in the form of uric acid." We must know, therefore, whether the experiments of Majendie were performed on purely carnivorous animals, or the contrary; and we must also know, whether Dr. Ayres has tried on purely carnivorous animals the experiment of feeding one with albumen, and the other with gelatine; and whether he has tried on animals, whose respiratory processes require a more carbonaceous diet, the experiment of feeding one with pure starch and albumen, and the other with pure starch and gelatine; as this would at once determine whether the chemical processes in the organism have the power of converting gelatine into proteine.

I think I am justified in supposing, from the great research and tentative habit of Liebig, that *he* has thus experimented. I wish to learn from the learned admirers of Liebig if that be not the fact.—I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

Nov. 9th, 1845.

JOHN CHAPPELLSMITH.

THE PROJECTED COLLEGE OF APOTHECARIES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Should you think the following observations worthy a place in *THE LANCET*, you will oblige me by giving them to your readers, many of whom may continue, like myself, members of the National Association. You will perceive that I principally reiterate, with a few reflections, statements which have been made by yourself, and recently included in the very temperate and well-digested address of the LONDON COMMITTEE OF ASSOCIATED SURGEONS. What measures the Committee of the National Association may take in reference to the last amended Medical Bill, I am not prepared to anticipate, but I hope they will be induced to abandon a New College altogether, unless we can obtain it on proper terms. Now, if, as you say, the New College would not have the power to originate its own curriculum, nor, by a final examination of its members, to confer a qualification for 'practice, I ask, in the name of common sense, what would the New College be without such fundamental provisions? Would it not be worse than a toy-shop, to please lunatics and take their money? When first the Medical Reform Bill came out, the questions of education, qualification, registration, and quackery, engaged mostly our attention; but the apple of discord cast amongst us by the opprobrious charter has been sufficient, unhappily, to divert us from the straightforward path, and unless we unite in some well-defined object, as you predict, the next session of Parliament will settle our disputes in a way we may not like. It was also unfortunate that the National Association set out with the unconditional resolution for a New College; but as the Committee did afterwards entertain the question of adjustment with the College of Surgeons, they have admitted the principle of departure from that resolution, and given to us the privilege of exercising our judgment in favour of a New College or an alliance with the Old, according to circumstances. The strong objection to a New College, and which appears to have been somewhat overlooked in the indignant rising of the National Association, must always be, the want of uniformity and assimilation it would have with the excellent principle of legislation sought to be carried out for the three kingdoms. In the present constitution of grades belonging to the profession, so powerfully fixed by the old colleges, and by custom, we cannot interfere; but it appears to me we have a right to raise the question, whether the physician and pure surgeon should not first pass the examination of a general practitioner, by which he would obtain more public confidence, and more confidence and respect from the general practitioner he is called upon to meet in consultation. In the above remarks, I do not wish to prejudice the Committee of the National Association, but I would respectfully bespeak their attention, and that of all my brethren, that we ought, if possible, to become reconciled to the old colleges, and that should we fail to do so, not to accept a New College minus the two important provisions before mentioned.

I remain, Sir, your very obliged servant,
Halesworth, Nov. 10th. THOS. STOKES, M.R.C.S.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.—THE FUTURE STEPS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The "Resolution," against the fourth Medical Bill, come to by the Committee of the "National Association of General Practitioners," at their last meeting, augurs well for the cause of medical reform, it being, at once, the proof conclusive of the soundness of the views entertained by you, and those who are acting with you, as well as the demonstration incontrovertible of the erroneous character of those upon which that Committee has hitherto acted.

Charged, hitherto, with an utter want of judgment, with bad

faith, with imbecility and cunning—want of judgment, in wasting its efforts for the attainment of an object neither practicable nor desirable—bad faith, in its solitary negotiation with the College of Surgeons—imbecility, in the concession of every disputed point—and cunning, in having, by an unworthy artifice, deferred for so long a time the discussion of the minister's fourth and last Bill—it now stands convicted of gross inconsistency in condemning a measure, not essentially different from that in favour of which it so recently pronounced a strong verdict.

This "Resolution" I regard, not as a token of repentance, but rather as a manœuvre of the enemy, adopted in the expectation that through it some portion of the lost confidence of the profession may be regained, whom they would desire to suppose, that whatever their past errors may have been, their future conduct will be irreproachable. Let the profession, however, judge of the future by the past, and consider, that men who could wander out of the right path so widely, may again miss their way. Duped once, I would be chary of being made a dupe a second time.

There are now, as ever, two propositions before the profession, the one impracticable and undesirable—viz., separate incorporations; the other, attainable and most desirable, *id est*, enfranchisement in the College of Surgeons. The former proposal has been tried, and found wanting, for the attainment of the latter, no sustained and vigorous efforts have been instituted.

But one honourable course of conduct remains to the Committee of the National Association, and that is, forgetting self, and giving up their insane attempt at the establishment of third incorporation, which must, in the very nature of things, be ever an inferior and subordinate institution, for them to unite their efforts to those of that large and intelligent portion of the profession who are striving after a just recognition of the undoubted rights of the surgeons of this country in their own institution.

The questions remain to be asked, however, Will the Committee adopt this wholesome advice? Will it abandon its darling project of a new Apothecaries Act? I fear not, the old leaven will ere long, I strongly suspect, reappear. The eyes of the profession are now open, however; they will not so easily be caught slumbering again.—I am, Sir, very faithfully yours,

Notting Hill, November 12th, 1845.

AUTHUR HASSALL.

THE LAWLESS AND SECRET COMMITTEE.

"To the Hon. Secretaries of the National Association."

GENTLEMEN,—We, the undersigned, hereby request you to withdraw our names from the list of members of the National Association of General Practitioners; our doing so will intimate to you our dissatisfaction at the proceedings of the Committee of the said Association, and our want of confidence in it for the future.—We remain, Gentlemen, your obedient servants,

"THOMAS WILLEY, Surgeon.

"THOMAS WILLEY, jun., M.R.C.S.E., &c.

"W. H. MAY, M.R.C.S.E.

"Leicester, Nov. 25, 1845."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—We have, by this day's post, in a letter, of which the above is a copy, withdrawn our names from the list of members of the National Association, being unwilling any longer to sanction a lawless, irresponsible, self-elected, permanent Committee, whose proceedings have (by their own reporting) been at total variance with the interests of the general practitioner. We beg to add, that we are amongst those who owe to you their best thanks for the interest you have *always* taken in the cause of medical reform.—We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

THOMAS WILLEY.

THOMAS WILLEY, jun.

W. H. MAY.

Leicester, Nov. 25th.

MR. HAMMOND AND THE ANDOVER UNION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—From your observations on my conduct in your number of the 22nd inst., it is quite evident that you have been totally misled as to the nature of the affair between the Board of Guardians and Mr. Westlake.

With regard to myself, it was quite impossible that I could act otherwise than as I did, when I was expressly requested by the Board to fulfil the duties of that gentleman while under suspension.

Were the poor residing in the house, and in the parish at large, to be left wholly uncared for?

As there can be but one reply to this question, I shall not trouble myself to enter further into the matter, merely suggesting that it is not impossible that I may have as large a share of professional "esprit" as my neighbours.

With reference to your insinuations as to my professional qualifications, it is unnecessary to do more than subscribe myself,

Your obedient servant,

OCT. HAMMOND,

A Member of the Royal College of Surgeons in London; and a Licentiate of the Society of Apothecaries.

P.S.—I must beg the insertion of the above in your next number.

Andover, Nov. 26th, 1845.

* * MR. HAMMOND sadly miscalculates if he thinks that his explanation will prove at all satisfactory to the profession. If the *Guardians* had not known that a person was *ready and willing* to supply the place of Mr. Westlake, they would not have dared to suspend that gentleman from his office.—ED. L.

PROFESSIONAL GRADES AND DUTIES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Whatever emanates from the pen of Mr. Rumsey* on the question of medical politics, whether given avowedly, or under his quondam assumption, "*RURICOLA*," is likely to receive an attentive consideration. It is this, then, that induces me to point out what I believe to be the false position he has taken up in his letter on the College Fellowship question, in *THE LANCET* for Nov. 15th.

According to his own view of the case, he ought himself to have been excluded from the fellowship even after examination. He would confer the title on no one who is directly or indirectly an apothecary! The often mooted question then comes, Who is, and who is not, an apothecary? To say nothing of practitioners prior to 1815, my own opinion is, that every licentiate of the Hall is legally and actually an apothecary. He may be something in addition—a surgeon, or clergyman, if he will,—but he cannot be less. Clearly there is not a doubt upon the point, that neither the act of prescribing nor that of dispensing makes a man an apothecary. If the former, physicians would be entitled; if the latter, druggists. "Once a captain always a captain," is an adage, and he who was surgeon-apothecary at Chesham is surgeon-apothecary still, although he lives at Gloucester. Nor does the way in which he chooses to be paid for his services alter the question. It may, for aught I know, be something very high-minded, very disinterested, to say that you must be paid in this or that way, that your fee is honorary. But how would the honorary-loving recipient of a patient's fees look if the fees were habitually withheld. Unutterable things enough, I suspect. The fact, however, cannot and need not be concealed, that "the labourer is worthy of his hire," and he who performs certain services for another should be placed in a position to demand remuneration. But, after all, is there anything so shocking in the mode of charging for "visits" as to justify the exclusion of the person from the fellowship? The very notion is ludicrous, and stultifies itself. To visit, is to attend upon: attendance may be either at home or abroad. The physician or "pure" surgeon who is consulted by a patient, attends on that patient. For his attendance on the patient what does the physician or pure surgeon expect?—Money. What does Mr. Wakley expect for performing the duties of coroner for Middlesex?—Money. What does Sir James Graham expect for doing the onerous and responsible duties of Secretary of State? To say nothing of power—Money. What do the clergy expect, and take care to get, for their holy aid?—Money. What does every man expect who renders services to another—what is he entitled to?—Money. All seek it; all require it. There is nothing like it. The mare will not go without it. Is it not, then, the height of squeamishness and absurdity to quarrel amongst ourselves about the mode of payment, and to assert that one mode more than another justifies the exclusion of men of honour and intellect from scientific distinction!

But, then, to practise pharmacy! that is bad indeed! A "surgeon," a *pure*, honourable man,—may plaster and cauterize the dirty buttock of a beggar; his doing so will be a proper and *intellectual* act, (?) and not render him unfit for collegiate renown; but if he cure indigestion, or irritation consequent on local disease, and, as a safer and better means of cure, make the medicine himself, and do not, as a consequence, render chamomile, calomel, as I once heard a druggist's assistant do, he becomes at once a contaminated being, unfit to tread the portals of his college, or to bear a title which men of less experience than himself have had thrust upon them! All this, however, is so self-evidently absurd, that I need not at present pursue the subject further, or apologize to Mr. Rumsey for dealing plainly with it.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

W. HEMPSON DENHAM.

Nov. 16, 1845.

* The address of Gloucester was accidentally omitted from the letter of Mr. Rumsey, page 548.—ED. L.

THE LISTS OF M.R.C.S. Eng. & L.S.A.'s.

HAVING ascertained that the name of the author of the following letter is actually, as he states, in the lists of the College of Surgeons and Apothecaries' Hall, we feel bound, as an act of justice, to give his communication full publicity.—ED. L.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the columns of your last week's journal, my name is introduced in an article condemnatory of the department of professional practice I have assigned myself, and, in addition thereto, appears a serious attack upon my character and conduct in their moral and professional relations, wherein you state, by implication, that my name is not to be found in the Hall or College lists. Common justice requires of you at least to correct that misrepresentation.—I became a member of the Hall in 1824, and of the College in 1827. The uncharitable misstatements of your "reviewer," as to the nature, titles, and tenour of my publications, I will not here dilate upon; they are before the public, and must speak for themselves. But I may be permitted to observe, that the spirit of my writings has been to unmask the empiricism you denounce, and to uphold the dignity of the profession you charge me with dishonouring.

In pursuing my career in the route of circumstances as an author and practitioner, I have by no unfair means solicited the suffrages of the public. I have advocated no nostrum, insisted upon no exclusive skill or pretension; but, on the broad basis that every or any branch of the art and science of medicine, which I was legally qualified to practise, was as open to myself as well as to another, I chose that I considered most neglected, and wherein the want of a qualified man was most felt by the public to antagonize the fearful empiricism which did and still prevails. That it is possible even the unenviable position I have taken up may be and has been conducted honourably to the world, and creditably by the individual addressing you, I fearlessly insist upon; and, except in the fact of frequent announcements, (a mere matter of enterprise, as evinced in your own columns, and by all medical authors and publishers,) but which, in my case, constitutes the serious offence, I challenge you, or any one breathing, to prove me guilty of one single act of professional dishonour.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

R. J. CULVERWELL, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.A.C., &c.

21, Arundel-street, Strand, Nov. 24, 1845.

* * It having been represented to us that another portion of our last week's REVIEW is open to misconstruction, we feel no hesitation in stating, that we did not intend to refer to Messrs. Mason and Dawson except as the authors and advertisers of the works mentioned. On referring to the lists of the Colleges, we find that they are Extra-Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, Members of the College of Surgeons, and Licentiate of the Apothecaries' Company. We certainly, in our review, condemned the titles of their books, their modes of advertising, and the works themselves, but we had no intention of imputing to them that they were the authors of extortionate practices.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

DISPENSING BY PARTICULAR DRUGGISTS.—To the Editor.—SIR: Some reflections have appeared in *THE LANCET*, on the conduct of a medical man attaching to his prescriptions (whether by printing or otherwise) the name of the particular druggist by whom he wishes those prescriptions to be compounded. This is held to be unprofessional conduct. But what is to be done in the case of a medical man who does not dispense medicines, but has always to send them to a druggist to be compounded. The probability is, that if the medical man in question does not direct them to be taken to a particular chemist, they are certain to fall into the hands of another druggist—the patron, in these parts, of medical men, who seek his fostering wings, and whose interest it is to injure that medical man's practice who does not resort to his shop? What avails attention, talent, or anything else, on the part of that surgeon, if the prescription is to fall into the hands of a person who will scarcely hesitate to alter it, or to dispense it with inferior drugs, and thus damage the reputation of the prescriber with his patients? I ask, what is to be done in such a case but to commit the prescription to the care of those who will correctly and carefully dispense it?

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

DELTA.

Nov. 8th, 1845.