

exhibitioners have suddenly been called upon either to remove their children, or else submit to a demand which they had no right to expect, or for which they may be wholly unprepared. Children who may have been provided for under wills in accordance with former regulations of the College, can no longer be admitted, and the school which was manifestly intended as a boon to the less wealthy members of the Medical profession, will become an advantage only to the rich. Upon reference to the 27th section of the Act of Parliament relating to the College, your Lordship will observe that, whatever may be the magnitude of the change proposed in any law, it is only necessary to carry a resolution at *one* general meeting, and it can be immediately enforced, upon obtaining the sanction of the Visitor of the College for the time being. Your Lordship, as Visitor, constitutes the only court of appeal, and I therefore venture, upon public grounds, respectfully to ask your Lordship to withhold your sanction to any alteration in Rule 30 which will deprive the exhibitioners of one-fourth of their present advantages.

In conclusion, my Lord, I humbly submit that one of the chief objects of the Royal Medical Benevolent College was, and is, to afford a cheap but sound education to its exhibitioners, and that no advantage which the public had a right to expect would be carried out with good faith should be hastily withdrawn, especially at a small meeting of Governors, not even convened by a special summons to each, in accordance with the spirit of the 27th section of the Act.

I have the honour to be, my Lord Bishop,

Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,
Sebbon's-buildings, Islington, Wm. A. N. CATTLIN.
August 12th, 1856.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Winchester.

MY LORD,—In my previous communication I omitted to state some important facts which I feel should have been represented, in order to justify any individual Governor in appealing to your Lordship against the majority of a general meeting; I therefore beg your Lordship's permission to submit them.

1. Upon the question of adjournment being lost by show of hands, a ballot was demanded, in accordance with the 18th section of the Act, and refused by the chairman on the ground that, the votes having been taken by show of hands, a ballot could not be granted.

2. When a ballot was demanded prior to the show of hands, upon a resolution proposed by the Council, it was intended that the opinions of the whole body of Governors should have been taken, and not merely the votes of the few who were present.

Whether such decisions of the chairman upon both these points were legal and equitable, I submit for your Lordship's consideration.

3. A printed statement of the affairs of the school ought to have been in the hands of the Governors prior to the meeting, without which it was impossible for them to judge whether the important changes proposed were or were not necessary.

Although no such printed statement was at any time in the hands of the governors, and it was impossible to understand the complicated accounts referred to *only* during discussion at the meeting, nevertheless an adjournment was refused, although a fair number of the governors present desired that further investigation should take place. My Lord, I would not be so ungenerous as to assert that no change is necessary, but I hope sufficient facts have been submitted to justify me in asking your lordship to withhold your sanction until the governors have had a fair opportunity of ascertaining what change, if any, is really required.

I have the honour to be, my Lord Bishop,

Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,
Sibbon's-building, Islington, Wm. A. N. CATTLIN.
August 14th, 1856.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In justice to those who may entertain opposite opinions to myself, I forward for publication two letters just received from the Lord Bishop of Winchester, in reply to mine of the 12th and 14th instant.

It is now for the general body of Governors to decide whether a fundamental law of the institution shall be altered by a majority at *any one meeting*, especially when the new rule (as in the late instance) has the oppressive character of a retrospective action.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Sebbon's-buildings, Islington, Wm. A. N. CATTLIN, F.R.C.S.
August 18th, 1856.

(COPY.)

Farnham Castle, August 16th, 1856.

SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 12th and 14th inst. The matter to which you refer does not fall within my province as Visitor of the Royal Medical Benevolent College. It is a detail of business which it properly belongs to the Governors to settle definitively, and into which I can in no way interfere.

I am, Sir, your very faithful servant,

W. A. Cattlin, Esq.

(Signed)

C. WINTON.

(COPY.)

Farnham Castle, August 16th, 1856.

SIR,—When I wrote to you this morning I had not adverted to the fact that the resolutions passed at the meeting of the 11th inst. involve alterations in the Bye-laws, and therefore, by the Act of Incorporation, require to be confirmed by me as Visitor. But I am bound to add, I have no difficulty in confirming them: one of them appears to me to be necessary, in order to carry out the objects of the institution; and all likely to be beneficial to the College.

I am, Sir, your very faithful servant,

W. A. Cattlin, Esq.

(Signed)

C. WINTON.

LOCK HOSPITALS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I yesterday visited the Royal Portsmouth, Portsea and Gosport Hospital, and I have much pleasure in informing you that the lock wards were opened last February, and are in full operation. Five hundred pounds a year have been granted by the Admiralty, and twenty beds are now appropriated for syphilitic cases. The women most gladly avail themselves of the advantages of the institution; but cases are frequently refused for want of room. I think the authorities at the War-Office should without delay grant an additional sum, and I hope the suggestion which I have ventured to make may be favourably received.

I am sure the institution will be the means of effecting an immense amount of good, and I hope you will continue to advocate the necessity of similar establishments at *all* the great naval ports.

I may add that the patients have the benefit of religious instruction when under treatment, and several of them have lately applied for admission to the Penitentiary in Portsmouth, where a certain number are received on trial.

I have also the satisfaction of stating that H.R.H. Prince Albert, who laid the foundation stone of the hospital, lately gave a subscription of £50 to the lock wards.

Perhaps the information contained in this note may be of some use, should you have time and space to resume this important, though somewhat ungracious, subject in your columns.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

H.M.S. *Flying-Fish*, Portsmouth,
August 15th, 1856.

JOHN ROSE, M.D.,
Surgeon, Royal Navy.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—On looking over your answers to correspondents in last Saturday's LANCET, I was struck on reading your reply to L.R.C.S.I., with the necessity of directing your attention to a very similar law to that which you there reprobate, now in force in connexion with the Royal College of Surgeons of England. I agree with you, sir, that "merit and ability should be a passport to anything in our profession;" and hence I cannot but regard that honour as a questionable one, which is dispensed liberally to certain aspirants on the payment of a ten-pound note. No questions are asked of them. They have paid for the title, and are dubbed F.R.C.S. without any evidence having been afforded to the court that they are better qualified than their brethren, who either do not possess any loose money, or else prefer the membership to the higher (?) title obtained after so mercantile a fashion.

It is likewise notorious, sir, that the young member of the College, who can only be elevated to the Fellowship after severe examination, must have spent three of his years of study in London, and paid for his lectures and practice at a London school; thus virtually preventing a large class of young surgeons, who may have been educated at the colleges and schools of Birmingham, Manchester, Bristol, &c., from ever aspiring