and having kept it in reserve ever since, he has now, under the delusion or with the pretence of its being wrung from him by the machinations of two of his colleagues, contrived dexterously to throw it as a firebrand amongst us to work for his own ends. It is due, however, to Mr. Morton, to say, that I have never witnessed in him any disposition inopportunely to press himself forward; in particular, I feel assured that on the occasion of the late vacancy, that gentleman would not, as far as he was concerned, have permitted any real or supposed claims of his own to interfere with the free choice of the college, and I entirely acquit him of all voluntary connexion with the present discreditable agitation. On the other hand, no one has any just ground for imputing to me any ill-will towards Mr. Morton. Associated with him in the same school, though with different individual pursuits and objects, I feel that his success, if founded on his own merit, as I am sure he would desire it to be, must reflect advantage as well as credit on us all; and I am the last person who would wish to impede his fair advancement.

Before any meeting of the Senate took place, I called of my own accord on Mr. Cooper to learn his sentiments on the expediency of inviting Mr. Syme to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. Liston's death. Referring to that private interview, Mr. Cooper says, that "he (Dr. Sharpey) presumed to tell me, 'that the more I endeavoured to bring Mr. Morton forward, the worse it should be for him, and the more he should be kept back.'" If Mr. Cooper remembers his own words in that rather excited conversation as particularly as he professes to give mine, he will perhaps thank me (I know Mr. Morton will) for my forbearing to repeat the most contemptuous and disparaging terms in which he spoke of the merits of others, as compared with Mr. Morton. I have no recollection of having used the phrase "kept back," but as Mr. Cooper professes to have remembered it, and gloats over it with peculiar zest, he has of course the advantage of me. While, however, I admit that a particular expression may be positively spoken to, I have little reliance to place on any report professing to give the "ipsissima verba" used in connexion with it. Such a report may, by containing the marked expression, sound very like what was actually said, but even a slight deviation in a connected word, alleged to have been used, may give a very decided turn to the sense. The word *should* in the above quotation argues a tone which even in the heat of altercation I am satisfied I did not assume. Indeed, the pretended significance of my alleged use of the expression "kept back," which Mr. Cooper so much harps upon, is quite out of keeping with the fact which Mr. Cooper himself states—namely, that I was not unfavourable to the proposal that Mr. Morton should have the rank of full surgeon.

Thus, then, it is not the fact that I intrigued to displace Mr. Cooper, nor is it the fact that I joined in any irregular or censurable proceedings in order to introduce Mr. Syme.

CHARGE OF CULPABLE HOMICIDE AGAINST A SURGEON.—ACQUITTAL.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY, EDINBURGH, MAY 18.

SOME time ago a coroner's jury, sitting in Westminster, returned a verdict of manslaughter against Mr. Gibson, of Glasgow, in consequence of a convict affected with fever having been sent by him to Millbank Prison as free from infectious disease, and in a fit state for the journey. The death of the deceased convict was ascribed to the negligence of Mr. Gibson, in allowing his removal from Scotland. Mr. Bedford, the coroner, placed the case in the hands of the Lord Advocate, at whose instance the proceedings at Edinburgh were instituted. The following is a summary of the trial, before the Lord Justice-Clerk, (Hope,) Lord Cockburn, and Lord Wood:—

"Mr. DAVID GIBSON, surgeon to the Prison Board of the Lower Ward of Lanarkshire, was charged with culpable homicide; as also with the wilfully granting a false certificate to a public officer, knowing the same to be false; as also culpable neglect of duty, in so far as the accused, as surgeon to the prison board, had granted a certificate to the effect that a man named Patrick M'Ginty, who was under sentence of transportation, was free from infectious disease, &c., and that his health would be not endangered by removal from the prison of Glasgow to Millbank; whereas the said certificate was granted either wilfully, and in the knowledge that it was false, or in culpable neglect of duty, inasmuch as the said Patrick M'Ginty was at the time affected with disease of the lungs, peritonæum, and other parts of the body, of a serious and dangerous character, so that he was in such a state of dis-

ease and debility that he could not be admitted at Millbank; and after lingering some time, he died there.

"The accused pleaded not guilty. Mr. Moncrieff and Mr. Miller appeared for him.

After hearing evidence at great length for the prosecution, and examining five witnesses in defence, Mr. Crawford, for the Crown, departed from the two first charges in the libel; but urged the jury to find the accused guilty of the third charge—namely, culpable neglect of duty.

Mr. MONCRIEFF having addressed the jury in behalf of Mr. Gibson, the Lord Justice-Clerk summed up. The jury, without a moment of hesitation, returned a unanimous verdict of *not guilty*.

Correspondence.

THE PROPOSED CHARTER TO THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

[CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DR. JOHN CHARLES HALL AND THE AUTHORITIES IN LONDON AND EDINBURGH;—THEIR REPLIES.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—At the request of several fellows of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, I ventured to take some steps to procure an alteration in the 5th clause of the proposed charter to the College of Physicians. The memorial to Sir George Grey has already been placed before your readers. With your permission I now propose to lay before the profession, in the pages of the advocate of the rights of all classes of medical men—THE LANCET, the result of my humble efforts on behalf of myself and the fellows of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh and Dublin.

I first communicated with the worthy secretary of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association, Dr. Streeten; and then, by his advice, with the authorities in London and Edinburgh. I regret that I cannot forward you the answer to my letter, addressed to the registrar of the Royal College of Physicians of London, Dr. Francis Hawkins, as it is marked "private;" but it displays all that kindness of heart (and evidences a wish that justice should be done to all) for which this distinguished physician is so well known to every one. I may, however, say, without stepping over the bounds of propriety, that every disposition has been shown by the authorities in London, to give our case an attentive consideration. I next wrote to the president of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, and to Dr. Renton, who represented the College of Physicians of Edinburgh, before the parliamentary committee. The reply from Dr. Paterson, the secretary, and Dr. Renton, will be read with much interest at this moment.

College of Physicians, Edinburgh, May 17, 1848.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours of the 13th inst., I have to inform you that the subject of the position of the fellows of this college, under the proposed charter by the College of Physicians in England, has not escaped the notice of those to whom our college has confided its interests as respects the contemplated measures of medical legislation. In particular, I am authorized by our president, Dr. Christison, to state, that in his evidence, delivered before the committee of the House of Commons last week, he took occasion to mention this as a point in which the proposed charter of the English college required amendment, in order to effect that reciprocity of privileges between the several colleges of the kingdom, and the desirableness of which there has been a formal recognition on the part of all the medical corporations. And continued efforts will not be wanting on the part of this college and its representatives to secure for all the fellows practising in England (whether graduates of British universities, or foreign graduates admitted to the fellowship after regular examination on the part of the college) the right of practising as physicians under the new charter of the English college, without being required to submit to any additional examination, or having resided two years at a university.

I am, dear Sir, your obedient servant,

To J. C. Hall, M.D., East Retford. G. PATERSON, Secretary.

Edinburgh, May 17th, 1848.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your note of the 15th instant, I beg to inform you that my attention has been directed to the fifth clause of the proposed charter to be granted to the Royal College of Physicians of England. The provision contained in it, I agree with you in thinking, partakes too much of an illiberal and exclusive character. While acting as the delegate of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, in

my late visit to London, I took an opportunity of stating that opinion to a party most likely to afford redress in the matter; and I have the satisfaction to acquaint you, that an alteration will be made in the wording of that clause, so as to meet your views, and remove all objections which may be urged, with propriety, against it in its present shape.—I am, dear Sir, respectfully yours,

To Dr. J. C. Hall.

R. RENTON.

Reply to the Letter published in the last Number of THE LANCET from Sir G. Grey, Bart.

Whitehall, May 20th, 1848.

SIR,—I am directed by Secretary Sir George Grey to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, relative to the operation of the proposed charter to the Royal College of Physicians of London. And I am to inform you that your statement shall receive due consideration.—I am Sir, your obedient servant,

To Dr. J. C. Hall.

G. CORNEWALL LEWIS.

From the publication of this correspondence it will be seen that there is every reason for concluding that justice will be done to the fellows of the Royal Colleges of Edinburgh and Dublin, now in practice as physicians. But we must not stop here. Not only now, but for ever, the fellows of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh must claim the right of being admitted into the College of Physicians of England, without examination, if they think proper to practise as physicians in that part of Great Britain so called; and I think you, Sir, will agree with me, that no Bill for the amendment of the medical profession will be perfect which would, in the same country, make a man a physician on the north side of a river, and a Mr. Nobody on the south.—I remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

JOHN CHARLES HALL, M.D., F.R.C.P. Edin.
Grove-street, East Retford, May, 1848.

THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, LONDON—RIGHTS OF BRITISH GRADUATES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As a humble member of a British university, I beg to address a few words on the charter of the College of Physicians, London, and on the amicable arrangement made by certain chartered bodies in London as to that which is most salutary to the medical profession. The chief object of the present movement of the College of Physicians seems to be to obtain increased power by sacrificing none, and hence making themselves complete despots as regards the licensing of physicians in England. Is it just, however, that the graduates of the British universities should thus be trampled on? Should not a graduate of a British university, having been found a fit and proper person to practise his profession, be allowed to do so without being again reduced to the position of a student, after having been subjected to a strict and searching examination?—or a man who has been found fit to practise the healing art seven miles from the General Post-office, be not fit to practise the same profession three miles from the same?—or, to carry the degradation still further, shall a physician who has been peculiarly regarded for his scientific acquirements in Scotland, who by virtue of such has received the highest honours there, and who thinks fit to remove to England, shall he be degraded to a position even below a student?

Are we living in the nineteenth century—methinks it the middle of the dark ages; but, as Lord Brougham observed, “the Almanac says it is nineteen hundred, and we must believe it.”

To take an example: the illustrious Professor Simpson, lately appointed physician-accoucheur to her Majesty in Scotland, would, if he had attended her Majesty in England, have rendered himself liable to fine or imprisonment. Is this the law of England? Is there anything so preposterous? The English College of Physicians should consider that Scotland is as much a part of Britain as England. If the College of Physicians but consider that the examination for the degree of M.B. Cambridge is inferior to the examination at the University of St. Andrew's, they cannot with any degree of propriety look down on the Universities of Glasgow, Aberdeen, &c.; and if, also, they recollect that some of the brightest ornaments of the medical profession in England are Scotchmen, or, at least, Scotch graduates, they will learn to look at things differently.

1st. Let, then, all graduates of British universities assert their claims to be admitted members of any College of Physicians

in Great Britain, under certain regulations, without undergoing a further examination.

2nd. Let the College of Physicians of the different parts have power to elect one or more examiners who shall be present at the examinations at the different universities; and, if they think fit, take part in such examinations, so that a uniformity of examination may be obtained.

3rd. Let a member of one College of Physicians be allowed, on removing to any part within the jurisdiction of another College of Physicians, to become member of the same, and have all the rights and privileges he would in his own college without further payment—or, if a fellow, be elected a fellow.

4th. Let the sum paid for a membership in different counties be the same—say £25 member, £50 fellow.

5th. Let not the College of Physicians of London have power to grant degrees, which power exists, and always should exist with universities; as, for instance, in London, if a person having passed the membership at the College of Physicians, London, that person may on proper grounds receive an honorary degree of M.D. from the University of London.

6th. Let the graduates and under graduates of the University of London agitate for a representative form of government, a senate house, or hall of convocation, will soon follow—the degrees will be granted publicly—the honour and dignity of the university will be upheld by those who have an interest in it—benefactions and endowments will follow. The silk and velvet will not be merely useless baubles, but insignia of power, giving useful stimulus to the rising generation. The feelings of the graduates must then be attended to by the College of Physicians, London.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A LONDON UNIVERSITY RADICAL REFORMER.

University College, London, 1848.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND THEIR MEDICAL ATTENDANTS.

MR. CLARK BARBER, of Colsterworth, Lincolnshire, requests us to give insertion to the following remarks:—

“It has fallen to my lot to render medical attendance to a number of neighbouring parishes, under the old system of farming parishes by contract, ground down to the lowest pitch by invited competition. By the words “invited competition” I mean that it was not an unusual thing for parish officers to invite two or three surgeons to their vestry meetings, in order to see who would undertake the management of the sick poor at the lowest price. In the days of which I am writing, compared with the present time, friendly societies were very few in number, and most of them were not attended by contract: but now these societies have received very great augmentations, and the members are admitted to receive medical attendance at the rate of three shillings per head, including everything excepting fracture of legs or arm, and leeches.

The above rate of charge is certainly not a remunerating one for the surgeon, but such (with a little alteration) as he would be contented with, provided the members requiring his aid should be strictly confined to the poor man and journeyman mechanic, and also that he (the medical man) is not required to go too far from his residence. But when a class of tradesmen are introduced, such as grocers, drapers, butchers, bakers, publicans, &c. &c., I really feel quite astonished, and wonder how they can degrade themselves and inflict such serious injustice upon the medical man as to expect to be attended at the same rate as a poor labouring man, or medical-club patient. I really cannot think how such a class of respectable men can so far forget themselves and the position they hold in society, as to think they are proper objects to be admitted upon the poor man's scale of remuneration to his medical attendant. I have always found the above class of people to require much more attendance and attention than the poor man. I have had for the last few years not less than between four and five hundred self-aiding medical-club patients under my care, strictly confined to the labourer and journeyman mechanic. I have two-and-sixpence per head for a male, and three shillings for a female club patient, and I have no hesitation in saying that (after making all deductions and drawbacks, such as visiting members early to place them on their club-books, writing certificates, &c. &c., with all expenses connected with the society) the Poor Man's Medical Club is quite as good and profitable to the surgeon as the societies of Odd Fellows and Foresters.

I think it would not be amiss to state here, that, on union account, in cases of accident, the pay the surgeon receives is as follows:—viz., £5 for compound fracture of the leg or thigh;