

physician or surgeon, however high his qualifications, can be appointed to a county hospital in Ireland, unless he be also a member or licentiate of the College of Surgeons of that country, and that by the enactment of a new law the extension of this restriction to dispensaries is contemplated!

But it will be the business of the legislature to set all these questions at rest by peremptory laws, which shall, first of all, establish three great Faculties of Medicine,—one for each capital of the United Kingdom; and, secondly, require them each to demand precisely the same proofs of qualification from candidates for their diploma. There needs no law to regulate the limits within which that diploma shall authorise the candidate to practise. The certificate system being wholly abolished, the private interests of Professors and Courts of Examiners can never tempt them to seek the interposition of such restrictive powers. In fact, it is the convenience alone of the public and the profession which demands the institution of more even than *one* great faculty of medicine for the entire of the three countries. France, which is a large domain, has but one. But we desire three, for here convenience tallies with advantage, and the judicious rivalry of three well-appointed Universities will heighten the general scale of medical education. This would generate a rivalry of *science*,—of teachers competing for fame by the excellence of their instructions,—of examiners by the worthiness of their tests. Then, indeed, if either Faculty can secure an excess of candidates at its doors by the celebrity of its diploma, in God's name let that celebrity secure to the professors a profitable repute, and let hauteur and contempt be felt for those alone who have sought and obtained a legal qualification to practise, at the hands of ignorant teachers and neglectful examiners.

We venture to predict, however, that the future republic of medicine will never afford an opportunity for the exercise of such baneful feelings.

---

REMARKS BY DR. TYTLER ON THE  
LETTER OF MR. BARNETT.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—I beg to express my thanks to Mr. Barnett for making known the very important cases which he has transmitted to THE LANCET, and for the specimen of rice which has been sent for my inspection. The rice is of the same description as that which is mentioned in Captain Bowie's letter (see LANCET, page 119)—viz. rice which has the appearance of being good, but the deleterious qualities of which are evinced when least suspected. Thus is corroborated what I asserted in my former letter to you—viz. that the deleterious qualities of rice can, in the present state of our knowledge, only be proved by its effects on the animal system, and cannot be previously pronounced on. The disease producible by bad barley is not inferior in interest to that produced by rice; and the instance adduced by Mr. Barnett is only an illustration of the dreadful effects occasioned by a species of disease in barley, a drawing of which was laid by me before the *Medico-Botanical Society* at its last meeting. The dark powder contained in barley, and named by the natives of India *kindole* and *lera*, is well known as a deadly poison; but barley is diseased in various minor stages, and, according to the state of the grain, is the severity of the malady. But Mr. Barnett and other practitioners will remark, that I merely state these as facts, being just now by no means prepared to enter the vast field of medical research which here lies before the members of the profession. I am, Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

R. TYTLER.

London, Nov. 16th, 1833.

---

ELECTIONS AT THE ALDERSGATE-STREET  
DISPENSARY.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—In an explanatory letter, which appeared in your last Number from Dr. Birkbeck, he attempts to vindicate Mr. Salmon for having had recourse to the making of money votes, which he is stated to have done in self-defence. This plea was refuted, shortly after the elec-