

assert that their proposed plan is *not* different from that which your anonymous correspondent *believes* to be generally acted upon in other institutions of the kind. They *know* it is not the same, and they have said so. They would try the question on its merits alone, without reference to precedents of any kind. They see an opportunity for elevating their *general* status, and for establishing, among themselves and their professional neighbours, a higher standard of scientific inquiry, and a more useful groundwork for combined practical observation. They are fully aware of the disadvantages that would result from an undue division of responsibility, and in their proposed plan they have provided against such an inconvenience. Let the number of medical officers, appointed to act during any particular period, be fixed at 2, 3, 4, or whatever other amount the governors may deem most advisable; they do not propose to depute the responsibility to any greater number; and they conceive that, by reference to the principle of divisional service, they have sufficiently explained all this in their address to the governors. The object of the governors being unquestionably to make the hospital as extensively beneficial as possible, and to place it at once upon the most efficient possible footing, it would be idle to imagine that they could entertain any value for the mere patronage of the institution, when put in comparison with the higher considerations here adverted to; and it was from a firm conviction that, under the circumstances of the case, their plan would be more conducive to these ends than any other, that the memorialists determined to bring it forward.

It is *not*, perhaps, to be wondered at, that the governors should hesitate before adopting a system that is in a great measure without a precedent; but the terms offered to them by the memorialists are in all respects so fair, and so free from every taint of self-interestedness,—so obviously calculated to engender feelings of mutual respect and good-will among the medical practitioners of the place, as well as to fulfil the main intention of the charity, that they most assuredly merit a more favourable consideration than has hitherto been vouchsafed to them.

Your anonymous correspondent states, that 15 out of the 17 medical men resident in Carlisle have thus united in the expression of their sentiments upon this subject. It may not be out of place to mention here, that one gentleman avoids taking any part in the question, from having made up his mind to decline all connexion with the infirmary; and that Dr. Barnes, a governor of the institution, is the only medical practitioner in the place who opposes the plan suggested.

One word of admonition to "*Cumbriensis*," whoever he may be, it was an act of very questionable respectability, in such a case, to go abroad disguised, and beg *in formâ pauperis* for arguments and authorities which he was unable to find at home.

I remain, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

RICHD. JAMES, Secy.

Carlisle, October 11, 1841.

OPERATIONS AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HOSPITAL.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—As an old student of University College Hospital, allow me to prevent your readers forming false conclusions from the comparisons you have instituted in last week's Journal, on the number of amputations performed at that hospital by its respective surgeons.

It is quite true that Mr. Liston has, as you have stated, performed by far the greater proportion of amputations, and the explanation of this "curious fact" is perfectly easy. Of Mr. Liston's colleagues, Mr. Quain has been surgeon to the hospital but eighteen months, whilst Mr. Cooper's ill health has of late years rendered him nearly incapable of performing the practical duties of his office. Now, the plan pursued at that hospital is, that each surgeon should have his week for the admission of patients; yet that this rule (combined with the circumstances I have just mentioned) does not prevent a surgeon of Mr. Liston's reputation from getting more cases requiring operations, than would otherwise have fallen to his share, will, I trust, be easily understood by all your readers.

I remain yours, &c.

JOHN BUCK, Surgeon.

Wells, Norfolk, October 19, 1841.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS IN LONDON.

List of Gentlemen admitted Members on Friday, October 8, 1841.—Jonas Day, Michael Ryan, Henry James, James Edward Mathew, Mark Henry Devlin, Thomas Godfrey, Robert Henry King, Herbert Giraud, Richard Henry Oakley.

Friday, October 15.—George Reveley Sladen, Peter Goodall Lay, William Stedman, John Andrews, William Bower, James Lyde, Walter Carless Freer, John Luscombe Teed, Charles Cobbe.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The publisher of the *PROVINCIAL JOURNAL* begs to inform gentlemen desirous of completing their sets, that a new and improved series, containing Sir A. Cooper's papers, &c., commenced with the last volume, April 3, 1841. The back numbers from this period may be obtained through the medium of any bookseller or newsman in town or country.

Letters and communications should be addressed to *Dr. Hennis Green*, 58, Margaret Street, Cavendish Square. Letters connected with the Provincial Association may be addressed to *Dr. Streeten*, Foregate Street, Worcester.

Printed by THOMAS IROTON, of 105, St. Martin's Lane, in the Parish of St. Martin in the Fields, and GEORGE JOSIAH PALMER, of 20, Regent Square, in the Parish of St. Pancras, at their Office, No. 3, Savoy-street, Strand, in the Precinct of the Savoy; and published by JOHN WILLIAMS RUMSEY, at his Residence, No. 6, Wellington-street, Strand, in the Precinct of the Savoy.—Friday, October 22, 1841.