time attend at the public examination in Latin, and dispute for the degree." I thanked Dr. Stokes and took my leave.

A few days after this I called on Dr. Allman and told him that I wished him to read a memorial which I intended to present to the Board, as I had introduced his name into it. He uncivilly refused, and further said that such a proceeding was useless, as I was rejected; in proof of this he produced a slip of paper which he stated to be a transcript of the College statutes, which declared that unless each candidate had a majority in his favour "*non prævaluerit*." I replied, "The decision of the Board will give me the majority. Good morning, sir, you will see me at the Latin examination."

All the Professors except Linnæus Secundus (Dr. Allman) were at the Latin Examination, when twelve candidates were present. We were examined to the extent of about one hour, when all withdrew to the Museum. After a few minutes delay Dr. Stokes asked my Christian name, "for," said he, "Dr. Macartney has volunteered to certify your competency, and an appeal to the Board is now unnecessary." I had the degree conferred on me on the 8th of July. I know not what altered Dr. Macartney's opinion. I answered only one question to him in Latin.

Let the foregoing facts speak for themselves.

LETTER OF REMARK
FROM THE
CHAPLAIN OF ST. GEORGE'S
HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I last week sent the enclosed communication as a reply to the final letter of "A Governor of St. George's Hospital," which appeared in your contemporary "*The Medical Gazette*."

The justice, however, of inserting my reply has been denied me for the reasons assigned by the Editor of that Journal in his last number.

To his objection as to the "*lengthy*" character of my communication I trust all persons who remember the nature of the "Governor's" correspondence, will allow its proper weight. If, however, as appears in his reasons for rejecting my communication, he has adopted the opinion entertained by many, that the character of the controversy is not very reputable, I can only observe that this very obvious truth ought to have prevented the

insertion of the "Governor's" first letter. I have the honour to remain, Sir, your most obedient servant,

W. H. WALKER.

St. George's Place, Hyde Park-corner,
July 14, 1835.

To the Editor of the Medical Gazette.

SIR,—Although nothing which is not in itself degrading can be more unsatisfactory than the task of carrying on a controversy with an anonymous opponent, yet, as there are several remarks in the last letter from a "Governor of St. George's Hospital," on which I feel myself compelled to make some observations, I with much reluctance once more take up my pen to address you on the subject of his communication.

This, however, will be the last time that I shall notice any assertions which your anonymous correspondent may advance; I therefore take this opportunity of making a few remarks on the character of the controversy which has recently occupied so large a space in your columns. The "Governor" boasts that he has "uttered no abuse," that he has "called no names." Now, whether this is strictly true or not matters very little; he has done what is far worse than either; he has imputed the worst of all motives to a number of governors whom he "calls" by the "name" of a "Clique,"—motives, the true nature of which is exemplified, according to his account, by the employment of "dishonest means" for the purpose of obtaining "personal ends." And here I cannot but observe in passing, that in accusing me of being a leader of this clique, he says in his last letter, apparently with the most perfect *naïveté*, that "he thought he was paying me a compliment." I have no doubt of it, sir, but also that with his opinions of the "Clique," he "*thought*" it was more than an ordinarily bad one. He conceives that he has now made out a good case, and with the greatest complacency intimates his intention of laying aside that pen which has been so fluently employed. As to the question how far he has succeeded, or how far he has failed in making out a case, I mean not to give any direct opinion: thus much, however, I venture to predict, that the public will not so much judge of the "Governor" in this controversy, by the *accuracy* of his statements, as by the *manner* in which those statements have been communicated. Sure I am that no anonymous writer, be his merits in other respects what they may, can ever command either respect or confidence, if in *concealment* he hesitates not in imputing the most dishonourable motives to his opponents, while he has not

the *moral* courage openly to avow himself, and defend his conduct in so doing.

But to come to the point; I presume that I must be contented to put up with the Governor's "compliment" such as it is, and will therefore proceed to the consideration of the second "misstatement," which he seems to think he has so satisfactorily disposed of. If I understand him rightly, he insinuates that I have been guilty of a quibble; for that in voting for the amendment of Sir C. E. Smith, I in fact advocated the "illegality" of the appointment of the Committee. In his attempt to rid himself of his first misstatement, he has become guilty of another—that of misrepresenting the object of Sir C. E. Smith's amendment. He has told you that the object of the amendment was "that the report of the Committee should not be received." Let the amendment, however, speak for itself, and it will tell a very different tale. It is as follows:—"Resolved that this Court do adjourn the consideration of this question, and that it be recommended to the Weekly Board to summon a special Court to take into consideration the propriety of referring the PROPOSED RULES to a select Committee." Thus then, sir, it appears that the object of this amendment was *not* to prevent the possibility of the "report of the Committee from being received"—it was *not* "to destroy the labour of months by a *coup-de-main*;" but to refer that report to a select Committee, chosen to the satisfaction of all parties. For this I voted, being convinced that of all measures that could be proposed, it was most likely to be productive of peace, and effect an amicable adjustment of the proposed alterations.

Since the discussion of the amendment in question, I have found that the measure contemplated therein is fully justified by the practice of the Board on a former occasion. A Committee was appointed on the 11th of November, 1829, "to investigate the internal administration of the hospital." This Committee afterwards presented a long report of alterations proposed to be made in the laws for the officers. A special Court was summoned for the 1st of January 1830, to consider this report. The result was that this Court appointed *another Committee*, to which "the whole of the resolutions proposed by the former Committee were referred:" the only difference between this and the case in question is this; that in the latter the Committee would have been appointed in a much more constitutional manner. Viewing then this amendment when cleared from the effects of the misrepresentation, whereby the "Governor" has, I trust, unintentionally disguised it; I

cannot conceive now, any more than I could at the time when I seconded it, why, according to the earnest recommendation of the noble Chairman on that occasion, it should not have been unanimously adopted.

The existence of the third "misstatement" appears to be fully admitted by your *anonymous* correspondent; while at the same time, with a species of ingenuity I presume *peculiar* to him, he attempts to turn the tables on me. In reply to his sarcasm I have only to observe, that in noticing his inaccuracy I never questioned his ignorance on the subject. The object was simply to show, that this gentleman, be he who he may, was bold in making assertions, the truth of which he was in no way prepared to establish. I was as ignorant of the law in question as the "Governor" himself, until some matter relating to the pupils having been discussed at the Weekly Board, I was induced to examine under what law the physicians and surgeons were placed in this respect. If blame attaches any where, it is surely not to me, but to those only who, knowing they were placed under certain laws, have never thought it worth their while to inquire what those laws were; otherwise, ignorance of the law in question could not so readily be pleaded.

As your *anonymous* correspondent seems to challenge an inquiry into his inaccuracies, I cannot refrain from noticing a very singular one, which may, perhaps, be termed a simple misrepresentation rather than a perverse misstatement. By way of further illustrating the impartiality of the medical officers, he adverts to the law restricting the age of the physicians and surgeons to sixty-five years, a restriction which had never before existed. I intend not for a moment to call in question the impartiality of these gentlemen; but how this illustration can help to establish it, I am perfectly unable to comprehend. The proposed restriction either originated with the medical officers, or it did not. If it did not, I see not what merit can be claimed for them *on that account*. If it did, its operation is strongly—no doubt properly—but most assuredly not *impartially*, provided against by a declaration that the law in question shall "not affect the present physicians or present surgeons."

It not being my intention to trouble you any more on this subject, I will avail myself of the present opportunity of remarking on a note of your own which I find annexed to my last communication. When I expressed my regret that your columns should have been open to *ex-parte* statements, I never intended to convey an idea that you had not done full justice to the

parties attached, as far as you could do so by a willing insertion of their rejoinders. But this I conceive to be only a demand of common justice, with which no respectable journalist who had allowed his publication to be made the instrument of attack on any party, would refuse compliance. I complained not of this, and had you allowed your own maxim "*Audi alteram partem*" to have its proper effect on this occasion, — had you suspended your judgment until you had heard both sides of the question, whatever your verdict might *then* have been, you would never have received one syllable of complaint from me. The letter of your *anonymous* correspondent, before it had been met by any reply, was certainly an *ex-parte* statement, and it is here, sir, that I feel there is sufficient ground for remonstrance. I find, not only on the publication of the "Governor's" first letter, the "Editor of the Gazette," calling the attention of his readers to it, as being a production on which "all comment would be superfluous," but even the week before its publication giving notice of its appearance in terms that cannot be misunderstood. But of this I shall say no more, nor press the inference which seems necessarily to follow. What I have said may possibly be met by an expression of "thorough indifference and contempt." Nevertheless I make these remarks without fear; at the same time I trust, that the "strain in which they are couched," is neither unbecoming the occasion which has called them forth, nor the character of the person who has made them. I now leave them in other hands to determine how far they are founded in justice and in truth. I have the honour to remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. H. WALKER,

Chaplain of St. George's Hospital.

July 7, 1835.

LETTER

RESPECTING THE FABRICATIONS OF
A SCRIBE AT ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—May I beg the favour of your insertion of the following remarks in refutation of some of the misstatements in a letter signed "A Governor of St. George's Hospital," and published in the *Medical Gazette* of the 20th June.

In the first place, sir, it is not true as therein stated, that Mr. Bagshaw ever moved the appointment of a Committee to revise the laws, nor, indeed, without

violating every feeling of propriety and delicacy towards Mr. Fuller, could he have done so—for it was on *the very day* that Mr. Bagshawe was elected a Governor, and at *the* Special General Court (at which Mr. Bagshawe was present), that Mr. Fuller is stated to have proposed the appointment of a Committee for this purpose, though fully aware at the time that the meeting was not competent to entertain it. This will, sir, illustrate the "Governor's" regard for truth, when he asserts that "Mr. Bagshawe and Mr. Fuller separately and unacquainted with each other's purpose, moved for the appointment of a Committee to take into consideration the revision of the laws." It was, sir, at this Court that Mr. Bagshawe, in consequence of some observations from a Governor, said that he would not deny that he became a Governor to serve the interests of his relative Mr. Palmer; and that with regard to the appointment of a second Assistant-Surgeon, then under discussion, he considered the medical officers the only proper persons to decide what appointments of this kind were necessary; that the hospital was "blest" in having such officers, and that the Governors ought at once to accede to their desire. It has been stated by one of the Committee, that the only reason why Mr. Bagshawe was placed on the Committee, was the Secretary's pointing out the necessity of having the assistance of a gentleman of the legal profession, and from his publicly expressed sentiments you will not be surprised, sir, that Mr. Bagshawe should have been the one selected as pre-eminently qualified for the purpose. The "Governor" makes it a matter of grave accusation against the "minority," that they did not oppose Mr. Fuller's first proposition for a Committee, at the Special General Court, yet in the same paragraph he states that this proposition was met by a declaration that the Court was not competent to entertain it; consequently even had it been objectionable to the "minority," which it was not, they had no opportunity of opposing it; but the fact was, that it was highly objectionable to the medical officers, as it embraced the postponement of the consideration of the appointment of a second assistant surgeon, until the laws were revised, and met with very little favour from them. The "Governor" goes on to say that in consequence of this objection, Mr. Fuller "withdrew his proposition, and reintroduced it in the usual manner at the Weekly Board," leaving it to be inferred, that it was reintroduced at the *NEXT* Weekly Board, and that such was the usual manner of proceeding; but, sir, it was not brought forward in any way until