the Society, and on consideration they expressed their assent.

738. Mr. Grogan.]—*What is the National Institute, which you put third; is that any distinct or combined body, or what does the term exactly convey?*—It is a body that has no chartered or legalized existence at the present moment, but Sir George Grey, considering that it represented the interests of a large body of practitioners, required that some individuals, members of that Institute, should be upon this committee.

739. Would it deserve the name of "general practitioners"?—The members of the Institute, I believe, are all general practitioners.

740. Mr. Wakley.]—When did your conferences commence?—There was a preliminary meeting, for the first time, on the 1st of December last year.

741. Do you recollect with whom?—It was composed of the same individuals whose names I have mentioned, with the exception of the members of the National Institute.

742. How many meetings had you without the presence of the members of the National Institute?—I cannot mention precisely the number; there was a preliminary meeting on the 1st of December, and a succeeding meeting took place on the 8th of December, when a communication was made to Sir George Grey.

743. Did Sir George Grey make any suggestion that it would be well to communicate at the same time with the medical authorities of Scotland and Ireland?—No, he did not.

744. Did the same parties continue to meet throughout?—Yes, with the subsequent addition of the members from the National Institute, at the request of Sir George Grey.

745. When did that accession to your numbers take place?—In a letter dated the 10th December, in answer to the first letter addressed to Sir George Grey, Mr. Phillips says, "I am directed by Secretary Sir George Grey to acknowledge the receipt of the letter of the Presidents of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons and the Master of the Society of Apothecaries, dated the 8th inst., and to express Sir George Grey's satisfaction at the course proposed to be adopted by them, which, he trusts, may lead to some satisfactory settlement of the questions affecting the medical profession. I am to state that, with a view to this object, it appears to Sir George Grey of importance that the interests of the general practitioners should be considered, and he would suggest whether some representative of that body could not be included in the proposed conference. Sir George Grey requests that you will communicate this letter to the President of the Royal College of Surgeons and the Master of the Society of Apothecaries."

746. After that time the requirements of the National Institute of Medicine appeared?—Yes.

747. And they were received as parties to the conference?—Yes, and a communication that the conference was so constituted was forwarded to Sir George Grey.

748. Before they appeared, had the question been considered whether it was advisable to grant a charter of incorporation to the general practitioners?—*That was not a subject of consideration till the union took place*; the committee was not considered as fully constituted until they joined the body.

749. Until they joined the body, had you considered whether it would be expedient to make any modification of the 55th of George III?—The subject generally was not taken into consideration until the committee was considered to be fully constituted in the estimation of Sir George Grey, and that did not take place until the representatives of the National Institute joined the committee.

750. Are you aware whether any one of the bodies appearing on that occasion had made an appeal to the department of the profession to which they belonged, with respect to the conditions which it would be advisable to adopt at any such conference?—*For some years past, the subject of incorporation of the general practitioners has been matter of very frequent discussion, and the Society of Apothecaries has had, at different times, correspondence with associations of general practitioners in different parts of the kingdom, and the Society became aware, in consequence of that correspondence, that there was an earnest desire entertained generally that the general practitioners of the country should obtain an incorporation of a collegiate character.*

751. I put the last question in consequence of a sentence, or a portion of a sentence, which appears in the remarks introductory to the "Principles," which are embodied in the

paper you have produced: it states, referring to the principles, "That they have met with the unanimous assent of the different classes of the profession, as represented in the committee"?—We considered, in the committee, that all classes of medical practitioners were represented.

752. Was there a single member, or, at least, a single *extra-licentiate* of the College of Physicians, in that committee?—No.

753. Is it not stated here that the proposal had obtained "the unanimous assent of the different classes of the profession"?—*"As represented by the committee,"* the physicians, surgeons, and general practitioners were represented.

756. You came to the conclusion that it would be advantageous to the profession, and useful to the public, provided medical practitioners were registered in three different and distinct classes—namely, physicians, surgeons, and general practitioners?—That was the general opinion of the gentlemen present; and it seems, as far as I am able to learn, to be the opinion of parties in the profession generally.

757. You, as one, approved of that classification?—Certainly.

758. Do you consider that it is necessary for the protection of the profession or for the protection of the public, that the classification should be carried farther, and that there should be divisions and subdivisions of the respective classes?—*Not subdivisions*; there should be a division of the physicians, surgeons, and general practitioners; that is a division which has existed for very many years, and which it is desirable should still be continued, as being in accordance with the public wishes, and apparently with public convenience.

760. My question does not refer to a division of the profession into physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries, but whether it is expedient for the public welfare or the protection of the profession, that there should be divisions of those classes?—*That does seem to be contemplated in these "Principles," that there should be a further subdivision than the three enumerated.*

761. Are there not to be associates and fellows of the College of Physicians; is not that division contemplated?—That is a subordinate division, and depends upon the organization of the particular college, and not as to the registration.

762. Is it not contemplated that there shall be fellows of the College of Surgeons, and members of the College of Surgeons, and that there shall be members of the College of Surgeons, and general practitioners?—The charter of the College of Surgeons authorizes the distinction, and creates the distinction of members and fellows.

763. Do you consider those distinctions essential?—I think that those distinctions are desirable, inasmuch as they promote a higher education on the part of the individuals desirous of obtaining those titular distinctions.

765. *Chairman.*]—As far as the registration goes, it is not intended to introduce more than three denominations: physicians, surgeons, and general practitioners?—No.

766. You do not intend in the register to subdivide those denominations into different classes?—No.

767. Mr. W. Lascelles.]—So that any licentiate or extra-licentiate may be placed on the register?—Yes; I infer from the scope of the charter of the College of Surgeons, and from what they have already announced, that the fellowship of the College of Surgeons, eventually, will be granted only to individuals who have passed a literary examination prior to their being subjected to a professional examination, the object of the college being to promote a higher general as well as a professional education in those to whom the fellowship of the college will be granted.

768. *Chairman.*]—Still the object of the registration is a registration with reference to the right to practise?—Yes.

770. Sir Henry Halford.]—Do you consider that the term "associate," applied to the College of Physicians, establishes a new distinction?—My own opinion is, that the term "associate" is open to some objection, and I have expressed my opinion to the members of the college; but I have not heard yet what decision they have come to upon that subject.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE UPTON-ON-SEVERN UNION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Messrs. Braddon and White, in the last number of THE LANCET, place the matter of the "strike" or resignation of the medical officers of the Upton-on-Severn Union in the

position of a personal squabble, in which light I am quite certain that you must be unwilling to have it intruded upon your readers. However, in justice to myself, I find it necessary to contradict, in the most absolute terms, several of their statements. First. It is not true that I made any such statement to Mr. Prior as alleged by them. I never, either to that gentleman or to any other person, intimated my concurrence in their views with regard to the medical officers of the union, or the line of conduct which in my judgment was proper to be pursued by the profession in the circumstances affecting the union. Secondly. They assert that my statement to the effect that I resigned in 1844 because my assistants were not allowed to attend my cases is "nonsense," as I at that time had none, but only one articulated pupil. I repeat that I had then two efficient assistants—viz., Messrs. Stephenson and Harrison, both of whom were perfectly able, from professional education and experience, to assist in medical and surgical practice, although not qualified. Thirdly. Messrs. Braddon and White state that "Mr. Braddon did not oppose Mr. Marsh when he might have done so with success," at the expiration of the probationary period of six months, for which I had been elected for the fourth district. To this I have to state that it is "nonsense" indeed, inasmuch as there was in reality no election at all. There was even no declaration of vacancy, the best proof of which is the fact that no advertisement appeared in the newspapers, as always is the case when an election takes place; and I was re-appointed for twelve months, as a matter of course.

I also repeat that I am as sensible as any gentleman in the profession of the unworthy treatment too often experienced by its members who have the misfortune to be poor-law medical officers, of which I myself have been a devoted victim, though, on this occasion, I have been placed by circumstances in the position of opposing two gentlemen, who have at the eleventh hour, as it were, brought themselves prominently before the public as sticklers for the honour of the profession. I have not sought this position. Messrs. Braddon and White have in a very uncalled-for manner compelled me to repel a series of calumnious slanders, in venting which it appears to me that they have much less consulted the interest and honour of the profession than the gratification of private pique.—I remain, Sir, your obliged servant,

HENRY B. MARSH, M.R.C.S. Eng. & L.A.C.

Upton-on-Severn, Sept. 19th, 1848.

TRACHEOTOMY IN HYDROPHOBIA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Recourse to tracheotomy in hydrophobia was first proposed by Dr. Physick, of Philadelphia, in the New York Medical Repository, in 1802. The suggested use of tracheotomy was extended to other diseases by Dr. Marshall Hall, in his "Diseases of the Nervous System," published in 1841.

Mr. Turner's paper, to which he called your attention, p. 325, appeared, it seems, in THE LANCET, in 1843.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Sept. 15th, 1848.

SUUM CUIQUE.

A MISREPRESENTATION EXPOSED.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

London and Provincial Medical Directory,
11, Beaufort-buildings, Strand, Sept. 20th, 1848.

SIR,—With reference to a leading article which appeared in THE LANCET of the 5th ultimo, indexed, "Gross Mal-practice in Midwifery; Trial at the Staffordshire Assizes," page 160, in which the "London and Provincial Medical Directory" is referred to as an authority regarding the professional qualifications of William Harding Flint, of Longnor, Staffordshire, we deem it our duty to send you a copy of the replies of Mr. W. H. Flint to our annual circular of the present year, as well as the correspondence to which recent circumstances have given rise.—We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

THE EDITORS OF THE LONDON AND PROVINCIAL
MEDICAL DIRECTORY.

(Copy of Circular.)

SIR,—The annexed specimen, taken from the "London Medical Directory" for 1846, is respectfully submitted to your notice; it will be at the same time a guide as to the nature of the information we require, in conformity with the subjoined interrogatories, which we beg you to answer, in a clear and legible handwriting, and return by post at your very earliest convenience, not later than Saturday, October 31st.

You will please to observe, that gentlemen who do not make a return, and whose qualifications cannot be clearly identified, (frequently a very difficult matter,) will necessarily be entered in a supplemental list.

Your obedient servants, THE EDITORS.

Name and residence?—William Harding Flint, Longnor, Staffordshire.

Whether practising as physician, surgeon, or general practitioner?—General practitioner.

Qualification, where obtained, and the date thereof?—M.R.C.S., L.S.A., 22nd Dec. 1844.

If possessed of any medical appointment, now or formerly?—Medical officer, Bakewell Union.

W. H. Flint, Esq.

In reply to our inquiry as to the correctness of this return, we have received the following:—

The secretary to the Royal College of Surgeons acquaints the editors of the "Medical Directory," in reply to their inquiry, that Mr. William Harding Flint, of Longnor, is not a member of the said college.

The secretary begs to observe that there are other individuals stated in the "Directory" for 1847 to be members of the college who are not members.

25th August, 1848.

Apothecaries' Hall, 26th August, 1848.

SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 24th instant, I beg to inform you that no person of the name of William Harding Flint has received the certificate of the court of examiners of this Society.—I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

To the Editors of the London and
Provincial Medical Directory.

ROBT. B. UPTON,
Clerk to the Society.

46, Princes-street, Soho, August 29th, 1848.

SIR,—In consequence of recent events (to which we have no desire further to allude) having called in question the accuracy of the "Medical Directory," as regards your qualifications as a practitioner, we have to request that you will either confirm or deny a return made to us (presumed by yourself) as a M.R.C.S. and L.S.A., December 22nd, 1844, it being possible your qualifications may refer to some other societies than those of London, as, upon application to the College of Surgeons, and also to the Apothecaries' Company, we are assured that your name does not appear as a member of either of those societies. The character of the "Medical Directory" will be our apology for this intrusion, to which an explicit answer is necessary, with as little delay as possible, otherwise it will be our imperative duty to publicly vindicate the veracity of the work in question.—We are, &c.,

W. H. Flint, Esq.

THE EDITORS.

Longnor, September 1st, 1848.

GENTLEMEN,—In answer to yours of the 29th ultimo, I beg to say that, in making the return to you, I did so in what I considered a regular way, and according to the requirements of your application, following the example of several gentlemen known to me, whose names appear in the "Directory," and who, like myself, have derived their qualifications from Ireland. The entry, as it now stands in the "Directory," is virtually correct, with the exception of "Medical Officer, Bakewell Union," which office was resigned in the month of April last.—I am, gentlemen, yours obediently,

W. H. FLINT.

London, 46, Princes-street, Soho,
September 4th, 1848.

The editors of the "London and Provincial Medical Directory" present their compliments to the Registrar of the College of Surgeons, Dublin, and will feel obliged if he will take the trouble to examine the college list, and inform them if the name of William Harding Flint appears as a member thereof; and if so, the date of his diploma will be an additional favour.

Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland,
September 6th, 1848.

The Registrar of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland presents his compliments to the editors of the "London and Provincial Medical Directory," and, in reply to their note of the 4th inst., begs to inform them that the name of William Harding Flint is not borne on the lists of this college, either as a fellow or licentiate.

London, 46, Princes-street, Soho,
September 4th, 1848.

The editors of the "London and Provincial Medical Directory" present their compliments to the Registrar of the