on the strength of the Bill introduced into the House last year, "whole hosts of men flocked to Aberdeen and St. Andrew's for degrees, expecting by those easily-obtained diplomas to be admitted into the London College." But this objection will not apply to *Edinburgh* graduates, as the number of gentlemen who took their degrees there last year was *at least one-half less than usual*. Why, in the name of fortune, not admit all British M.D.'s who have completed their twenty-sixth year, without examination, and on paying a reduced fee? That would be at once fair, honourable, and conciliatory. But at the very least, all *Edinburgh* graduates and fellows of the *Edinburgh* College of Physicians, twenty-six years of age, ought, undoubtedly, to be so admitted, should they wish it.

I hope, Sir, you will kindly consider this point in your place in Parliament, and also publish this note in your next number, that the above exclusive and insulting rule may be resisted in time. Yours respectfully,

May 17, 1845.

M.D. EDIN.

THE "ONE PORTAL" OF THE PROFESSION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department professes to be anxious that *all* should enter the medical profession through one portal, and in the Bill about to be again submitted to the consideration of Parliament, he has introduced a most objectionable provision to secure that object; but if he had consulted the public safety, he would have made that entrance through the portal of the general practitioners. Nature draws no distinction between medicine and surgery; and before a man should be permitted to practise a *part* of his profession, he ought to be *compelled* to make himself master of the *whole*. Then, and not till then, may he be safely allowed to practise whatsoever *branch* of it his inclination or his circumstances may determine; and then, also, if he covet the distinction of "a pure surgeon or a pure physician," in the name of all that is *puerile*, let him enjoy it.

I have called Sir James Graham's provision a most objectionable one, but it is much more than that; it is most degrading and most odious, for it renders it *imperative* upon every one wishing to enter the medical profession, *first* to obtain the permission, consent, or "*licence*," as it is smoothly termed, of a set of semi-qualified monopolists, directly opposed to the respectability and interests of the general practitioner. But even if that were not the case, the proposition is in itself so monstrous, so gross a violation of the liberty of the subject, that it cannot be contemplated but with united feelings of indignation and disgust. What! Is it come to this? Must an Englishman ask permission to make the science of medicine his study and profession? Apply the same regulation to law, to divinity, or to any other pursuit, and its tyrannical character will become at once self-evident. Most emphatically and most solemnly, do I protest against such an enormity; and most earnestly do I entreat you, both in the house and out of the house, to raise your voice against it.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, yours very respectfully,

J. BEDINGFIELD.

Stowmarket, May 24th, 1845.

DUTY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COLLEGE TOWARDS THAT INSTITUTION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Having sent my name, together with the names of some of my professional neighbours, for enrolment in the list of the Association of General Practitioners in Medicine, Surgery, and Midwifery, in the hope that so large a body as the Association now numbers would, by expressing its determination to use every legitimate means in its power, induce the Council of the College of Surgeons to acquiesce in its wishes; and finding, that instead of this most desirable issue, the College itself is to be at once abandoned by its present, and those who would become its future members, by the setting up of some new institution *in opposition* to it, I have this day addressed a note to Messrs. Bird and Ancell, requesting them to erase my name from the list of the Association.

To avoid the charge of inconsistency, I beg to state some of my reasons for so doing: First—Until it was announced by the Committee, "that, from the outset, it had been their intention to obtain a separate corporation," I had entertained a hope (as stated above) that an adjustment would be brought about between the Council and the members of the College. Secondly—I would beg to remind the members of the College, collectively and individually, of the *oath* which they and I took and subscribed our names to when we were admitted.

The oath concludes thus, "and, to the utmost of your power,

maintain the dignity and welfare of the College—so help you God." Now, notwithstanding the Council of the College have, by their recent charter, inflicted so much injustice on the great body of its members as to furnish them with "a reasonable excuse for resisting their ordinances," (another part of the above oath,) it by no means follows that the members are to desert the institution, the dignity and welfare of which they have sworn to maintain to the utmost of their power.

Most respectfully and earnestly do I entreat every member of the College to bear in mind this oath which he has taken. In joining to set up a new College, we should not only virtually, but actually, violate this sacred obligation, by doing that which (if carried into effect) must eventually be the ruin of the present College, to which we belong, and we should justly be taunted by the whole world for our perfidy.

The general practitioners must ever constitute the great bulk of the profession in this kingdom—if, therefore, a new establishment is to be raised, how is it to be supported but by the fees paid by its future members? And how, then, I would ask, is the present College to be kept up, and what is to become of its unrivalled museum and library, together with all the benefits it is capable of diffusing amongst its members, for the public good?

Although as a member of the College of Surgeons I feel that I am degraded and insulted by the recent Charter, and no less so by the scandalous manifesto of the Council, nevertheless, I feel that nothing can absolve me from the *oath which I took when admitted*. In conclusion, permit me to add that I am ready to join in any scheme for rescuing the College from its present untoward position, yet I will never voluntarily sever myself from it, nor knowingly do that which may contribute (if followed by others) to degrade that noble institution.

Most cordially thanking you for your long and unwearied exertions for the real welfare of the profession, and of the general practitioner in particular, I remain, Sir,

Your obedient and obliged servant,

Honiton, May 26th, 1845.

J. C. JERRARD.

OPINIONS OF THE PROFESSION ON MEDICAL LEGISLATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Lest the Hanover-square-room Committee should construe silence into approval of their proceedings, it would be advisable for provincial practitioners to break it. How is this to be accomplished? There cannot be a doubt that all are deeply anxious respecting the present state of affairs. Two matters agitate the medical world:—1st, That of separate incorporation of general practitioners; 2ndly, Their enfranchisement in the College of Surgeons.

Have these questions been put to the country practitioners? No. They have been harassed with "reports," and perplexed with paltry questions; but their deliberate opinion on these two main questions has not been obtained. Then how can it be obtained? Their pressing duties will not suffer the mass to visit the metropolis, therefore an earnest, brief, simple appeal, by circular, should be made to the members of the profession, calling upon them to express their approval, by a monosyllable, either for a separate incorporation or enfranchisement in the college. The result must be decisive in character.—Yours, &c.,

CHARLES SIMPSON, M.R.C.S.L. & L.A.C.

Stamford, May 26th, 1845.

* * Although the members of the profession cannot express their opinions personally at any meeting or meetings in London, yet they may fully and effectually accomplish the object described by our correspondent, by means of a system of *district representation*; a system that ought to be adopted in electing the CONFERENCE.

THE AMENDED BILL AND THE APOTHECARY-CHARTER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Permit me to make a few remarks on matters connected with the amended Medical Bill and proposed new Charter, and the commentaries upon them contained in THE LANCET. In my humble opinion, no man, whether the Editor of any medical periodical, or any other person, has rendered services for the reformation of our medical and surgical corporations, and the management of our magnificent public medical institutions, at all approximating, in value and importance, to those rendered by yourself, and promulgated, and, as far as possible, reduced to practice, through the medium of THE LANCET. And although your leading articles have occasionally been very stringent and awakening, yet they have not been more so than the frailties of human nature, and