

before the opening of the session in 1833, withdrew from further pecuniary responsibility, by giving up the control of the schools in a great measure to the professors, and receiving from them a guarantee to the amount of the estimated annual expenditure. Thenceforth, therefore, the medical and surgical department of the London University can only be regarded as an association of teachers, conducting the school as a speculation of their own, superior in no respect to the other medical schools of London, but inferior to most of them in not possessing the means of that practical instruction at the bed-side of the sick, without which a due knowledge of medicine and surgery cannot be acquired. On the other hand, the previously existing schools of surgery, connected with the great hospitals of the metropolis, possess the advantages of a well-organized system of instruction, both in precept and in practice; in them the great body of English practitioners have been educated, and their teachers have attained a degree of celebrity as public men, to which the high character of English surgery may be ascribed.

Your petitioners therefore humbly submit, that the association of medical teachers in the *London University* has no claim to any superiority of power or privilege over the other medical and surgical schools of London; and that, to give to the former distinctions or privileges which are denied to the latter, would involve the double injustice of unfair preference and unmerited exclusion.

Your petitioners beg leave to represent that large sums have been expended in founding and supporting the medical schools of the great hospitals in London, in erecting suitable buildings, and in providing museums, libraries, and the other requisites of professional education; that property to a considerable amount is invested in these establishments, in which gentlemen of abilities, knowledge, and zeal, are employed as teachers. Among these schools, which depend for their success merely on the talents and exertions of their teachers, and on their respective advantages in other points, an honourable competition exists, conducive to the promotion of knowledge, and advantageous to the public.

Your petitioners beg leave to express, in the strongest terms, their serious apprehension of the public disadvantage that would result from any measures calculated to derange the present efficient system of medical and surgical instruction, especially from the conferring on any one school a monopoly of power, and thus degrading and injuring the other institutions.

Your petitioners are firmly convinced that the occupation of teaching, and the power of examining and conferring degrees, ought to be exercised, as they now are, by distinct institutions; and that the union in one and the same institution of these discordant attributes, must be attended with danger to the public welfare on the numerous occasions in which the interest of the teacher and the duty of the examiners would interfere with each other.

Your petitioners therefore most humbly pray that your Majesty will not grant to the institution, which has assumed the name of the *London University*, the power of conferring medical degrees; and they further pray, that if the expediency of such grant should be referred by your Majesty to the consideration of your Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, they may have the opportunity of being heard by counsel on the subject matter of this petition.

THE LANCET.

London, Saturday, April 26, 1834.

IN the *Times* of Saturday last, April the 19th, there appeared under the head of "Court Circular," the following paragraph.

"A number of the Lords of His Majesty's most Hon. Privy Council have been summoned to attend a committee of their Lordships on the 24th of the present month, to hear counsel in support of the petition of the London University, praying for a charter. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, the Cabinet Ministers, the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and the Chief Secretary for Ireland, have received summonses."

Notifications to a similar effect having been published in other journals, we must infer that their exists, on the part of the Government, a determination to bring the University-charter question to a definitive settlement. As an advantageous auxiliary to the arguments of counsel in support of the claims to a charter, the SENATE of

the University has selected the present as the most appropriate time for publishing an address, explanatory of the grounds on which the Council found their pretensions to a charter.*

The tone of this address is in the highest degree favourable to the character of the institution;—a liberal spirit pervades it throughout; the style of its composition is correct and lucid; and the points in debate are well arranged and ably supported. In the second paragraph we are introduced to the chief bearings of the question, thus:—

“It may be presumed that no opposition would be offered to the prayer of the University if it sought merely a charter of incorporation. The opposition is offered because it seeks to be incorporated under such a name, and in such a manner, as would convey to it a power of conferring degrees.”

This is a perfectly candid statement of the question at issue. Had the University sought for a charter of incorporation merely, no motive for opposition on the part of Oxford or Cambridge could have been induced.

But is it quite certain that, even now, the strongest hostility to the grant is evinced by the two English Universities? We propose this question, because we have been led to understand that the managers of the Scottish Universities have endeavoured, by every manœuvre, to render the application to the Government and the Privy Council an unsuccessful one. Whether this report be founded on fact or not we are unable to state, but it must be acknowledged that the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons in London are hostile to the grant, and in that hostility are joined and supported by the whole of the lecturers who are attached to the medical schools of this metropolis.

Their opposition has arisen on what is

considered by all monopolists to be a legitimate ground,—a feeling of selfishness. The private lecturers, being recognised by the examining bodies, are monopolists in *their* way. The hospital teachers connected with the chartered eleemosynary institutions, are, many of them, double monopolists, and, consequently, believe that they have a double interest at stake, for many of them already fill the seats of office in the College of Surgeons. Ought, then, an hostility springing up in such quarters, and supported on such pretensions, so to weigh with the Government as to induce the ministry to refuse the grant of a charter to the University? We think not, because it is perfectly clear that the interests of the public form no item in the arguments of the enemies of the University.

But the question must be considered under a more comprehensive view. The private objects and petty jealousies of recognised teachers must be put aside, as demanding, while investigating this subject, only an insignificant portion of our attention, and we must go at once to the main point, namely,—Is it of importance to the community that the University should enjoy the privilege of granting degrees under a charter conferred by the Crown?

Frankly, then, we confess, that we cannot discover in what way the *public* can be benefited by the grant of a charter to the University, constituted as that University now is; and, further, we are decidedly of opinion that if the crown were to confer upon the professors of that institution the privilege of awarding medical degrees, the possession of that privilege would, at no distant period, prove in the highest degree injurious to the interests of the professors themselves. What, we repeat, can the public gain by the extension of the privilege of medical degree making? The proprietors of the University and the public must be aware that there is no preroga-

* Address from the Senate to the Council in support of the application of the University for a Charter. London. Taylor. pp. 15.

tive of the crown which enables the King to alter the *law* in relation to medicine, or to any other subject. His Majesty, therefore, can only award certain privileges in accordance with the law as it now stands. Hence it follows that no degree which the King may enable the University to grant, can confer on the possessors of that degree the right to practise medicine in any part of his Majesty's dominions. In short, the medical graduate of the University could not dispense a dose of senna-and-salts without subjecting himself to the liability of paying a penalty of twenty pounds, under the provisions of the Apothecaries Act of 1815.

What solid advantage, therefore, would the degree confer on its holders? None, of which we know, in the existing state of the law, and surely, under a reconstruction of our medical statutes, monopolies will not be sanctioned, whatever may be the excuses for establishing them, either in universities or in hospitals.

When, therefore, it is considered, that the degree will at best be merely an honorary distinction, we cannot see why the University should not be content, under its charter of incorporation, with the power of conferring degrees in arts, to which may be added such other titles of distinction as the endowments in finance, science, and literature, of the professors and senate, may make it convenient to bestow.

In offering these remarks, our attention is directed to changes which must take place within a very few years with respect to collegiate education generally, and we cannot forget that the degree-making system at the whole of our Universities is one which has been conducted on such loose principles of propriety, that it requires a speedy and thorough emendation. Nay, it must not be disguised that it has been a system of fraud, of delusion, and that it has gone far towards the establishment of an aristocracy of wealth, to the

rejection, insult, and oppression of the most meritorious of the labourers who have toiled in the fields of literature and science. Why, in the name of all that is liberal, is knowledge deemed contraband if it be not acquired in certain seasons, on certain spots, and at a given cost? If the charter of the King is to be made an instrument for conferring literary and scientific distinctions, why are the admissible applicants to be restricted to those students who happen to pay their fees into the coffers of some particular institution?

It may be contended, that where there is no collegiate residence, there can be no acquaintance with, and no security for, the maintenance of the morals of the student; but surely we are not to be told in the nineteenth century that the discipline of a University is the safest guarantee of a virtuous course of conduct! The non-residence of students at the University of London, may be regarded as one of the advantages of that institution,—that is, if an opinion is to be formed from what has been too frequently the fruit of a domicile at Universities elsewhere. Thus, it is observed in the Address to which we referred at the commencement of this article, that “the education of the student is brought to the very threshold of his home; and he may avail himself of it without sacrificing the inestimable benefits of domestic intercourse and parental superintendence.”

Should the University be empowered to grant degrees in arts, we have no security that the candidates would be received at our medical colleges, or at our inns of court, upon equally advantageous terms with the graduates of the favoured Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Is it not clear, then, that a new law with respect to the government of the whole of our academical institutions is required, in order that rewards for a knowledge of sci-

ence and for learning may be distributed justly, and that all unnecessary barriers and restrictions should be for ever broken down and destroyed?

With respect to medical degrees, we would suggest to the Senate and Council of the University, that the power to grant them in connexion with existing arrangements, may prove most detrimental to the medical department of the University. If the charter should contain such a provision, it will necessarily specify those subjects into which the examination shall extend; and it is quite obvious that the conduct of the examination will not be confided to the professors exclusively. They would necessarily be assisted in their scrutiny by assessors, or visitors, appointed by Government. The examination, therefore, although it might not be of the most severe description, would, nevertheless, be sufficiently comprehensive to be contemplated with a feeling of dread by the generality of students. Hence, if the degree is to be merely an honorary distinction, and is to secure no legal privilege, how many students will be found to encounter the risk of rejection by seeking to obtain it. In such a struggle a defeat would be a severe disgrace, while victory would bring no advantage.

In selecting their medical schools, therefore, the students, it may be presumed, would soliloquise with respect to that of the London University, nearly as follows:—
 “Now that our articles of indenture-
 “ship are expired, we have to pass two
 “or three years in London. The *London*
 “*University* sounds well; it has excellent
 “teachers, and there are, we understand,
 “admirable accommodations for the pu-
 “pils. We should like it above all other
 “places, but we have no desire to undergo
 “the examination for the degree; yet if
 “we attend the medical school of that in-
 “stitution, and obtain no degree, it will
 “be said that we were rejected at an ex-

amination for it; or if we allege that we
 “did not seek to obtain the degree, it
 “will be at once contended that we knew
 “that we were incompetent to undergo
 “the examination. We, therefore, shall
 “select a school where there exists no
 “such degree, and where no such slur
 “can be thrown on our attainments.”
 The time has passed when the examinations for degrees can be conducted as so many farces. Henceforth, if privileges be conferred by law, the public will not be backward in demanding that the privileged parties shall afford sufficient securities for the adequate fulfilment of the statutes.

When, therefore, it is borne in mind that the degree of the University cannot confer the right to practise, and, further, that the examination for that degree must be enforced before competent judges, to be provided by the charter, we would inquire of the SENATE whether the exercise of the privilege of granting medical degrees might not prove ruinous to the medical department of the institution.

The SENATE, with characteristic liberality, have made the following statement in their address:—

“If, after the investigation of the Committee of the House of Commons, it should be enacted that these degrees or certificates of superior attainment should be granted only by a central Board of Examiners, and that the existing Universities should be deprived of the power of conferring them, the University of London would not desire to possess a privilege confided to no other body of teachers, and if in the previous enjoyment of such a privilege, would be ready to resign it. But if this be the plan adopted, the Senate is of opinion that the examinations for conferring degrees should be entirely separate and distinct from the examinations for granting a license to practise; and the candidate for a medical degree should be required to give full and satisfactory proof of a sound general education.”

As a Committee of the House of Commons is now sitting on medical affairs, would it not be better to wait for a few

months, than to create any new legal interest in connexion with medical education, practice, or government, at a time when it is utterly impossible to make *any* arrangement which is *likely to be permanent*? Since, therefore, it is acknowledged by the SENATE (p. 3) that "the mere possession of a charter would tend very greatly to ensure the permanence of the University," with such a charter let the Senate and Council for the present be content, relying with confidence on the exertions of the professors for the success of the institution. If the claim for the granting of degrees in law and medicine be withdrawn, and a charter be obtained confirming the privilege of awarding degrees in arts, the University will succeed in receiving under the sign manual, all that it will be advantageous for it to possess at the present moment. But, as we have already stated, no one arrangement can now be effected with a view to its *permanency*, as it is morally certain that the whole of our public academic institutions must be placed under that wholesome restraint which can arise only from the institution of a new code of laws.

SINCE the preceding article was written we have been furnished, by order of the PRESIDENT of the College of Surgeons, with the document entitled "PETITION," &c., inserted at page 158 of our present number. We have now neither time nor space for lengthened comment on that document, though we cannot refrain from observing that the very first sentence contains a statement which is remarkable for its inaccuracy. The document is entitled "The petition of the *Royal College of Surgeons in London*, against the grant of a charter to the London University."

What blundering fool could have penned such a sentence as this? The Royal College of Surgeons consists of the President,

the Council, and upwards of *six thousand Members*. The petition, therefore, is from the majority of the *Council*,—no portion of the *six thousand* other members of the College having been consulted on the subject. This is tolerably impudent. But mark the following. The petitioners humbly submit, "that the grant of such a charter to the London University would be injurious and unjust to the other medical schools of the metropolis, which your petitioners are bound to protect to the utmost of their ability."

Oh, the brazen varlets! "Bound to protect the schools of the metropolis?" Why, is it not notorious that they repeatedly endeavoured to *destroy* all the private schools in the metropolis which were unconnected with hospitals,—all, in a word, except their own establishments,—and even enacted one by-law with a view to ruin the medical department of the University itself? But let that pass. The Council of the College—twenty-one out of upwards of six thousand members—have thought proper to enter the field as petitioners against the University, in order to "protect" the hospital and other medical schools of the metropolis. Why, gracious powers, fourteen out of the twenty-one members of the Council actually belong to those very hospitals and medical schools on behalf of which they appear before the Privy Council as disinterested, patriotic supporters!

The names of these gentlemen, and the institutions to which they belong, are as follows:—

Sir ASTLEY COOPER, Guy's Hospital.

Sir WM. BLIZARD, London Hospital.

Mr. ANDREWS, ditto.

Mr. LYNN, Westminster Hospital.

Mr. WHITE, ditto.

Mr. GUTHRIE, do., and Medical School, Windmill-street.

Sir ANTHONY CARLISLE; Westminster Hospital.

Mr. BRODIE, St. George's Hospital.

Mr. KEATE, ditto.

Mr. LAWRENCE, St. Bartholomew's Hospital.

Mr. VINCENT, ditto.

Mr. EARLE, ditto.

Sir C. BELL, Middlesex Hospital.

Mr. TRAVERS, St. Thomas's Hospital.

It may be fairly presumed that the above gentlemen are exceedingly anxious to "protect" the hospitals and schools to which they belong, from any change which may tend to lessen the fees which are annually paid into the coffers of their establishments.

It is just to observe that several of the gentlemen above named may have refused to sign the petition. It must, however, be recollected, that it has received the support of the majority of the Council, fourteen members of which are connected with the medical schools of our hospitals.

The Commissioners of *Chelsea Hospital* have politely intimated to Sir JAMES Mc. GREGOR that it is not their intention to make any alterations in the medical arrangements at Chatham.

The duellist at the *Westminster Hospital* was strongly opposed during the late contest by the whole of the medical officers of that institution, except his grateful friend Mr. GUTHRIE.

THE following letter was received by us from Mr. COSTELLO on the 17th inst., but we could not conveniently publish it in the last number of our Journal. It contains a plain statement of the case of FISHER up to the period when Mr. COSTELLO discontinued his attendance, and at that time the man was following his occupation as a labourer.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the last number of the *Medical Gazette* my name is introduced in connexion with a case of stone, which was operated for in St. George's Hospital by Mr. HAWKINS. With what occurred in the hospital I have no concern; but it is important for me to correct the impression which even this incidental mention is calculated to produce. It is stated that I operated by lithotomy *nine times*, and that subsequently the patient Fisher was received into St. George's. This is an error. I find from my notes, that I used my instrument five times, and perhaps there was one sitting which had not been set down. This added will make six. The inference from the article in your journal is, that Fisher, in applying to St. George's, had lost confidence in the efficacy of lithotomy, or that he had been tired out by the number of applications of the instrument. This, however, was the very reverse of the fact, as you will learn from what follows.

I was applied to by Sir J. Chapman on behalf of Fisher, who then was, and had been for two years, unable to work as a labourer and thrasher. I operated on him in the presence of between sixty and seventy practitioners of the neighbourhood, in the town-hall of Windsor. It was ascertained that the bladder contained several calculi of the size of a pigeon's egg. The second operation took place also at Windsor; the subsequent applications were made at considerable intervals, in Egham, at the houses of Messrs. Furnival and Gilbertson, surgeons.

Fisher resumed his work as a thrasher after the second sitting, and to every sitting afterwards, he came from his work, and returned to it, a distance of between three and four miles. His general health was restored, and his sufferings had ceased almost altogether when I last saw him. After the last sitting I told Mr. J. Furnival that if Fisher did not void all that remained of the broken-down calculi, I should be ready to come down on his dropping me a line at any time. I was never applied to afterwards on behalf of the poor man, and I concluded he was cured.

I learned from Fisher's wife some time ago that when he began to get bad again he went into Egham, where he was told that I had left England, and was living in France. He often said to her, if he could see me once more he should be all right. His sufferings increased, and he was persuaded to go to St. George's Hospital, on the assurance that the surgeon of the hospital *would employ the same means that I had used.*

This is a statement of facts which cannot be controverted, and I believe a simple appeal to the facts will not inflict any injury on my professional reputation. On the conduct of other surgeons it is not my desire or object to comment.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. B. COSTELLO.

38, Bruton-street, Berkeley-square.

April 17th, 1834.

Mr. COSTELLO, therefore, has furnished the first part of the case. The second part has been supplied by Mr. CÆSAR HAWKINS, and was published on the 12th instant in the subscription journal of the BATS. As Mr. HAWKINS has accused us of attacking him, we will here insert the statement made by himself, without at present adding one word of criticism:—

“Not very ‘lately,’ but in June last—not quite a year ago—a patient named John Fisher, aged fifty-seven, was admitted into St. George’s, under the care of Mr. Caesar Hawkins, for stone in the bladder, from which he had suffered during two years. He stated that he had sometime before been under the care of Mr. Costello for six months, who had nine different times performed an operation for the purpose of grinding or reducing the calculus. At the time of his admission his health was so far broken, that the introduction of a sound almost always brought on rigors, and some degree of fever. It is thus apparent that he was not a favourable subject for any farther operation, and, *à fortiori*, not fitted for experiment. We therefore feel convinced it will gratify the benevolent mind of our contemporary to learn, that *no experiment* was tried, and that *no new instrument* was used after his admission into the hospital. As there was no reason to suppose that the calculus was small, it was decided that it should (if found practicable, without using force) be withdrawn with the forceps through the urethra, or, at all events, into the perineum, and then cut down upon in that situation. This purpose, however, could only be partially accomplished, owing to the unyielding state of the parts, through which it was found that it would be impossible to make the instrument, having the stone between its blades, pass without violence. An incision was therefore made into the perineum upon the forceps, which still grasped the calculus; a small portion of the prostate was divided, and the concretion, which was about the size of a hazle-nut,

removed by the wound, the forceps being, of course, withdrawn through the urethra in the usual manner.

“No local symptoms of importance occurred, and the wound went on well, but the poor man died on the thirteenth day after operation, *from the formation of abscesses in the joints*, a large collection of matter being found in the right shoulder, another in the knee, and several small depôts in the hands and fingers.”

THE “REFUTATION OF SOME MIS-STATEMENTS RESPECTING THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.”

Published by MacLachlan and Stewart.

(From our *Edinburgh Correspondent*.)

THE attack made on the medical faculty of the Edinburgh University by the private teachers, was more like a charge of the imperial guard at Austerlitz than any ordinary assault, and so destructive was the fire of MACKINTOSH’S artillery, that the professors were unable for some time to recover from the impetus of his heavy shot. The call to rally, however, induced a few men more bold than the mass of the discomfited troops to turn round and fire off this “refutation.” It was necessary to show some fight in return, and on this momentous occasion the medical faculty made choice of a few men to lead the “forlorn hope,” who, from the irritation more especially occasioned amongst them by the powder and ball of MACKINTOSH’S ten-pounders, were most desperate in determination of revenge.

JOHN THOMPSON, the oldest and most expert workman in the “chair manufactory,” and Drs. TURNER and CHRISTISON, and Mr. SYME, are the “refuters” appointed by the faculty of the University, and the pamphlet now before us may be considered as the work of the united efforts of these four great powers.* Their production is even a worse failure than might have been anticipated. It was supposed

* It is with regret that we see the names of the authors of the excellent works on Inflammation and Toxicology mentioned in connexion with such disreputable proceedings.—ED. L.