form the resection of the bones of the face to a greater extent, more particularly as smaller operations of this kind had always met with success. I generally found a relapse after resection of the bones, of a much rarer occurrence, than after the operation for carcinoma, or fungus in other parts of the body; at least, the disease, in respect to its curability, is much more favourable than carcinoma of the glands. Amongst the remedies calculated to prevent a relapse, I prefer the decoction of Zittmann to all others.

Some of the operations which I have described, are, on account of their great extent, and the success which attended them, not devoid of surgical interest; but their greatest value, in a scientific point of view, is to be found, perhaps, in the fact demonstrated, that by *dividing the face along the median line*, I have suggested a new method of operating, the effect of which is to prevent the paralysis of one moiety of the face, the infallible consequence of commencing our incisions in the posterior part of the cheek.

MR. WARD'S DEFENCE
OF
IRREGULAR PRACTITIONERS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—I have been, for many years, an occasional subscriber to THE LANCET, which I regard as a valuable medium for communicating to each other, and to the medical profession generally, the individual sentiments of its respective members. There is no profession more honourable, more useful, or more important, than the medical; nor is there any other in which it is so necessary for the public to be in possession of an absolute guarantee, and certainty that all its members are men of real talent. It is because I think thus highly of the profession, and am anxious that every possible means of extending and improving its efficiency should be resorted to, for the benefit of the public, that I trouble you with a few remarks upon the *British Medical Association*, whose first anniversary is reported in the second number of your present volume as having been held in London on the 30th of Sept. last.

I do think it necessary that the public should have the best possible satisfaction that the man whom they entrust with the restoration or destruction of their health, is a man who thoroughly knows, and is perfectly aware of what he is about. For this very reason I deprecate the formation of this Association, and still more the application to Parliament to confine the study, science, and practice of medicine, surgery, &c., within its own contracted circle. I feel perfectly assured that this "liberal"

proceeding of the most "liberal" section of a "liberal" profession will, if successful, entail a large amount of injustice on the public, and especially on the poorer classes of society, who now often receive much benefit (especially in the minor cases of disease) at a cheap rate, from persons whose practice will be completely put an end to by the contemplated measure. The consequence of this, in very many instances, will be that the poor, unable to pay the charges of a "regular" practitioner, which charges, now high, will no doubt be rendered higher by the increased "respectability" of the profession, after the putting down of "quackery," will be compelled to forego the benefit of medical assistance entirely, or submit themselves to be quacked and drugged by a parcel of ignorant and inexperienced young men who, at some public institution, may be allowed to acquire that practical knowledge which is necessary for their subsequent success, at the risk and sacrifice of those whom poverty compels to become the subjects of their crude experiments, in their first essays to reduce theory to practice; this alone is a sufficient reason why we should pause before adopting the suggestion of the "Medical Association," which would oblige every person, on every trifling occasion of injury or disease, either to forego the benefit of medicine, or to incur the serious expence of calling in a "regular" practitioner.

There are no circumstances under which the stale adage of "a stitch in time saves nine," is more palpably and immediately applicable than in the early stages of disease. The simplest remedies which can be furnished by the druggist, frequently at almost no cost at all, may be sufficient to stop a disease in its infancy, and prevent its progress, when a few days would give it such a predominancy in the system as might bid defiance to all the skill and ingenuity of the ablest practitioner. I have no doubt that the knowledge of this fact induces hundreds of poor persons to make timely application to these parties, when their circumstances might render the employment of a "regular" practitioner out of the question. I do, therefore, protest against the "respectability" of the profession being enhanced, by putting money into the pockets of "regular" practitioners, at the risk of annually sacrificing an immense number of human lives, and inflicting a large amount of human suffering through the want of that attention in the earlier stages of disease, which might have stopped its progress, but which poverty compelled them to decline until the last moment. If more evidence than this were necessary that the "liberal" members of the profession who thus seek an exclusive protection, are actuated (notwithstanding all their assumptions of generous care about the public) by the most sordid motives of

pecuniary interest (apart from any other consideration), that evidence is abundantly supplied in your present number of *THE LANCET*, by the letter there inserted, in which the practice of a clergyman, who generously gives his attendance on the poor at half the "regular" prices, is unsparingly reprobated. No charge of incapacity, or want of information, is brought against the reverend practitioner, but the bare fact of his serving the poor at a lower rate of prices is made the basis of repeated applications, first to the Apothecaries' Company and then to the bishop, to put him down, and when both these applications fail, the "regulars," in the plenitude of their "liberality," would be furnished with new powers from Parliament to enable them to pillage the pockets of the sick without fear of opposition.

And why should they have these new powers? What proof do the members of this self-constituted "Medical Association" adduce, that they are the people, and that medical wisdom shall die with them? Have they reduced the healing art to a regular scientific process, which can be demonstrated to their pupils, like the making of a coat by a tailor, or a table by a cabinet-maker? If so, what mean the conflicting theories, and antagonist practices, which pervade the whole profession? Is it not notorious that different members of the profession have completely opposite methods of treating the same diseases? And is not this diversity of opinion and practice a proof that the principles of the science, which the "regulars" would thus monopolise, are not yet generally known, or clearly defined? I appeal to every candid and intelligent member of the profession, whether a large proportion of the most important therapeutic agents have not been discovered by persons who have been denominated "quacks." With what face, then, can this self-constituted "Medical Association" ask the British Parliament to shut out the future possibility of such valuable additions to that medical information of which many of them stand sorely in need?

I speak of this as a matter of public principle and interest, and not from any personal considerations; inasmuch as my own practice cannot be molested by any or all the powers of monopoly that may be granted to this pseudo-"liberal" section of the profession styling itself the "Medical Association." My practice is, almost entirely, in one of the most distressing maladies of the human frame; of the causes and cure of which the "regular" practitioners of the "liberal" self-constituted "Medical Association" are confessedly notoriously ignorant. For many years my professional attentions have been chiefly occupied with cancer and tumour, during which it has often been my lot to be called in, in those desperate cases of carcinoma which have completely baffled the

ingenuity and evinced the ignorance of the most noted "regulars." My system of treatment, at once simple and effective, forms a perfect contrast to that of the "regulars," inasmuch as I hold that, in no case is the knife necessary for the reduction of tumour or cancer, in any of their forms; while the "regulars" fall, continually, to cutting and maiming, as a cover for their ignorance of pathology, and of those therapeutic agents which would remove the malady more simply, with an infinitely less amount of suffering and anguish, and without any danger to the patient. The columns of *THE LANCET* afford me as many proofs as I can wish for of the many lives that are continually sacrificed, and the incalculable amount of agony which is needlessly inflicted on the unfortunate, through the unskilful manner in which these most painful of all maladies are treated in the London hospitals, by the very parties who are now asking Parliament to afford them the means of resting satisfied and contented in their ignorance, by paralysing every hand, and closing every mouth, that may attempt the dissipation of that mischievous ignorance, by operating, or prescribing for these maladies, in any other than the "regular" way. Thus, if the nefarious scheme of this "Association" succeed, will the health, limbs, and lives, of the public, be placed, without any check, at the mercy of every booby, who may be able to pay fees, and parrot recitations, while the really talented, *practical* man, whose profession has been taken up by his own choice, and whose knowledge is the result of observation, study, and experience, is to be precluded from affording the public the benefit of his ability, so "liberally" displaced to make room for the unwilling *protégés* of parents and guardians who were determined that their youths should be "doctors," whether nature had provided them with the necessary brains and industry or not.

This may serve "the interests of the profession," about which the orators of the "Association," and your correspondents, in *THE LANCET*, declaim so magniloquently; but will it serve the interests of the public? Let the public answer that question. There is at this moment an eminent M.R.C.S., in London, "quacking" upon my mode of treatment, who has actually published a book on cancer, though all he knows of it is from a recipe which he bought, from my late brother, two years ago. I have letters now in my possession, from this "regular" quack, to my brother, who was an irregular "quack," expressing an ardent wish that he (the M.R.C.S.) could become an apprentice to him, the "quack." One of these letters contains these words:—

"I shall consider myself more than repaid, if I can be enabled to do what I know both you and your brother can and have done

And yet these are the men whom the worshipful company of the self-styled "Medical Association" would, if they could, drive out of the field of practice, to die of starvation in a garret, that the moderate fees which are now paid to them might be doubled, and transferred to the pockets of the "regulars."

Now, Sir, to cut this matter short, I purpose to test the right of these "liberal" intolerants thus to arrogate the exclusive power of knowing the various ills, to which humanity is subject, and their mode of cure. It might reasonably be demanded of them, before such powers as are now claimed by them should be entrusted to them, to show that they possess a perfect knowledge of *all* the diseases incident to the human frame, and are in possession of all the readiest and most certain modes of cure. I will not, however, ask them to pass through an ordeal like this. I will simply require them to prove their superior capability in *one* instance; and, if they succeed in that *one* instance, I will acknowledge that they are, indeed, the medical Solons they would be considered, and cease to oppose the establishment of their monopoly.

Let this Association select from their hospitals as many as thirty persons, afflicted with the following forms of disease. Ten females, labouring under carcinoma of the breast, of which five may be occult, and five ulcerated cancer; five, afflicted with tumour of the head, face, or neck, such as the young man's, who, a short time ago, was operated on with the knife, in the *North London Hospital*, by a member of the Association, and who lived only four hours after the operation; and five, suffering from ulcerated cancer of the nose, such as new noses as usually made for from the skin of the forehead, or five cases of *noli me tangere*. These will make twenty. The other ten cases I will leave to the selection of the Association. They may either comprise a variety or not. If they can find a couple of *Hoo-Loos*, I have no objection. I will then claim the right of dividing the afflicted company into two lots of fifteen each, and will leave to the choice of the Association which lot they will take, upon whom to exercise all their powers of "exclusive" wisdom, while I try, with the help and blessing of God, to "quack" the other lot into health.

Now, Mr. Editor, I leave the world to judge whether the test of superiority which I here offer to the acceptance of this "Medical Association" be fair and equitable. If it be so, let them accept it; and propose an early day for carrying this trial of our respective systems into effect, and the result shall decide whether these gentlemen have yet arrived at that pitch of absolute perfection in medical science which can justify them in asking, or Parliament in granting,

the uncontrolled and irresponsible powers which they demand.

If they shrink from its acceptance, I fancy the world will apply to them—all "liberal" as they are—epithets more truly descriptive of their character, than any which I shall choose to quote in this letter. I am yours, &c.,

JAMES LAWRENCE WARD.

18, Trafalgar-street, Leeds,
Jan. 26th, 1838.

ON BENEVOLENT FUNDS
AND
LIFE ASSURANCE
IN HEALTH AND SICKNESS.

BY WILLIAM FARR.

(*The first part of a Paper read before the Council of the British Medical Association.*)

THE Association is greatly indebted to Dr. Webster, its able President, for bringing the subject of Life Assurance under notice.

The discussion of the subjects of mortality and sickness applied to the practical interests of society and of the profession, to which we belong, cannot fail to do good. It will impress the principles which regulate Life Offices on the minds of our members, induce them to profit by the advantages these institutions offer, and direct their attention to the collection of facts which are still wanting to render assurance available against some of the accidents of life.

The remarks I wish to make are of a general nature, and refer less to details than to principles. Mr. Fleming, and an actuary, practically acquainted with the business of life offices, will furnish the Association with any further details it may require.

The utility of the BENEVOLENT FUND, to which a third of the subscription is devoted, has been called in question; and the arguments against it, and in favour of mutual assurance, are so strong as to throw us back on first principles, to inquire on what basis this fund stands; whether its advantages are over-balanced, or can be obtained in a less objectionable mode. The Benevolent Fund is placed at the disposal of the Council to be bestowed on members of the profession, or their wives or children in distress; and this implies that the recipients have no direct right to the advantages they may claim or receive. On the plan of assurance each party is entitled on the principles of justice, to the sum he receives.

Before asking what evils benevolent funds and assurance avert, we must look at the present constitution of society. This will, at the same time, throw light on the Poor-law question. A certain supply of food, and physical conveniences are required, without which we are miserable and perish; these staple necessities of life do not grow spontaneously in our climate; they can