mote superstition, than the reasonable determination of men interested in the welfare of the human species; we would, therefore, propose that the Council appoint a conjoint Medical and Surgical Board, not more than one half to consist of members of the Council; the office of such Board being to examine candidates for the membership in all those sciences, whose knowledge may be considered essential to the formation of a competent medical and surgical practitioner.

4. Consolidation, not extension of our existing Institutions, seems on all accounts most desirable, provided, at the same time, a rule of equity and justice be meted out to all existing members of the College; and this brings us naturally to a clear and decided expression of our opinion that the selection to the fellowship, under the Charter of 1813, has been a palpable infringement of the rights of those existing members of the College, for whom we claim, as a right, under a Supplementary Charter, admission to the fellowship; with this proviso, that they be of ten years' standing, that they produce testimonials of good character, and that they engage neither to retail drugs, nor to make the remuneration of their services dependent on the quantity of medicine supplied to their patients; and that, on the same conditions, all those who were members previous to the grant of the last Charter, be made fellows in rotation, as soon as they shall have been members ten years.

5. Future members, as well as those who have passed since the Charter of 1843, to be elected fellows by examination only, or as the reward of merit, at the discretion of the Council.

6. The age of admission to members we would fix at twenty-two, a period of five years having been devoted to professional studies, not less than three of which should be connected with hospital practice.

7. The examination for the membership and fellowship to be open to the fellows and members of the College.

8. We deem it necessary that the number of the Council be increased by an infusion of provincial surgeons, whether practising surgery alone, or surgery, medicine, and midwifery conjointly; but no fellow to be eligible to the Council who dispenses his own medicines.

9. The Meetings of the Council to be open to the fellows.

January, 1846.

DR. LOCOCK'S LETTER ON THE MAL-APPROPRIATION OF HIS NAME BY THE QUACKS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I willingly acknowledge that I have reason to be gratified both with the manner and the spirit with which you have been pleased, in your last number, to call the attention of your readers to the shameful way in which notorious quacks had made use of my name.

You are wrong, however, in supposing that I have taken no steps to put down such conduct, and that I would not be desirous of getting rid of such a serious personal annoyance, were it possible.

By the advice of several of my medical friends, in whose judgment and knowledge of the world I had full confidence, I refrained from inserting any disclaiming letters in the newspapers; agreeing with them that it would lead to endless trouble, from the constant repetition of the quack advertisements, and from the very numerous country papers, magazines, journals, &c., in which they are daily inserted. Unless my repudiation appeared nearly as often as the advertisements, no effectual counteraction could be obtained.

I took the advice also of an eminent lawyer as to the propriety of applying to the Court of Chancery for an injunction, but the opinion returned to me was decisive. I quote the following passage:—"I fear you must continue to bear the annoyance of which you complain, because it is clear to me, that as you can prove neither loss nor damage by the sale of Dr. Locock's wafers, you have no remedy either at law or equity."

Three years ago, the death of my father, Dr. Henry Locock, appeared in the papers. He had retired from practice for more than twenty years, and I have ascertained was totally unacquainted with "Lady Dick." Not till after his death did the Corn-cutter at Charing-cross ever venture to publish a pretended certificate, without either date or address, signed "Henry Locock, M.D." But it is evident that as my name is not Henry, and my father's death has prevented any contradiction from him, it is not in my power to prevent or to stop such a dishonest proceeding.

It was also not till after my father's death that these pretended Pulmonic wafers were advertised; and in the printed

hand-bills which accompany the box, I found that the composition of the drug was attributed to Dr. H. Locock.

It was in this way that the fraud on the public was concocted; and I am afraid that I am likely to have no other redress than has fallen to the lot of others who have been similarly circumstanced. Every one will remember, a few years ago, the constant paragraphs in the newspapers puffing off *Ashley Cooper's pills*.

I do not wish to occupy your space with so unworthy a subject; but I was anxious that my professional brethren should not suppose that I was otherwise than seriously annoyed by such a breach of honesty; or that I was indifferent to your well-meant lecture on my apparent inertness.

The only other remark I take the liberty of making is, that you are mistaken in supposing I have any present intention of retiring from practice. If your paragraph to the contrary remained uncontradicted, I might perhaps be able to "prove both loss and damage."

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES LOCOCK, M.D.

Hertford-street, May-fair, March, 1846.

ON THE CASE OF RUPTURED UTERUS REPORTED BY MR. TYTE, SURGEON, HARROW.

LETTER FROM MR. TYTE IN REPLY TO MR. D. JONES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In No. 8 of THE LANCET for 1846, page 229, there is a summary of my case of rupture of the uterus, and some remarks thereon by Mr. David G. Jones: the former is not quite correct, as it states, amongst other things, that the head was so far advanced as to press upon and dilate the perinæum,—my statement being, that the head had descended low in the pelvis, slightly dilating the perinæum,—and omits to mention that I had attended the patient three years before through a tedious labour. Mr. Jones characterizes the treatment as unusual, and says that it ought not to pass unnoticed, from the extraordinary manner in which it was conducted, repeating the statement I have corrected above, that the head was pressing upon, and dilating, the perinæum. If I have erred in my mode of conducting the case, I have the satisfaction of having done so in excellent company, as the following quotation from Dr. R. Lee's lectures on midwifery, page 435, will show.

"When the head of the child presents, and rupture of the uterus takes place, the best plan is without delay to deliver with the perforator and crotchet; and to prevent the child, during the operation, from passing through the rent into the peritoneal sac, pressure should be made over the fundus uteri, and the opening made in the head in the most gentle manner. I have seen no case of ruptured uterus in which it was possible to deliver with the forceps; and I am not aware that any case of ruptured uterus has been recorded in which a living child was delivered with the forceps. 'Efforts have frequently been made to deliver with the forceps in such cases,' says Dr. Collins, 'but this instrument is seldom applicable, as the introduction of the blades generally forces the head out of our reach; besides, but little would be gained, for the child dies shortly after rupture takes place; the dimensions, too, of the pelvis are in such cases for the most part defective; all which circumstances would seem strongly opposed to this mode of delivery. In three of the thirty-four cases above alluded to, attempts were carefully made to deliver with the forceps, but without success.' Dr. Burns is of a different opinion. He says, the child may live for hours, after rupture of the uterus, if the placenta be not detached, or the hemorrhage great. If the head have entered the pelvis, and be within reach of the forceps, we must cautiously introduce the blades, taking great care not to press upon the head or make it recede. From this hazard, and from observing that in such cases the child is generally dead, it has been advised by good authorities to perforate the head; but if we have no other inducement to use the perforator, I should consider that, unless the head be high, the forceps would be as safe in this respect."

This quotation, which may perhaps not quite accord with Mr. Jones's modern views on midwifery, will, I think, bear me out in my treatment.

It will be observed, that when we proceeded to deliver, the head had receded somewhat, but was in the cavity of the pelvis; there had been no labour pains of any utility for upwards of fifteen hours; her pulse flagged, and she had vomited. Every practitioner ought to be aware, as Mr. Jones says, that vomiting is a frequent occurrence during labour, and I think also, of some other information quoted above; but taken in connexion with the rest of the symptoms, who could

question that delivery ought to be at once effected? The difficulty with the vectis and forceps arose from the frequent recession of the head, for, as Mr. Jones remarks, there was no impaction; and he wishes to impress upon your readers, that he could have performed an operation in little more than half an hour, which the highest authorities in the art never knew to have been done, and believe to be an impossibility. The same cause (the recession) produced great difficulty in the perforation of the head, and the extraction of the child appeared to be impeded by spasmodic contraction of the fundus and body of the uterus around it. I contend, then, that, from the general circumstances of the case, we were imperatively called upon to deliver, and that the post mortem satisfactorily accounts for the difficulty in the use of the instruments, by revealing the ruptured state of the uterus, and that the practice pursued is sanctioned by high and multiplied authority, and I do not believe that any competent judge would question it.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

Harrow, February, 1846.

EDWARD C. TYTE.

ROYAL MEDICAL AND CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY.

(THE BUST OF THE SURGICAL JANUS.)

WE have received the following note from Dr. Cursham, and readily place it in our columns. It certainly was a lucky and well-timed accident which led to the removal of an offensive resemblance to a bad original.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you do me the favour to state in the next number of *THE LANCET*,—that the removal of Mr. Lawrence's bust (along with that of Dr. Bright) was merely a temporary arrangement, until additional brackets were put up in the library, and that the Council had no knowledge whatever of this proceeding, which originated entirely with myself.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

GEORGE CURSHAM,
Hon. Sec. to the Royal Medical
and Chirurgical Society.

Saville-row, March, 1846.

ON REFLEX MUSCULAR ACTIONS.

NOTE FROM MR. W. ANDERSON, RUTLAND.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have not the slightest desire to occupy your pages with prolonged controversy upon the reflex muscular actions; nor is it at all in accordance with my taste and habits to retort the spirit and language of the letter signed "Vindex," in your last number. I could, however, serve him in his own strain, if I did not deem the subject of too important a nature to be treated with levities such as are found in Peter Pindar. In matters of science, the employment of the poignant shafts of wit, raillery, or satire, by men pretending to a scientific character, is, to say the least, inapt and unbecoming: such weapons better become the unphilosophic. Regarding medicine as a boon from the Creator to suffering humanity, I consider that it is the duty of the members of the profession to cultivate it in a calm and dispassionate spirit of philanthropy; and how much soever it may be regretted, that doctrines now established upon the firm basis of truth (and which have immortalized the names of the founders) were opposed by ignorance, prejudice, and passion, we are not warranted in receiving any new doctrine without a full and searching investigation of its merits. If it withstand such investigation—if its truth appear ultimately in native lustre to the entire conviction of the world, it will be the more durable, and its author's name will be deservedly handed down to posterity, associated with an imperishable fame. I revere the memory of Harvey, Hunter, Sydenham—of Galileo and Kepler—and of others less illustrious who have advanced the cause of science—of medical science and humanity. I respect the name of Dr. Marshall Hall, but I can see no reason why his new doctrines should be encircled with the halo of sanctity with which "Vindex" would shield them from the scrutiny of the profession. Whether they be proved to be true or erroneous, Dr. Marshall Hall has merited his wreath, by turning the attention of the profession to the inquiry of a subject most important in human physiology and pathology; but I cannot help thinking, that such intemperate zeal as is manifested in the letter of "Vindex" will do more to unsettle the new doctrine of the independent function of the spinal marrow, than all the arguments brought against it by its opponents. He brings

into the field the same intolerant spirit of dogmatical denunciation in defence of his conviction, which he would no doubt loudly deprecate, if exercised against it.

It is, indeed, a grave and serious matter to appear before an entire profession charged with ignorance of so small a portion of the human structure as the olfactory nerve, and it was no little relief to me to find, at the conclusion, that that entire profession is included, "at one fell swoop," in a charge of ignorance also. For my own part, so obtuse are my faculties, that my ignorance cannot perceive its egregious error. I cannot, in my conscience, plead guilty to the charge, nor can I see that my accuser has substantiated it against me. I have not interfered with the anatomy of the olfactory, but I am disposed to repeat, that, in viewing the function of that nerve,—when I see impressions made upon its sentient extremity, followed immediately by certain muscular phenomena,—I regard them in the relation of cause and effect, notwithstanding the intervention of a sensation.

I shall now, Sir, for the present, withdraw from this subject; but if I live, I shall return to it another day, when more fortified by facts deduced from observation, &c.

Oakham, Rutland, Feb. 1846.

W. ANDERSON.

** We regret that, from the crowded state of our columns, we could not conveniently publish the whole of the letter of Mr. Anderson. Confident are we that the discovery made by Dr. MARSHALL HALL is one of the most brilliant to be found in the records of physiology. Mr. Anderson will find the subject to be in every respect worthy of his most attentive consideration.—Ed. L.

A NATIONAL FACULTY OF MEDICINE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I was very much gratified on reading your editorial remarks contained in *THE LANCET* for February 28th, concerning the formation of a NATIONAL FACULTY OF MEDICINE, together with the resolutions of the Council of the British Medical Association on the same subject. Both of these, if I mistake not, contain the elements of much good to the profession. Certain it is, the time has now arrived when nothing short of a National Faculty will satisfy the requirements of our body; and the sooner the British Medical Association buckles on its armour, and commences the honourable fight for it, the better.

No institution, as it appears to me, has stood its ground more faithfully in professional opinion than this, and no institution is more capable of originating a scheme of voluntary organization for this purpose. These views have not been hastily forced on my belief; for as yet I have not attached myself to any reform association whatever. I have been content to be a quiet, unobtrusive observer of all such matters. The time, however, has now arrived when I cannot help believing, that if the profession would but rouse from its extraordinary apathy, and be more united, each part making some concessions for the general good,—no portion of it asking for too much,—a Faculty of Medicine might be formed, (say for England, as a starting point), which, by its system of representative government, its mode of conducting the education of candidates for the profession, its rewards for scientific medical improvements and discoveries, its registration of all classes of the profession, &c. &c., must ultimately, if not speedily, force itself on the notice of the government. The profession cannot possibly remain much longer in its present anomalous condition; something must be done, and that soon, to ameliorate it, or it will not long exist as a profession. * * * The existing institutions might remain as they are. Let the College of Physicians grant the diploma of physician, the College of Surgeons that of surgeon,—let the surgeon who wishes to practise pharmacy in addition, apply to the Apothecaries' Company,—let all these elements be for the present incorporated in a Faculty of Medicine,—let the faculty register these diplomas, and publish the list, annually, of physicians and surgeons thus entitled to practise,—let the moneys thus acquired, and by the registration of all students entering the profession, be appropriated to the cause of medical science, in granting premiums for valuable discoveries and improvements in all the departments of medical science, with the publication of an annual registration list, a national Pharmacopœia, &c. &c. * * * To the British Medical Association I would say, "You are the only body who ought to undertake the management of this matter;" and to the profession, and more especially to the surgeons in general practice, (really the bulk of