MEDICAL REFORM.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

(COPY.)

*To the Right Honourable Lord Viscount Palmerston, G.C.B.,
Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department.*

The Memorial of the undersigned Lecturers in the Medical Department of the Newcastle-on-Tyne College of Practical Science, humbly sheweth,—

That your Lordship's memorialists have had their attention directed to a Bill now before Parliament, by which it is proposed to grant certain privileges to the medical graduates of the University of Durham, which concessions, in the opinion of your memorialists, would operate to the general disadvantage of the medical profession in England, and be productive of considerable private injury to your memorialists.

That the only means of affording medical education possessed by the University of Durham, is a School or College in Newcastle, maintained by that University in opposition to your memorialists.

That attendance on the lectures delivered in that School is enforced, by the existing statutes of the University of Durham, as an essential preliminary to medical graduation in that institution; and that, as yet, there are no graduates in the University of Durham who have obtained a medical degree by examination.

That the conduct of the University of Durham, in recently attempting to create a new class of medical practitioners, with inferior qualifications, under the title of Licentiates in Medicine, and in announcing that those licentiates could practise on equal terms with the members of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, was a violation of the rights of those national medical institutions, which would probably be revived, were the Legislature to recognise the claims to a *quasi* independent medical jurisdiction now put forth by the University of Durham.

That the authorities of the University of Durham, taking advantage of a temporary difference amongst members of the medical profession resident in Newcastle, have endeavoured to obtain a degree of ascendancy over medical education, which your Lordship's memorialists believe to be incompatible with the honour and independence of their profession, and calculated to retard the advancement of medical science in the north of England.

That the interference of the University of Durham with the institutions of Newcastle has also been productive of considerable injury to the inhabitants of the latter town generally, by prolonging discord, by impeding the progress of industrial education amongst the working classes, and by forcing into a position of antagonism to an important church institution many who, like your memorialists, are members of the Church of England, and warmly attached to its principles.

Under these circumstances, your memorialists humbly hope that your Lordship will be pleased to oppose the Bill now before Parliament, and adopt such further measures as may appear to your Lordship necessary for the protection of the interests of the medical profession, and for the general welfare of the community in this district.

(Signed) JOHN FIFE, KNT., F.R.C.S., &c. &c.
H. G. POTTER, F.R.C.S.
GEORGE ROBINSON, M.D.
WILLIAM DAWSON, M.D.
S. W. RAYNE, M.R.C.S.
H. W. FIFE, M.R.C.S.
J. B. FIFE, M.R.C.S.
THOS. A. FURNESS, M.R.C.S.

(COPY.)

Whitehall, June 14, 1854.

SIR,—I am directed by Viscount Palmerston to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., inclosing a Memorial from the Lecturers in the Medical Department of the Newcastle College of Practical Science.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Sir John Fife, Newcastle-on-Tyne. H. WADDINGTON.

PARIS UNIVERSAL EXHIBITION OF 1855.—A meeting of the surgical instrument-makers and cutlers of the metropolis was held on the 30th ult., at Marlborough-house, at the invitation of the Board of Trade, to advise the officers of the department of Science and Art in making the preliminary arrangements for the Paris Exhibition.

DR. CORMACK'S VOTE AT THE ROYAL MEDICAL AND CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY.

THE following correspondence has taken place with respect to Dr. Cormack's vote:—

[NOTE FROM DR. DRUITT.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—A paragraph appeared in THE LANCET of June 24, respecting a vote alleged to have been given by Dr. Cormack at a certain meeting of the Royal Medico-Chirurgical Society. In that paragraph my name was introduced, and thus I am made to appear as a witness in the case. May I appeal to your courtesy to allow me to state that the paragraph in question was inserted without my knowledge or consent, and that I have not the faintest recollection of any circumstance relating to the vote which Dr. Cormack did or did not give? and further, that I have no doubt whatever of Dr. Cormack's veracity.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Curzon-street, July 1, 1854. ROBERT DRUITT.

[THE SUB-EDITOR OF "THE LANCET" TO DR. DRUITT.]

SIR,—I am directed by the Editor of THE LANCET to inform you that your note, dated July 1, shall appear in the journal of this week. As Dr. Tanner distinctly asserts that the conversation to which your note refers took place, the Editor would be glad to know whether your communication is intended to convey a contradiction of that statement.

[DR. DRUITT'S REPLY.]

SIR,—I have no distinct recollection of the conversation stated to have taken place between Dr. Tanner and myself; yet, having implicit confidence in Dr. Tanner's honour, I believe that it did take place, though I have forgotten it.

The sole object of my note of the 1st was to avoid being dragged in as a sort of witness in a case where the truthfulness of a gentleman was disputed. I did not see Dr. Cormack vote, neither did I see him do the contrary. I know nothing of the facts. I am not a witness, and anything said by Dr. Tanner to me then or at any other time does not make me one.

In this as in other cases, where great excitement has been created, I believe the memory of the most conscientious man may err as to a matter of fact. I infinitely prefer this way of explaining the discrepancy, and would not accuse either Dr. Cormack or Dr. O'Connor of wilful falsehood. At all events, I beg that my name may not be dragged into any controversy in which the veracity of a gentleman is disputed.

In order to do justice to both parties, perhaps you will be good enough to state that, in washing my own hands of the matter, I no more desire to be understood as implicating Dr. O'Connor than Dr. Cormack.

I am, Sir, with thanks for your courtesy,
Your obedient servant,
39 A, Curzon-street, July 4, 1854. R. DRUITT.

[THE SUB-EDITOR OF "THE LANCET" TO DR. TANNER.]

THE LANCET Office, July 3, 1854.

SIR,—The Editor of THE LANCET has requested me to beg your attention to a Notice to Correspondents contained in that journal of June 24, in which your name appears. He would feel obliged if you would inform him whether the statement there made be strictly correct, so far as concerns yourself.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Dr. Tanner. THE SUB-EDITOR OF "THE LANCET."

[DR. TANNER'S REPLY.]

July 3, 1854.

SIR,—In reply to your inquiry, I beg to say that the statement contained in the Notice to Correspondents, in THE LANCET, June 24, is strictly correct as far as regards myself.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
The Sub-Editor of THE LANCET. T. H. TANNER.

APPOINTMENTS.—At a general meeting of the governors, held on Wednesday, the 5th ult., Dr. J. C. Hall, Dr. J. Law, and Dr. C. Elam, were unanimously elected physicians to the Sheffield Public Dispensary.