

Reviews and Notices.

DEMONSTRATIONS OF DISEASES IN THE CHEST, AND THEIR PHYSICAL DIAGNOSIS. By HORACE DOBELL, M.D., Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, etc. With Ten Plates. Pp. 115. London: Churchill. 1858.

DR. DOBELL'S object is to connect the physical signs of diseases of the lungs with the structural changes in these organs, as seen in *post mortem* examinations. As a preliminary to this, he gives several chapters on the principles of acoustics in general, and on those of the chest in particular; and points out to the student, in a clear and simple manner, the best mode of obtaining a knowledge of physical diagnosis. He advises to educate the ear by experiments on inanimate bodies, with reference both to the production and the conveyance of sound; and there is no doubt that advantage would be derived from practising the instruction which he gives to produce imitation of the chest-sounds—the caution being always borne in mind which the author lays down.

"It would be a great mistake to suppose that these sounds, produced by experiments on inanimate objects, are exactly like those audible in the chest; that is not intended for a moment, although many of them are extremely similar, and convey an impression much more correct than any verbal definition. The special advantage to be gained from the practice of these experiments consists in the education thus given to the ear; the acoustic conditions are in each case plainly seen; the sound can be listened to with ease, as often as requisite, free from the disturbances of the bedside; and hence, with a little perseverance, the susceptibility of the ear to distinguish and identify sounds and their causes will become so acute that the learner will be able to assign most sounds to their essential acoustic condition, and will readily understand what he hears when he auscults or percusses the human chest.

"We must not forget to guard against the danger of concentrating the attention on the special senses, to the exclusion of that *common sense* without which no learning, talents, or skill, and no accumulation of evidence, will ensure wisdom in our judgments." (P. 66.)

The ten coloured plates contained in the work mostly each consist of three or four figures, representing portions of lung in various stages of disease; and appended to them are outline descriptions of the physical signs produced in each case. The plates represent the following diseased states:—

Plates I.—III. *Consolidations*. 1. Isolated (Miliary) Tuberculous Granulations; 2. Conglomerated Interstitial Tuberculous Granulations; 3. Infiltrated Tubercle; 4. Apoplexy of the Lung, after Coagulation; 5. Healed Cavities: Fibro-cellular Cicatrices and Chalky Concretions; 6. First Stage of Pneumonia; 7. Second Stage of Pneumonia; 8. Second Stage of Pneumonia passing into the Third; 9. Medullary Cancer; 10. Hard Cancer; 11. Melanoid Cancer; 12. Indurated Lung, the Effect of Pneumonia.

Plates IV and V. *Liquefactions*. 13. Second Stage of Acute Bronchitis; 14. Chronic Bronchitis; 15. Third Stage of Pneumonia; 16. Second Stage of Tuberculous Disease; 17. Apoplectic Coagula in the Lungs, softening; 18. Apoplexy of the Lung before Coagulation, with and without Laceration.

Plates VI.—VIII. *Excavations*. 19. A large empty Tuberculous Cavity, with Reflecting Walls, free Bronchial Communications, and surrounding Lung consolidated; 20. A similar Cavity containing Secretion; 21. A very Superficial Cavity full of Air; 22. Small Tuberculous Cavities beneath a Stratum of normal Lung; 23. A large Tuberculous Cavity beneath a thick Stratum of densely consolidated Lung; 24. Emphysema (vesicular); 25. Bronchiectasis; 26. A Gangrenous Cavity; 27. A Pneumonic Abscess, partly emptied.

Plate IX. *Pleurisy, etc.* 28. Normal Lung, shewing the Interior of the Bronchial Tubes; 29. First Stage of Acute Bronchitis; 30. First Stage of Acute Pleurisy; 31. Second

Stage of Acute Pleurisy; 32. Third Stage of Acute Pleurisy; compressed and displaced Lung.

Plate X. *Pneumothorax, etc.* 33. Pneumothorax; 34. The Pathological Causes and Effects of Pneumothorax; 35. Empyema with Pneumothorax.

We advise the student to examine well these plates, and read carefully the corollaries which accompany them. They will probably refresh his memory of what he has seen in necropsies, in the same way as anatomical plates call to his mind what he has seen in the dissecting-room. The practitioner, too, may by their means from time to time refresh his knowledge of the pathological appearances of the lungs. And both will be materially aided in their appreciation of the connexion between physical signs and structural changes.

A CLINICAL MEMOIR ON STRANGULATED HERNIA, WITH THE AUTHOR'S PRACTICE; to which are added, Remarks on Obstruction of the Bowels from other Causes; and a Postscript. By GEORGE MACILWAIN. Pp. 120. London: Henry Renshaw. 1858.

MR. MACILWAIN is one of the most persevering opponents of the use of purgatives in hernia—perhaps the most persevering. The present volume is chiefly intended for the purpose of reiterating his views on this subject; and it contains, moreover, much practical instruction in regard to other points in the treatment of hernia. We believe that the practice against which the author directs his energetic pen is losing favour with all sensible surgeons; and, whenever it becomes extinct, much credit will be due to Mr. Macilwain for the hearty push which he has given it towards annihilation.

Inventions and Appliances IN MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

NEWBERRY'S COD-LIVER-OIL GINGERBREAD.

THE man who deprives medicine of its terrors to children is a "real blessing to mothers"; and in this light we must look upon Messrs. Newbery, of St. Paul's Churchyard, who have just brought out a medicated gingerbread, in which cod-liver oil is so artfully mixed that it is not discernible by the taste. Each square of about two inches is warranted to contain a teaspoonful of the oil. We may henceforth, therefore, administer it with pleasure to children, and, indeed, to grown-up persons, instead of with the loathing which it often produces in its undisguised and neat condition.

Association Intelligence.

SOUTH-EASTERN BRANCH:

SOCIAL AND SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS OF THE MEMBERS RESIDENT IN ROCHESTER, MAIDSTONE, GRAVESEND, DARTFORD, AND THEIR VICINITIES.

Social and scientific meetings of members of the South-Eastern Branch resident in Rochester, Maidstone, Gravesend, Dartford, and their vicinities, will be held on the undermentioned days:—

Friday, March 25th, 1859, at 3.30, at the Town Hall, Gravesend.

Friday, April 29th, 1859, at 3.30, at the Town Hall, Dartford.

The members resident in this district will be gratified by the attendance and assistance of any of the members of the British Medical Association.

JAMES DULVEY, *Honorary Secretary*.

Brompton, Chatham.

THE WELLINGTON COLLEGE.

SIR,—Public attention having been so recently drawn to the opening of the above important institution, just completed (as the address to Her Majesty informs us), within "little more than six years after the first subscriptions were asked", and for which the nation has munificently subscribed, in round numbers, nearly £160,000, it may not be uninteresting to compare what has been actually achieved for the sons and orphans of our country's "heroes" with what has been done at a somewhat analogous institution, also under the gracious patronage of the Queen, and opened three years and a half ago, by his Royal Highness Prince Albert, assisted by the Prince of Wales. Like the "Wellington", the college to which I allude is devoted to the especial benefit of a "profession"—a profession equally honourable with those of the military and naval services, although its members are less brilliantly rewarded—a profession, whose members, while equally devoted to their country's good, in contending daily and hourly with an almost universal and public enemy, not unfrequently fall a sacrifice to its malignant and deadly power. Deprive a nation of its "medical staff", and how many a home would become desolate! how many a child an orphan! how many a happy wife a widow!

In 1851, it first occurred to one of the most eminent men in that profession, to see what could be done in behalf of the less fortunate, but not less deserving, of his professional brethren, and, in his large hearted and benevolent scheme, the widow and the orphan were not forgotten. With an energy and zeal peculiarly suited to such an occasion, he soon found associates with hearts as warm and feelings as generous as his own; and on the 25th of June, 1855, John Probert had the inexpressible satisfaction of seeing the Royal Medical Benevolent College opened by the illustrious consort of his queen, accompanied by the heir apparent to the British throne.

A few words by way of comparison. In the Wellington College, no boy is admitted under a payment of £10 a year; in the Royal Medical Benevolent there are thirty-five, and in May next there will be forty boys, receiving an education equal to that of either Eton, Rugby, or Harrow, inclusive of books and maintenance, free of any expense whatever. In the Wellington, there are forty-one boys at £10 each per annum, twenty at £15, and nineteen at £40; while at the Medical, there are those already mentioned free, and, leaving out intermediate prices, a certain number of exhibitioners, the sons of medical men in comparatively easy circumstances, who pay £40 each per annum for the same advantages. Besides these, there are twenty pensioners, of the less successful members of the profession, or their widows, who are provided gratuitously with rooms and other accommodations, including an allowance of £15 per annum in money, with coals and gas. The above figures speak for themselves, and offer an instructive contrast as to what may be, or rather has been, done in a good cause by individual exertions, as compared with the achievements of a more public and more richly endowed institution.

Let it not be supposed that the above remarks are written in disparagement of the Wellington College, or as an advertisement for the Medical, which has at this moment upwards of one hundred candidates, who cannot be admitted for want of room; they are written rather in the hope that, by showing the amount of good effected in this particular instance by individual exertions, others may be incited to go and do likewise.

I am, etc., A. Z., NOT A MEDICAL MAN.

VACCINATION.

LETTER FROM G. MAY, JUN., ESQ.,

SIR,—The prevalence of small-pox has directed attention to the omission, in the compulsory Vaccination Act, to provide for the expenses of prosecuting parents who neglect to have their children vaccinated.

It is not, however, generally known, that the Public Health Act of last session gives power to the registrar, public vaccinator, or any officer authorised by the Board of Guardians or the overseers, to proceed for the recovery of penalties, and to defray the expenses, out of the common fund of the Union.

It would render great assistance in enforcing vaccination, if medical men would make a practice of punctually transmitting to the Registrar the duplicate certificates of vaccination; for wherever this duty has been neglected, the parents are rendered liable to prosecution; and in some towns, efficient steps have already been taken to carry out the law.

I am, etc., GEORGE MAY, JUN.

Reading, February 5, 1859.

Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Monday, February 7th, 1859.

LUNATIC POOR (IRELAND).

LORD NAAS asked for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to the lunatic poor of Ireland. In 1856, a commission issued to inquire into the state of lunatic asylums, both public and private, in that country. They visited all those institutions, and examined a great number of the persons connected with them. Although he did not propose to incorporate all the recommendations of the commissioners in the Bill he desired to introduce, he had, he thought, left none of an important character out of consideration. Neither did he intend to deal with any other description of lunatic than the poor, for that class was quite large enough, and the considerations involved were of a character sufficiently important to be made the subject of a special Bill. Nor did he propose to deal with criminal lunatics. But the main feature of the Bill was the substitution of local authority for that central governmental authority which had previously existed. Among other provisions, the Bill gave the power to fix the salaries of all the officers to the visitors, a portion of whom would be appointed by the grand jury, with the approval of the Lord Lieutenant. The mode of admission of patients to the asylum would also be altered. Upon information being received, either by an elder of the dispensary, or by a relieving officer, that a poor man was a fit recipient, the relieving officer should either bring the lunatic to the justice, or see that the justice was duly informed, so that he might visit the lunatic at his house, and the justice should have power to call in the assistance of the medical officer of the dispensary, and upon a certificate being given by him that the person was insane, he should make an order for the admission, and the relieving officer would undertake the conveyance of the lunatic to the asylum. The Bill also proposed to give power to the Lord Lieutenant to remove all lunatic persons who might be found in the gaols and workhouses. No places could be more unfit for lunatics, and no persons less fitted to take care of them than the officials of such places. [*Hear, hear.*] Of course, these arrangements would necessitate a considerable alteration in the accommodation at present afforded, as would be seen by a consideration of the statistics furnished by the commissioners in 1857, according to whose report it appeared that there were in the district asylums 3,824; in the workhouses, 1,700; in the gaols, 156; and it was supposed that in the various private asylums there were about 3,030 more. Of course, as the commissioners said, it would not be necessary to provide anything like the amount of accommodation that would be required by such numbers; but it was quite clear that a very large addition would have to be made. Power was also proposed to be given to the visitors to admit, under certain restrictions, patients who were able to pay a small sum for their maintenance. This was not now permitted; and the justices would have power, in case it was found that any inmate of an asylum was either himself, or through his friends, the possessor of property, to proceed against them, and recover such sum as might be proper in aid of his maintenance. The Bill would repeal all other statutes relating to lunatic asylums in Ireland; and as a whole, it was as analogous to the English Act relating to the same subject, which had been found to work well, as the state of things in Ireland permitted.

Leave was given to bring in the Bill, and it was subsequently read a first time.

Tuesday, February 8th, 1859.

SALE OF POISONS.

MR. WALPOLE moved for leave to bring in a bill to regulate the sale of poisons. At the end of last session a bill on this subject came down from the House of Lords, founded on the report of the late commission; but objections were taken to certain clauses interfering with the druggists' business, and at that late period of the session it was thought better to let it stand over for further consideration. All the reasons, however, which were then urged in favour of such a measure, had since been increased by the fearful accident which occurred last autumn at Bradford. The present bill was founded partly on the Arsenic Act, passed fifteen years ago. It was the opinion

of eminent chemists, that the Arsenic Act had to a great extent diminished the number of poisonings by arsenic, and Dr. Taylor said that, during the last year, only two cases were brought to Guy's Hospital. The Registrar-General's report showed that the number of cases of arsenic poisoning during the year 1857 was reduced to twenty-seven, whereas in the two years 1837 and 1838, there were 185 cases of poisoning by arsenic, or 94 in a year. If the law regulating the sale of arsenic had so far succeeded, it was desirable to extend similar provisions to the sale of other poisons. But the late sad occurrence at Bradford resulted from a mistake; instead of selling the article which the purchaser demanded, and which was one supposed to be innocent, the dealer sold another article, which, in fact, was arsenic. The existing provisions, merely as to the sale of the poisonous article, were not sufficient to prevent such a mistake, and it was necessary there should be some legal regulations as to the keeping of poisons, as well as the sale of them. The Bill of last year, in order to supply this defect, provided, that in the dealer's premises there should be a poison closet, where all his poisons should be kept together, separate from other medicines or drugs; but it was objected, that the business of a chemist and druggist could hardly be carried on under such a condition. There was another method suggested by the Committee of the House of Lords, which he thought might very reasonably be adopted. It was, that the person who sold certain poisons should be required to keep each article in a box or vessel labelled, in a conspicuous manner, with the word "Poison," and that the article should be sold in a wrapper or cover also labelled "Poison." All the evidence showed that this would tend to prevent mistakes, and the Bill which he now asked leave to introduce, therefore, contained such a provision. Certain penalties were imposed for breaking this law, and power was given to the justices in session to order any constable to go into shops where such articles were sold, and to see that the law was duly observed. He believed this would have a good effect, though, no doubt, the Committee were right in saying, that the best security would be to raise the standard of education among chemists and druggists, and to take care that they were well qualified to compound and dispense the medicines in which they dealt. It appeared from the Registrar-General's report for 1857, that 401 persons died by poison in the course of a year; in 113 cases the poison was not specified; 34 persons died by opium, besides 89 by laudanum, and two by morphine; 34 by prussic acid, including 15 by essential oil of almonds; 27 only by arsenic; 23 by sugar of lead; 13 by oxalic acid; and 15 by sulphuric acid. The deaths by poison might be divided into murders or manslaughter, suicides, and accidental deaths. Of deaths from the use of quack or improper medicines, the number was stated at 183 in four years. It was not to be expected that any legislation could materially diminish the number of suicides, or of deaths caused by poison deliberately given for the purpose of taking away human life; though in cases of murder, such regulations as he proposed would, no doubt, give a clue to the detection of the guilty persons. As he had before said, it was a mistake to suppose that any regulation with respect to the sale of poisons would stop self-destruction. The registrar's report showed that eight-tenths of these cases arose from the halter, drowning, or the razor, and only two-tenths were ascribed to poison or other causes. The object of the Bill was chiefly to regulate the keeping and sale of poisons, so as to prevent the fearful number of accidents which had arisen from the sale of these articles. The other point which he had to bring before the House was the articles which should be included in the schedule as poisonous articles. The committee of the House of Lords had placed twenty-three articles in one schedule, and he did not know how many on the other. Now, it was impossible to expect that the business of chemists and druggists could be carried on with such regulations; and he had cut down the number of articles from twenty-three to thirteen, and should be glad to find that the number could be still further diminished. The only articles with respect to which he felt any great difficulty were laudanum and opium, because they were continually asked for by the poorer classes in small quantities, and by placing difficulties in the way obtaining small quantities the trade might be unduly interfered with. He hoped he had overcome the difficulty by including the poisons of opium and laudanum in the schedule, but providing that where any poisonous article was required by medical prescription, the enactments of the Bill should not apply; and also, that where laudanum and opium were asked for in small quantities, the strict regulations of the Bill should not be observed. He invited the attention

of the House to the Bill on its passage through committee, and would take care to fix such a day for its consideration as would suit the convenience of those parties who were interested in the matter.

The motion was then agreed to, and leave was given to bring in the Bill.

Medical News.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, DEATHS, AND APPOINTMENTS.

** In these lists, an asterisk is prefixed to the names of Members of the Association.*

BIRTHS.

GILL. On January 27th, at 5, York Place, Islington, the wife of T. B. Gill, Esq., Surgeon, of a son.

WAY. On February 1st, at St. Austle, Cornwall, the wife of *John Way, M.B., of a son.

MARRIAGES.

DENIS—SPEER. Denis, John A., Esq., of Fairbrook House, Rathfarnham, to Catherine Pauline, only daughter of Thos. Charlton Speer, M.D., late 5th Dragoon Guards, at St. Ann's Church, Dublin, on January 27th.

JALLAND—HAWARD. Jalland, Robert, Esq., Surgeon, of Horn-castle, to Emily, younger daughter of W. Haward, Esq., of Little Blakenham Hall, Suffolk, on January 26th.

WOODWARD—DAUKES. Woodward, John Hawkes, Esq., to Bridget, only child of *F. Davies, Esq., Surgeon, of Pershore, and widow of the late Clendon T. Daukes, Esq., at Pershore, on February 3rd.

DEATHS.

WAY. On February 4th, at St. Austle, Caroline Handley, wife of *John Way, M.B., aged 34.

WHITECOMBE. On February 8th, at Notting Hill, Helen, wife of J. R. Whitecombe, M.D., Surgeon in Her Majesty's Indian Forces.

APPOINTMENTS.

HEWITT, Graily, M.D., appointed Physician to the British Lying-in Hospital, in the room of Robert Lee, M.D., resigned.

TATE, W. B., M.D., appointed Medical Superintendent of the General Lunatic Hospital for the County and Town of Nottingham.

PASS LISTS.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS. At a meeting of the Court of Examiners, on February 2nd, the following gentlemen, examined on January 25th and three following days, were declared to have passed their first or anatomical and physiological examinations, viz.:—

ADAMS, Matthew Algernon, Guy's Hospital
 ANDERSON, Alfred, Manchester
 ANDREW, James, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 ARMSTRONG, John Christopher, St. Thomas's Hospital
 ASH, William, St. George's Hospital
 ATWELL, George Haines, Guy's Hospital
 BAMFIELD, Samuel, University College
 BARNES, William Edgar Grose, Guy's Hospital
 BATHO, Robert, King's College
 BLAKER, Edgar Shaw, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 BLENNERHASSETT, Richard Henry, Westminster Hospital
 BOARD, Edmund Corner, Bristol
 BOWEN, David, Guy's Hospital
 BOWSTEAD, Rowland Mounsey, Queen's Coll., Birmingham
 BROMLEY, Charles Henry, Middlesex Hospital
 BRUNTON, Linton Bennett, London Hospital
 BUCK, Henry John, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 BUCKNILL, Ebenezer, Grosvenor Place
 CALLAN, William Joseph, Liverpool
 CANDY, John, Guy's Hospital
 COLBECK, Thomas William, King's College
 COMLEY, John Muspratt, Guy's Hospital

COOPER, George Frederick, St. George's Hospital
 COPP, Henry Burton Pear, University College
 DAVIES, Thomas Edward, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 DRURY, John Thomas, St. Thomas's Hospital
 EMANUEL, Leonard, University College
 FARR, George Frederick, Guy's Hospital
 FAULKES, Frederick, Manchester
 FELCE, Stamford, St. Mary's Hospital
 FENNEL, Charles, Charing Cross Hospital
 FOX, Charles Henry, St. George's Hospital
 GALTON, John Henry, Guy's Hospital
 GOODING, John Callender, Guy's Hospital
 GRIFFITHS, Alfred Leete, St. Thomas's Hospital
 HADWEN, A. St. John, Westminster Hospital
 HARRIS, John Charles, Westminster Hospital
 HARRISON, George, St. George's Hospital
 HERBERT, Benjamin Heywood, Queen's Coll., Birmingham
 HEWLETT, Richard Whitfield, King's College
 HIDE, John, London Hospital
 HORSLEY, Henry, Guy's Hospital
 HUNT, Thomas, Middlesex Hospital
 JONES, Robert, Manchester
 KIRBY, Thomas Charles, University College
 KITCHENER, Thomas, Guy's Hospital
 LEE, Leonard John, St. Thomas's Hospital
 LITCHFIELD, Henry Robert Campbell, Westminster Hospital
 LLOYD, David, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 LOWISH, William, King's College
 MARSH, Henry Thomas, Queen's College, Birmingham
 MARTIN, Timothy Henry, St. Thomas's Hospital
 MASKELYNE, George Henry, King's College
 MATTHEWS, Charles Samuel, King's College
 MAY, John Henry Square, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 McMORRIS, Robert James, Middlesex Hospital
 MEREDITH, Spencer, Middlesex Hospital
 MILES, Rees, University College
 MILLER, Thomas, Guy's Hospital
 MITCHINSON, Charles Calthrop, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 ORMEROD, William, Bristol
 PARKER, Charles Robert Geo., St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 PARKES, Thomas, King's College
 PELL, Walton Nethercoat, King's College
 POLLOCK, Julius Arthur, King's College
 POWELL, William, Manchester
 RIGBY, James Morris, Manchester
 ROBERTS, Charles, St. George's Hospital
 RYALL, William Frederick, Charing Cross Hospital
 SIMMONS, Benjamin, Guy's Hospital
 STADDON, John Hach, St. Thomas's Hospital
 STARKE, Anthony Geo. Hayden, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 STEDMAN, James Henry, Charing Cross Hospital
 THOMPSON, Abraham, King's College
 THOMPSON, Herbert, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 TURNER, Charles, King's College
 TURTON, Frederick, Birmingham
 UBSDELL, Henry, St. Mary's Hospital
 UTTERSON, Edward Vernon, St. Thomas's Hospital
 WALKER, George Charles, Liverpool
 WALLIS, Richard Stevens, Queen's College, Birmingham
 WARNER, John, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 WATTS, Frederick Hase, Middlesex Hospital
 WITHER, Francis Orde Bigg, St. Bartholomew's Hospital
 WICKHAM, William, King's College
 WOODS, Francis Hollis, St. Bartholomew's Hospital

MEMBERS admitted at a meeting of the Court of Examiners on Friday, February 4th, 1859:—

HEPWORTH, William, Ginsley, near Leeds
 JORDAN, Robert Jacob, Bedford Square
 KEENE, Frederick, Bow Road
 SANDERS, Charles, Chigwell, Essex
 STOKES, Henry, Brixton
 WEBER, Adolph, Lima, South America

Monday, February 7th:—

BARKER, Daniel, Macclesfield
 BARKWAY, Robert Edgar Edward, Bungay, Suffolk
 CAMERON, Charles, Calcutta
 CAYLEY, William, Stamford, Lincolnshire
 COTTON, Robert, Leeds
 HUGHES, Adolphus James, Dartford, Kent
 JONES, Pryce, Llanrwst, North Wales
 KAY, John William, Huddersfield
 MELBURN, John Thomas, Ryton, near Newcastle-on-Tyne
 POPE, Richard Tyrrel, Bristol

PROVIS, William Alexander, Holyhead
 SUTTON, William, Smethwick, near Birmingham

HEALTH OF LONDON:—WEEK ENDING FEBRUARY 5TH, 1859.

[From the Registrar-General's Report.]

THE London returns furnish satisfactory indications of improvement of the public health. The deaths in the metropolitan districts, which were 1429 in the second week of January, have shown a constant decrease during the three subsequent weeks. In the week that ended last Saturday they were 1243. In the ten years 1849-58 the average number of deaths in the weeks corresponding with last week was 1195; but as those in the present return occurred in a population which has increased, they can only be compared with the average raised in proportion to that increase, namely 1314. The comparison shows that the deaths of last week were less by 71 than the number which would have been returned under the average rate of mortality.

The deaths from scarlatina fell last week below 100, after having ranged above that point, and for the most part to a considerable extent above it, since the end of August. The number referred to this head in the table for last week is 92, which includes 16 from diphtheria. The deaths from diphtheria occurred in the following sub-districts: one in Belgrave, 3 in Gray's inn-lane, one in Somers Town, 3 in Islington West, one in St. George, Bloomsbury, one in St. James, Clerkenwell, one in Kent Road, one in St. Peter, Walworth, one in Battersea, one in Streatham, one in Peckham, and one in Woolwich Dock-yard. Besides these, a death occurred from "measles and diphtheria" in Kentish Town. Six deaths occurred from scarlatina in the district of Poplar, and 5 from the same disease in the sub-district of St. Paul, Deptford. Small-pox was fatal in 11 cases. Seven infants and an adult died from syphilis; one person from intemperance, besides 3 from delirium tremens. Eleven women died from diseases incidental to childbearing. Two persons died from carbuncle. Thirty-four persons died from injuries accidental or otherwise, and amongst these are 3 infants who had been murdered, and two persons who had committed suicide. The deaths of two persons resulted from want. A man and a woman died at the advanced age of 90 years, and a widow at the age of 96 years.

Last week the births of 939 boys and 983 girls, in all 1922 children, were registered in London. In the ten corresponding weeks of the years 1849-58, the average number was 1646.

At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the mean height of the barometer in the week was 29.585 in. The readings of the instrument varied from 29.25 in. on Wednesday to 30.08 in. on the next day. The mean temperature of the week was 39.6°, which is 2.1° above the average of the same week in 43 years (as determined by Mr. Glaisher). Both the *highest* and *lowest* temperatures in the week occurred on Saturday, the former having been 52.2°, and the latter 30.5°. The extreme range of temperature both in the day and the week was therefore 21.7°. The mean daily range was 12.3°. The difference between the mean dew-point temperature and air temperature was 5.8°. The mean degree of humidity of the air was 80. The mean temperature of the water of the Thames was 42°. The wind blew generally from the south-west. On Thursday it blew from the north. Rain fell to the amount of 0.40 in.

Mr. I. B. BROWN. This gentleman having lately resigned his post of Surgeon-Accoucheur to St. Mary's Hospital, the following resolution, on the motion of Captain Packe, seconded by Mr. A. Ure, passed at the weekly board of Governors held on January 21st:—"That this Board, gratefully acknowledging the zealous services of Mr. Baker Brown in advancing the interests of this hospital from its commencement, as well as the great professional ability and kindness to his patients with which he has performed his duties as Surgeon-Accoucheur of the institution, tenders to him its thanks, and accepts his resignation with regret."

THE SWINEY PRIZE. At a joint meeting of the Royal College of Physicians and the Society of Arts, held at the house of the Society in the Adelphi, a silver cup, value £100, and containing £100 in gold, was awarded, under the will of the late Dr. George Swiney, to Dr. Alfred Swaine Taylor, F.R.S., for his work on *Medical Jurisprudence*.

LIVERPOOL MEDICAL INSTITUTION: REPUDIATION OF HOMŒOPATHY.

A SPECIAL general meeting of the members of the Liverpool Medical Institution was held on Friday evening, January 28th, Dr. Vose in the chair. One hundred and eighteen members were present. The Secretary stated that the meeting was called in consequence of the following requisition which he had received:—

"To A. T. H. WATERS, ESQ., *Honorary Secretary to the Liverpool Medical Institution.*

"DEAR SIR,—We, the undersigned members of the Council, hereby request that you will, in accordance with Law 14, convene a special general meeting of the members of the Institution, for the purpose of having proposed thereat, the following additions to and alterations in the laws, or such other alterations or additions bearing upon the subject, as may be at the time agreed upon.

"Law 2. To be added after the word 'practitioners,' 'but no one practising homœopathy shall be eligible either as a member of the Institution or as a subscriber to the library, and any member or subscriber who may become a practitioner of homœopathy shall cease to belong to the Institution.'

"And also the following as a new law:—

"That no minutes or proceedings of any meeting of the Institution, shall be reported or published without the consent of the majority present at such meeting: and any member who shall violate this law, shall *ipso facto* be subject to immediate expulsion; provided always that this law shall not be so interpreted, as to deprive any member of the power to 'reserve his right of publication' in reference to any paper which he may read before the medical society.

"We are, dear Sir, yours truly,

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| "J. VOSE. | L. E. DESMOND. |
| "E. BATTY. | JOSEPH DICKINSON. |
| "JAMES TURNBULL. | A. B. STEELE. |
| "ELLIS JONES. | ALEX. STOOKES. |
| "HENRY STUBBS. | |

"January 19th, 1859."

The CHAIRMAN requested that no new member who had not paid his entrance fee and subscription would take part in the proceedings until he had done so. The Chairman also requested that any members who had not signed the obligation book, would do so before the proceedings of the meeting began. Several gentlemen came down to the table and entered their names.

It was moved by Dr. STOOKES, and seconded by Mr. K. ELLISON—

"That the Secretary be instructed to take a correct report of the proceedings, and for that purpose be allowed the assistance of short-hand writers."

It was then moved as an amendment by Mr. MILLETT-DAVIS, and seconded by Mr. PARKE—

"That the Secretary forward a brief abstract of the proceedings to the medical periodicals in the usual way."

The amendment was put and lost, and the original motion carried.

It was then proposed by Mr. STEELE, and seconded by Mr. BURROWES—

"That a full report of the proceedings of this meeting be forwarded to the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, the *Lancet*, the *Medical Times*, the *Dublin Medical Press*, and the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal*."

The resolution was put and carried.

A resolution moved by Mr. HAKES, and seconded by Dr. NEVINS—

"That the report of this meeting be printed, and a copy sent to every member of the Institution"—was then put and lost.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will now proceed without farther delay to the more immediate business of the evening; and if you will allow me, I will read the first of the two resolutions which this meeting has been convened to consider:—

"Law 2. To be added after the word 'practitioners,' 'but no one practising homœopathy shall be eligible either as a member of the Institution or as a subscriber to the library; and any member or subscriber who may become a practitioner of homœopathy shall cease to belong to the Institution.'"

Is any gentleman prepared to move the adoption of that resolution?

Dr. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I rise to propose the first resolution, of which notice has been given in the Circular. I feel the duty a difficult and responsible one, inasmuch as the eyes of the profession, not only here but throughout the kingdom, are upon us, and we have also the eyes of the public directed to us. It has been rendered also an unpopular duty by the opposite party, who have endeavoured to make this a question of liberality or illiberality [*hear, hear*], whereas, in truth, it is a matter of principle and a question of right or wrong. [*Cheers.*] If it is an unpopular duty, however, it is one from which I have not shrunk; and I cannot think that any right-minded medical man, who had the respectability and honour of the profession and his own honour and respectability at heart, would shrink from coming forward and taking the post assigned to him to the best of his ability. There is one thing only that I regret, that the duty should not have fallen into the hands of some one of the many gentlemen here who might have performed it in a much more powerful and efficient manner. I desire to bring this resolution before you, gentlemen, in a firm but temperate manner. I am sure that I am not actuated by any personal feeling, for I have always kept homœopaths at a distance from me. I have looked upon them as men who were outside the pale of the profession: I have held no intercourse in common with them. I come forward, therefore, on purely professional grounds, because I believe that homœopathy is wrong; because I believe that its practice is injurious; and because I look upon the mixed practice of homœopathy and legitimate medicine as subversive of every principle of honesty and fair dealing. [*Loud cheers.*] In short, I look upon it as an unprincipled species of quackery [*hear, hear*] that should receive no countenance or support or sanction from the medical profession. [*Cheers.*] I wish also to state at the outset, that it is not my intention to discuss the doctrines and principles of homœopathy; I take it that every gentleman who comes here has made himself more or less acquainted with what homœopathy is, and that he comes here not to form his opinions, but to act upon them. For myself, I may state that several years ago I examined carefully the principles and doctrines of the pseudo-science, hoping that I might be able to extract a few grains from the chaff; but I found nothing but the wildest absurdity combined with a great deal of misrepresentation and abuse of the regular system of medicine which we practise. [*Cheers.*] And, gentlemen, I hold in my hand here a treatise by Dr. Simpson, in which the fundamental principles of homœopathy have been fully examined, and its absurdity, sophistry, and delusions fully pointed out. He has completely analysed the subject, and so entirely sifted it, that I should say it would be almost impossible for any one who came after him to do anything in this way. I make these remarks, because at the last meeting the homœopathic gentlemen who spoke on the other side made the discovery in a somewhat triumphant manner, that we had not examined the merits of homœopathy at all. It was not our intention then, nor is it mine now, to go into the doctrines of homœopathy; I wish to bring the matter before you simply as a question of law,—a matter of government amongst ourselves at this institution. I shall proceed now to read the resolution which I bring forward, and in giving you my reasons for bringing it forward, I shall read what I have to say, in order that I may do it in an exact manner. I did not know how far this meeting might resolve to give the matter publicity, and to have had it fully and properly reported. I have done this, therefore, for my own protection, as well as for the protection of the cause which I came here to advocate. The addition is proposed to Law 2. Law 2 is, "That the Liverpool Medical Institution shall consist of physicians, surgeons, and other legally qualified practitioners;" and the addition which I propose to this law is after the word "practitioners" to be added—

"But no one practising homœopathy shall be eligible either as a member to the Institution or as a subscriber to the library; and any member or subscriber who may become a practitioner of homœopathy shall cease to belong to the Institution."

The rational or legitimate system which we have been taught and practise, is based upon every species of knowledge which can be brought to bear upon the prevention, the treatment, and the cure of disease. No false system can therefore overturn it, as it will incorporate any real improvement, even if it came from those practising a system of quackery. Medical men are, however, peculiarly liable to have deception practised upon them, and therefore they are necessarily somewhat jealous in admitting novelties; but I maintain that they

readily admit any novelty which can really be proved to be a useful improvement. I would instance the rapid manner in which they adopted the use of chloroform. I would here profess my firm, unshaken confidence in the rational system which we practise; my belief that it is making progressive improvement like other sciences, and that it has conferred inestimable benefits on mankind. I maintain therefore that the legitimate system of medicine is, in the truest sense, a liberal as well as a comprehensive system; and it is so especially in contradistinction to other systems of quackery, which are of an exclusive nature, and which always arrogate superiority and profess antagonism to the regular system. Exclusive systems of this sort are continually springing up; such, for example, as the Morisonian, which is based on the exclusive dogma that a certain pill, discovered by a certain individual who took the name of Iygeist, is the only proper remedy for every disease. Such, again, as the Coffinite system, which is based upon the somewhat less exclusive dogma that there are certain herbs, discovered by a certain man named Coffin, which are the only proper remedies for all diseases.

Again, there is the homœopathic system, which differs from these exclusive systems of quackery only in this respect, that it is a more subtle and refined species. That it is an exclusive system I shall now prove to you by an extract from the *Organon* of Hahnemann, the founder of it:—"It is impossible (he observes) that there can be another true best method of curing dynamic diseases (*i. e.* all diseases not strictly surgical) besides homœopathy, just as it is impossible to draw more than one straight line between the two given points."

Dr. MACINTYRE said, that he protested against Dr. Turnbull introducing a discussion on the practice of homœopathy.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the mover of the resolution must be allowed some latitude.

Dr. TURNBULL, in resuming, affirmed that he was not discussing the doctrines of homœopathy; he was merely showing the exclusiveness of the system. [*Hear, hear.*] "He who imagines (he continued) that there are other modes of curing diseases besides it, could not have appreciated the fundamental character of homœopathy, nor practised it with sufficient care, nor could he ever have seen or read cases of properly performed homœopathic cures; nor, on the other hand, could he have discerned the baselessness of all allopathic modes of treating diseases, and their bad or even dreadful effects, if with such lax indifference he places the *only true* healing art on an equality with those hurtful methods of treatment, or alleges them to be auxiliaries to homœopathy which it could not dispense with. My true conscientious followers, the pure homœopaths, with their successful, almost never-failing treatment, might teach these persons better." Now, I would ask, what are we to think when we compare this honest profession of exclusive doctrines,—illiberal if you choose to call them such, but unmistakably exclusive,—with the observation made with respect to the homœopathic theory, by the leading homœopathic practitioner who, at the last special meeting, said, that "its exact place in medicine could be determined by experience alone, not only the past but future experience; and homœopathy not being held as a dogma, he admitted that that place might be modified by future experiences."

I would exclude from this institution all who profess any exclusive system of quackery; and this law proposes to deal with the homœopathic only because it is the sole one that has made the attempt to thrust itself upon us. It has been urged, on the other hand, that we should admit homœopathic practitioners into this institution because they have the same diplomas and qualifications that we have, and ought not therefore to be treated as *unlicensed quacks*. In reply to this I would state, that there is no college or examining body in the kingdom that would admit a candidate professing homœopathic doctrines; and that they must all either have concealed their opinions at the time of their examination, or changed them since. Now, I would ask, is it honourable, seeing that this is the case, that they should retain and make use of these diplomas and qualifications, that they should thus sail, as it were, under false colours? If their system be as true as they tell us that their practice is flourishing, why have they not their own colleges, diplomas, and societies? We leave the field of practice open to them; but why persecute us by clinging to us, and endeavouring to rob us of our respectability? I contend, however, that the possession of a diploma is not the *only proper test* of a gentleman's eligibility of admission into this institution, and that the *law* requires to be amended. I maintain that a homœopathic practitioner ceases to be a medical man when he embraces

homœopathy, and that he forfeits his claim to be considered as such. Would any one call a Mormon, who had abandoned his belief in the bible, and embraced the new light, with its polygamous doctrines, a Christian? The cases are strictly parallel; and the Mormon has the same right to be considered and treated as a Christian, that the homœopathist has to be treated as a medical man. It has been said, however, by some of the so-called "liberal doctors," that we should admit them into our society in order to discuss medical matters with them. I reply, that it is of no use, and beneath the dignity of a scientific society to discuss with men who have abandoned the standard of common sense, to which we, the practitioners of rational medicine, appeal. Of what use would it be to discuss with them the potency which a grain of sulphur, or chalk, or of charcoal acquires when triturated so that a millionth or billionth part may be exhibited as a suitable dose in a severe or active disease?

It has been urged, however, that we should not persecute or make martyrs of them, and that persecution only increased the Mormon perverts; but surely no one would affirm that the Mormons should not have been driven away from civilised society. After reviling and traducing the rational system in every way, they now turn round, however, and wish it to be thought that homœopathy is only a sort of improvement upon, and an addition to the regular system. This leads me to observe, that I have now placed homœopathy before you as a delusion which may be honestly practised by a few deluded individuals; but that I have still to place it before you in a worse light as a mixed system. If we would exclude those professing and practising pure homœopathy, it is infinitely more necessary and right that we should separate ourselves from those who profess the doctrines of homœopathy, and yet, under the name of it, give the very medicines that we do, and in the same doses.

I may be told, however, that they are coming round, and that we should, therefore, deal gently with them. If it were so, why did they not come boldly forward and recant, and then I, for one, would not refuse to hold out the right hand, instead of telling us that the exact place of homœopathy in medicine (to which I have shown you, by an extract from the founder, it is diametrically opposed,) is yet to be determined by experience, past, present and future?

I need not tell you, gentlemen, that we have many opportunities of seeing the practical failure of homœopathy when it is tested in the treatment of severe actual disease; but what I wish to point out is, that it is impossible for either medical men or the public to know when it is practised purely and honestly.

As an illustration, I would take the homœopathic treatment of worms, given us by the homœopathic physician who spoke at the former meeting. He told us that such parasites were to be expelled by the means that are principally used in common practice, though for any disorder accompanying their presence, the specific (homœopathic) medicine was still to be used as before. Here, you observe, that globule comes in just in time to rob the old system of what is due to it. [*Laughter and applause.*] If we saw a heavily laden wagon drawn up a hill by a powerful horse, and a feeble boy pushing behind, and he was to imagine that the horse and wagon went up by his physical power, would it be as ridiculous as this?

We have a double duty to perform, in separating from those who practise the two systems, a duty to the public, in showing them that the difference between us and homœopathists is not trifling, but fundamental; and a duty to ourselves, that we may not be contaminated and sink to the level of such men. Will you cover yourselves with "indelible disgrace" if you draw a line of distinction betwixt yourselves and such men? Will you not rather, by passing this law, remove a stain which now rests upon the institution? [*Great applause.*]

I shall trespass only a very few minutes longer on your time, in order to show you the opinion of some of the medical colleges and bodies throughout the Kingdom, none of which have countenanced homœopathy in any degree.

The Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons at Glasgow, the Medical Society of London, and the Provincial, now the British Medical Association, have all passed resolutions prohibiting their fellows and members from meeting professionally with homœopathists. The Examiners of the Society of Apothecaries have stated, that they would refuse their certificate to any candidate professing homœopathic principles.

The Royal College of Physicians of London was applied to

for their license by a homœopathist, and the following was the reply of the College through the president at the time :

"SIR,—The foundation of the Royal College of Physicians was for the purpose of guaranteeing to the public skilful and safe practitioners.

"The College of Physicians regard the so-called homœopathists as neither skilful nor safe practitioners.

"Therefore the College cannot, without betraying a sacred trust, give its license to persons whom they regard as wholly unworthy of their confidence, and with whom it is not possible that they can hold any communion. I remain, etc.,

"JOHN AYRTON PARIS."

Since the first meeting, expression has also been given to the opinion of the profession in an article in the *Medical Times and Gazette*, from which I read the following extract:—

"Homœoquackery, unless medicine be a living falsehood, is a practical injury to suffering humanity. It heals with diseases, to the positive detriment of those who are the subjects of them. So far, then, from being persecutors, we are bound, especially bound as medical men, to discourage by every means in our power the spread of this malignant delusion. But in our view, they manifestly neglect to perform this duty who consort, as medical men, with those who are its practitioners. What are the public—the victims of it—to think when they see medical men accepting it as a matter deserving of their discussion, and admitting into their body, as worthy sons and practitioners of medicine, those who are spreading what medicine knows for certain to be a bane and injury to humanity. Let the heads of our profession shake hands with a homœopathist over the bed of a patient, and farewell to honour and honesty in the practice of medicine, it becomes nothing more than a dishonest trade, in exercising which men get money at any price."

These remarks have been written with special reference to the meeting which was held here. Let me hope, gentlemen, that you also this evening will show, by an overwhelming majority, that you have no sympathy with the spurious latitudinarian liberality of those who would associate with or countenance homœopathy, and I now sit down summing up my reasons for proposing this addition to our laws:—

1. Because homœopathic practitioners profess to treat diseases on a system diametrically opposed in all its essential principles to the rational system, and have, therefore, forfeited the title to be regarded as medical men.

2. Because homœopathy, being a negative system, which renders no assistance in cases where it is needed, and can be rendered by medical men, is, in numberless instances, the cause of positive injury.

3. Because, therefore, it is right that a clear line of demarcation should be drawn between homœopathic practitioners and medical men.

4. Because although homœopathic practitioners profess to practise consistently a system which is diametrically opposed to medical treatment, they very frequently give the same medicines that medical men give, and in the same doses.

5. Because it is proper to discountenance the delusions of homœopathy itself, and, above all, the imposture practised by those who give ordinary doses of ordinary medicines, and yet lead the public to believe that this is homœopathic treatment. [*Loud cheers.*]

Mr. K. ELLISON had great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Dr. MACINTYRE. I beg leave to move an amendment to this resolution; and in my doing so, you, Mr. Chairman, and the meeting, will excuse me if I am not sufficiently loud to be heard by those at a distance. I was not present at your former meeting on this subject, but I read the reports—the various reports—and sorry was I to see and to read them. I regret exceedingly, sir, that upon the former occasion, a similar course to the one now adopted should have prevailed. I thought it quite unnecessary that at the present day, in any meeting of respectable medical men in England, it would be necessary to detail to them the absurdities or the humbug of homœopathy, or to enter into the question of the merits of that system. I thought it was perfectly well understood by every member of the profession in England who cared for himself, or cared for the character of his profession. But, sir, it seems a different matter when it comes before us upon the simple proposition of altering a few words in any of our laws. It seems to have been thought necessary, by the gentlemen who brought forward this motion upon the former occasion and the present, by throwing dust in our eyes by way of attacking homœopathy, and by making it seem to be supposed

that they were the only persons who did not like homœopathy. Is it not perfectly well known, that every one of us dislikes homœopathy, and that every one holds the same opinion that Dr. Turnbull professes? [*Cries of "No, no," and question.*] Well, for my part, I have long entertained the sentiments which Dr. Turnbull professes. I know every word of what he has told us just now, but as it may be quite necessary that some of the gentlemen present should be enlightened as to the merits of homœopathy, I am perfectly satisfied to let Dr. Turnbull give a lecture upon homœopathy and its abuses. But, sir, the real question is, not what homœopathy was either as to its merits or defects, but the reasons to be brought forward by the gentlemen moving this resolution, for the necessity to change the law. To that point I wish to direct the attention of the meeting. It has neither been brought forward by Dr. Turnbull now, nor was it given at the former meeting, nor have I ever found a single tittle of evidence to show the necessity for altering this law; and I beg, sir, of you and this meeting to reflect that, although we may be pretty much of one opinion upon homœopathy, we may very fairly and very honourably be of two opinions with regard to the necessity for the change of this little law. [*Cheers.*] We have had no evidence of the necessity of the change. I have been a member of this institution for twenty-two years, and this law has stood as it was from the beginning. Eight years ago there was a revision of the laws, in the usual form for such a revision at the Institution's Annual Meeting: and this leads me for one moment to suggest, that the gentlemen who have got up this and the former meeting, went a little out of their way to have the meeting at a time of the year when they should not have been held. Changes in the laws of this institution have been usually made at the annual meetings, after proper notice of each change has been given; but it seemed to seize some gentlemen, during the latter part of last year, with a sudden panic, that something was going to happen with regard to homœopathy, that rendered it absolutely necessary, for some time before the annual meeting, to call a special general meeting to blow up homœopathy. Now I want to know for what purpose the law is to be changed; I have considered, and those who were the founders of this Institution considered, that to name homœopathy, or any similar quackery, in our laws, was a degradation. I consider it such to the present hour. That being the case, I want to know how this law has acted for the last twenty-two years. Eight years ago those laws were revised, and this law was then amply and fully discussed upon this very question, as to the pointing out of homœopathy, hydrophobia, mesmerism, and such other things. They did not go to Coffinism, not thinking that necessary. [*Laughter.*] It was then agreed by a large majority of the members of the institution, that it would be better to leave the law as it stood, because it was also supported by the laws for electing members by ballot, and, in other ways, that would protect this institution from the admission of homœopaths or Coffinists, or any body else. Well, sir, has the law been deficient up to this hour, and I ask if one tittle of evidence has been brought forward to show the necessity of the proposed change? I believe it is well known that we don't meet the homœopaths, any of us. Is there here a man who does? [*Cheers, and cries of "Question, question."*] About eighteen years ago, I believe one gentleman, who professed himself a homœopath, was admitted; and, if I am not mistaken, sir, you yourself plead guilty to the soft impeachment, that you voted for that gentleman.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that it was possible, but that there was no evidence to show that he had done so. [*Hear, hear, and laughter.*]

Dr. MACINTYRE. If you or I had to do it again, we should not do so; that is quite clear. Since that period, this Institution has been perfectly clear from homœopathists. There has not been one introduced to the Council of this Institution since that day, nor, I believe, has there been one for many years past proposed. Then upon what ground has this been done? Upon the well known fact, that the majority, at any rate, if not every member of this Institution, has been opposed to the admission of these people. Now, sir, under these circumstances, I maintain that there is no necessity yet shown for the alteration of the law. The very introduction of the name would single it from all other quackeries or errors, and would, I consider, be a degradation to our Institution itself. These gentlemen, as I said before, were suddenly seized with a panic about homœopathy, a few weeks before the annual meeting. They told us a great deal about what homœopathy was and was not at the former meeting; but they did not say

one word as to how these homœopaths were to besiege and take possession of this place. Now I know the public journals have got their cue from that meeting, and I suppose, therefore, that we are to have a regular siege. The editor of the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL says, "How fond they must be of us. They are attempting to thrust themselves into every place where respectable medical men meet." Now I think it would be quite a pity for us to let these gentlemen thrust themselves in; but they have not done it. Not a single man has been proposed for many years at this Institution who professes homœopathy. [*Cries of "Oh, oh."*]

Mr. JONES. We have had two.

Dr. MACINTYRE. Well, I believe I am wrong. Some eight or ten years ago, a young gentleman was proposed to the Council as a half member. He was, I believe, an assistant at the Homœopathic Dispensary.

A MEMBER. Five or six years ago.

Dr. MACINTYRE. Well, that young man was proposed as a member, but before his name came to the ballot, those who proposed him, finding that there was not the slightest chance of his election, withdrew him, and he was not balloted for.

Mr. STEELE. He was balloted for. I was a member of the Council.

Dr. MACINTYRE. At any rate he was rejected. Now I maintain that these gentlemen have not shown any necessity for the change in the law. For twenty-two years, excepting the gentleman I have just mentioned, and one who, I understand, has become a homœopath since, they have been excluded entirely by the laws. I did think, at one time, of making some remarks upon what Dr. Turnbull said, but as I think it was altogether beside the question, and took place only for the purpose of teaching the young gentlemen, who are not aware of what homœopathy is. [*Cries of "No, no," and "Question, question."*]

Dr. TURNBULL. Teaching twenty-nine gentlemen, perhaps.

Dr. MACINTYRE. We really all know what it is quite enough.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will you kindly give us a reason for our not changing the law.

Dr. MACINTYRE. It has worked exceedingly well for twenty-two years, and there is no necessity for the change just now. I did now expect that the gentlemen moving this resolution, would come forward and show us that a grand attack was to be made upon our Institution.

Mr. DESMOND. If any members become homœopaths after being admitted, how are we to get rid of them without changing the law?

Dr. MACINTYRE. I am much obliged to Mr. Desmond for putting me in mind of the second part of the rule which you propose to alter. "That any member or subscriber who may become a practitioner of homœopathy, shall cease to belong to the Institution." I was inquiring of some of these gentlemen a few days ago, why they did not go boldly to the mark at once, and get rid of the taint upon the Institution, by excluding those homœopaths who are now members. "Oh!" I was told, "we cannot do that, the law will not permit us. These gentlemen have paid for a great number of years: they have helped to purchase our books, and keep this building in repair, and the law of the land will not allow us to exclude them. Well, now, we are going to make a nice bit of a law here, which says, that any member or subscriber who may become a practitioner of homœopathy, shall cease to be a member of this Institution." Shall cease! that is very likely. How are they to cease to become members? Are we to turn them out? [*Cries of "Yes, yes," and "Of course."*] Very well, then, if we turn them out, what becomes of the law of the land? [*Cheers and laughter.*]

The CHAIRMAN. They will enter hereafter upon this understanding, supposing the motion to be carried.

Dr. MACINTYRE. But supposing you, sir,—or perhaps that is very unlikely,—or supposing I myself (which is quite as unlikely, I believe) were to become a homœopath. Why, sir, I was one of the founders of the institution, and have paid my subscription regularly for twenty-two years, and if I should unhappily lose my reason and become a homœopath [*laughter*], I must be turned out. [*Cries of "Yes, yes."*] Well, really now, I might become so demented that I would apply to the laws of the land to preserve my interests in this institution. Do you think that an alteration in our laws will cause an alteration in the laws of the land? [*Cries of "Oh! oh!"*] However, that is merely in answer to what Mr. Desmond has said. I will just allude now for one moment to the former meeting. The gentlemen who brought forward this same motion were then beaten; fairly and constitutionally beaten, according to

the laws of the Association. They did not like to be beaten, and they were determined not to be beaten. They did not wait, however, for eight or ten years more, until a regular revision of the laws should take place, but they must have a change in the law immediately. Well, they very assiduously beat up for recruits, and I must say, that very much to their credit they have produced a regiment—

Mr. HUGH NEILL. Of "stunners". [*Laughter.*]

Dr. MACINTYRE. A regiment well drilled—

Mr. NEILL. Of old soldiers, who kept the institution right thirty years ago.

Dr. MACINTYRE. Old soldiers, well drilled to fight; but there are also those who are new in the campaign. As I said before, those who were amongst the founders of the Institution, are rather apt to speak of it as "our Institution"; I have helped to carry on the business, and to do as much good as I could; but, sir, these gentlemen, so many of them that have come in, some three score gentlemen.

Mr. NEILL protested against such remarks. He was a member of the Committee of the Institution when they assembled in the Old Weighing House in Lime Street, and also when they went into York Street; and he protested against Dr. Macintyre or any other person making a charge against the old members who came forward on that occasion to support the honour and dignity of the profession. He was born a medical man; his father, brother, uncles, and all his relations, were medical men; and again, he protested against such a charge. [*Loud cheers.*]

Mr. FENTON, on the part of the new members, also protested against Dr. Macintyre's remarks.

Dr. MACINTYRE said that he had not the slightest personal feeling with regard to these gentlemen, to all of whom he should be glad to give the right hand of fellowship as members of the Institution. He did not mean to say one single word against them; and certainly his old friend Mr. Neill should not be the first man to take offence. He did think that the gentlemen who wanted to carry this resolution, had acted with an immense deal of energy, and had done more good to the Institution in a pecuniary point of view than almost any others. [*Cheers.*]

The CHAIRMAN. I quite took your remarks in a complimentary sense.

Dr. MACINTYRE. I intended them as such; and I have only to say in conclusion, that I wish all these gentlemen who have come in—for some of them are only full-fledged members of a fortnight old, though my friend Neill has been so long a member—I wish to compliment the gentlemen who bring forward these new men, or this regiment of old soldiers, upon the clever way in which they have managed to bring them in, and to carry the question which they have at heart. And now, sir, I will read my amendment: it is—

"That this meeting, while expressing its disbelief in homœopathy as a system of medical practice, and considering that the present laws of the Medical Institution are sufficient to exclude any objectionable candidate for membership, deem it unnecessary and undesirable to make the proposed alteration in the existing laws."

Dr. GEE seconded the amendment. He said: It contains a profession of disbelief in homœopathy, and asserts what no one can deny, that the present laws are sufficient to exclude any objectionable practitioner. Why, therefore, introduce the name of homœopathy into the laws of this Institution? Why should there be a reference made to it? I freely confess that I do not see how any individual entertaining the views of those who have indulged in such scurrilous remarks, as appear in the newspapers of this town upon the medical practice of the members of this Institution, can have the least desire to join us. We should therefore, I think, pass by those remarks in silence. Let us show that we have been unscathed and unharmed by their calumnies. I should urge the members of this Institution to go on harmoniously as before, and conduct our affairs without reference to any persons beyond our pale. But, whatever may be the result of this amendment, I sincerely hope that every particle of bitterness which may have been engendered in the course of this controversy, may be obliterated and forgotten; and that we, as brethren, will proceed more energetically than ever to cultivate medical science, and by a calm and dignified discussion of its principles and practice, increase our own medical knowledge. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, very late at the last meeting, I waived my right of addressing the meeting—a right which I have now of twenty-three years standing. I was a member of this Institution before the present building was erected; and

in the building in Suffolk Street I spent many happy, pleasant, and profitable hours. I have continued to pay my subscription regularly year by year, and it has never lapsed up to the present month. I think, therefore, that I have at least a right to be heard, and heard with patience, though I may have lost my reason, as my friend Dr. Macintyre would say—if he will permit me still to call him my friend—and though I may be one of those arrant quacks, or given to that horrid system of quackery, which Dr. Turnbull has so clearly and beautifully described. Suppose I am in your estimation a very little person, at any rate, I am not so in my own, and that is a great matter. [Laughter.] This is not the first time in the world's history that truth has stood in the minority; not the first time that medical councils and associations have persecuted truth—new truth; and therefore, when I look around me, and see men from north, south, east, and west, putting down homœopathy, as what they call a system of delusion, a fraud, and a snare; when I consider that this is the subject that has brought you together, to adopt a law which certainly has the aspect of persecution, and is regarded by the public in the light of persecution; I say, it would not at all surprise me to have met with such a thing in the days of Galileo, though it certainly does surprise me to meet with it now [interruption, during which Mr. Moore claimed the protection of the Chair]; to find in this century a class of men meeting together for the purpose of putting down truth, or what I believe to be the truth—or putting down an error, which you conceive to be an error, is to me remarkably sad and humiliating, as coming from that profession to which I have ever been attached. I say, the present is to me a remarkable and humiliating sight; for if homœopathy be as true as I believe it to be, it is a sad thing to see men opposed to it; and if it is an error, it ought to be borne with. [Oh! Oh!] I entered this Institution about thirty-six years ago, and everything “went pleasant as a marriage bell”, till this horrid thief, homœopathy, came across my track. That was in 1847. It met me—or rather, I met it—through Dr. Chapman, who had recently embraced it himself. I ridiculed it then, as much as you possibly can do now. Dr. Chapman, however, said that if I tested the medicines, I should alter my opinion. I tested them steadily and regularly for twelve months in my own house. I afterwards joined the Homœopathic Dispensary, and attended there for some time, before I announced my views to the world; and in 1850, I published a pamphlet, in which I distinctly stated my changed views, and I have never yet seen any reason to change the opinions which I then published, or to deviate one iota from the principles of Hahnemann. In the matter of dose, I give just as much as I believe is necessary—often a grain or two grains, or a drop or two drops of tincture, as the case may be. Dr. Turnbull has said that we give the same medicines that they do. You all practise on the homœopathic principle sometimes; and I believe that all diseases, when cured at all, are cured upon that principle. In very many cases, I have prescribed to patients the same medicines which they have had from a former physician.

A VOICE. I have no doubt of it. [Laughter.]

MR. MOORE. But I prescribed them always on the homœopathic principle. If homœopathy is a delusion, it is a very troublesome one—one which has cost me much labour, much pains, and self denial, and many a cold shoulder from my old friends in the profession. But I really think that at any rate it must be something more than a delusion to have stood the test, as it has with me, of upwards of ten years, daily and hourly practising upon that principle, and upon no other, except in incurable cases, where I adopt palliatives.

DR. PARR and DR. FERGUSON rose to order; the latter observing that, however interesting the private history of Mr. Moore might be, it was not exactly to the point.

DR. DRYSDALE. Mr. Moore has a perfect right to give a full reply to Dr. Turnbull.

MR. MOORE, on resuming his speech, stated that in 1837, he himself listened in Liverpool to Dr. Lardner, when that gentleman, with far more clearness than had been manifested by Dr. Turnbull on the present occasion, proved the impossibility of crossing the Atlantic by steam. In 1838 three steamers crossed the Atlantic. So much, therefore, for reasoning, demonstration, and argument upon principles of scientific truth. Patient experimental research was the only mode of deciding this great question. It was not to be put down by persecution or tyranny. The change of the law was unseasonable, because they did not meet the truth if it was a truth, or the error, if it was an error, in the way they ought to do. Dr. Abercrombie had pointed out the responsibility resting on medical men in

regard to every great truth; namely, that there was guilt in ignorance, if knowledge was within their reach; and that there was guilt in that hardness of heart which hindered them from the reception of truth. The change in the law was also un-English. He held the Medical Act before him; and the spirit of their constitution was a toleration of error; and not only the spirit but the letter of the constitution, for the Medical Act stated, that no particular theory of medical or surgical practice should exclude from the lists. The change was also very unwise, and tremendously injurious to the profession. [Laughter.] They might laugh; but he assured them that the public regarded it as anything but creditable to the profession. Whatever Dr. Turnbull might say about homœopathic quackery, he (Mr. Moore) should not have continued in that institution during the last ten years, if he had no attachment to his profession. Those charges were unjust and untrue. Lastly, he contended that the charge was un-Christian, as it violated that beautiful and golden rule upon which they all professed to act; of doing unto others as they would have others do unto them. It was un-Christian, too, because it interfered with the right of private judgment, and trampled upon the sacred precincts of conscience. The members were told, “You must think as we think, judge as we judge, or you will be turned out”; realising, in fact, the story of the Scotchwoman, who, when she tried to maintain her privilege of thinking, was told by her husband that she had no right to think except at the backdoor. [Laughter.]

MR. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, that is not the object of the law.

THE CHAIRMAN. The law is not retrospective.

MR. MOORE. No doubt, but the spirit of it is against us, and I am speaking of it as it may effect others in the future. With regard to the publication of the last report, Mr. Moore contended, that a great question like this did not come within the ordinary category of medical subjects, and that when an attempt was made by a majority to tyrannise over liberty of conscience, and break down the spirit of toleration, the minority had no right to be guided by such a majority, but were perfectly justified in publishing the proceedings under such circumstances as those in question, and when a galling wrong and injustice was attempted to be imposed.

After Dr. Parr and other members had risen to order, Mr. Moore concluded by saying, that a consciousness of his own rectitude upheld him in the course which he and his friends were pursuing.

“One self-approving hour whole years outweighs,
Of stupid starers and of loud huzzas;
And more true joy Marcellus exiled feels,
Than Cæsar with a senate at his heels.”

MR. STEELE said that they were told that there was nothing new under the sun, but he had certainly seen nothing so strange as that it should be necessary to bring together so large a number of medical men to give practical effect to the self evident proposition, that the followers of the delusions of Hahnemann, in common with all other empirics, could have no *locus standi* in a medical institution. They did not exclude all who did not think as they did, they allowed their members to think as they pleased, the institution was the arena in which medical truth and error were freely and fully discussed. But this had nothing to do with homœopathy, which was neither medical truth nor medical error. With regard to medical science, homœopathy was neither flesh, fowl, nor good red herring. [Laughter.] There could be no more community of feeling, action, or opinion between homœopathists and medical practitioners upon medical matters, than there could be upon religious matters between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Pope of Rome. The large meeting that evening showed that the originators of the movement had the sympathy, support, and sanction of the vast majority, if not the entire bulk of the profession of the neighbourhood. This surely was a sufficient answer to Dr. Macintyre, as to the reason which existed for a change in the law. It is perfectly true that a homœopathic practitioner had been proposed, and was very nearly been elected a member of this Institution, and, therefore, it was quite evident that their constitution was not, under all circumstances, sufficient to guard them from contamination. But what, perhaps, was even stranger than this was, that some twenty or thirty medical men, all or most of whom declared themselves to be disbelievers in the system, should come there and stand up as apologists for the followers of this delusion. [Cries of “No, no,” and “Nothing of the kind.”] Mr. Steele could only explain it upon one principle, that “evil communications corrupt good manners.” Pope said that—

"Vice is a monster of such hideous mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

When homœopathy was admitted, nobody thought much about it. By degrees some of their members came to endure her. They had already begun to pity her, and it would not surprise him, if, in due time, some of them were to embrace her. In conclusion, Mr. Steele said, that they had nothing whatever to do with the opinion of the public; that they were members of a free institution in a free country, that they had a perfect right to make their own laws, and it would be an evil day for the medical profession, when the community allowed itself to be swayed by popular feeling and popular clamour. [Loud applause.]

Mr. FLETCHER thought that though they had been accused of latitudinarianism, there was another danger almost as formidable—longitudinarianism. [Hear, hear.] Mr. Fletcher denied the truth of the analogy that, as a church would exclude a heretic, so a medical heretic ought to be excluded from a medical body. The basis of every church was the inspired writings of apostles and prophets; whereas in the case of a medical society, the standard was not an absolute one fixed for them, but fixed by them, and which varied in accordance with the progress made in the discovery of medical truth. With regard to the stain which it was said rested on the institution by the presence of homœopathic practitioners, he was rather surprised that at so late a period of the institution's history this should have been objected to for the first time. He objected to the new law proposed by Dr. Turnbull; first, because those who voted for it, voted for that which was absurd. They were absurd; therefore they were not medical men. Next, it was said that their practice was negative and injurious. He fully admitted this; but were they to exclude everything that was practically negative and absurd in medical matters? Thirdly, it was said that there should be a broad line of demarcation between themselves and homœopathy. Now, for unity of action, unity of opinion was absolutely necessary to secure promptitude and efficiency of action; but where they met for scientific inquiry, perfect freedom and no limitation whatever was absolutely necessary. What would they think if the Royal Society were to exclude a man for expressing his belief in the existence of matter? and yet Bishop Berkeley doubted even the existence of matter. With what roars of laughter would a chemical society now receive any one who doubted the atomic theory of Dalton. Here were men who held what he believed to be a fundamental error, and they were asked to exclude them in consequence. It was said that they mixed practice, which had been avowed and was dishonest; but however absurd a thing might appear to them, they had no right to charge a man with dishonesty in that which he openly avowed [hear, hear], and the open avowal made at the former meeting by Dr. Drysdale, and at this by Mr. Moore, freed them entirely from that accusation. If these gentlemen had been dishonest or dishonourable, and the laws of the institution gave the right to expel any one whose practice could be considered dishonourable, they had been wanting in a great moral duty in not excluding them before. If for fifteen years these dishonourable practices had prevailed, those who came forward to advocate this law as absolutely necessary, had been guilty of a gross dereliction of duty. With regard again to the line of demarcation, he would ask where was the precedent for it? The only analogous case, and that even was not a strict analogy, was the BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION. The *onus probandi* of precedent rested with the opposite party; let them prove whether, in the Medical Society of Edinburgh or the Medical and Chirurgical Society of London, any such precedent existed. The Edinburgh Society requested homœopathic members to withdraw; but there was a very wide distinction between that and making a law of the kind now proposed. Mr. Fletcher went on to argue, that if they adopted Dr. Turnbull's theory, that no college would admit a homœopath, and that no person holding these views could honestly obtain a license to practise; they gave such institutions the right of establishing in what way medical men should practise. It was logically impossible to escape from the dilemma; and therefore, if they wished freedom for one, they must have absolute freedom for all. [Hear, hear, from Mr. Moore.] He (Mr. F.) concurred with the opinion and action of the College of Physicians and College of Surgeons upon this matter. The College of Surgeons had always most strongly refused to take any action whatever in the matter. With regard to the proposed law, he was sure that it was virtually, and he believed legally, in distinct opposition to the trust-deed under which

the institution property was held. The ground upon which the institution stood was granted in 1837, on a lease for seventy-five years, by the corporation, and a large sum of money was presented by the corporation towards the building. It was not only a professional, but also in part a public institution. And with regard to the legal right, the corporation reserved to themselves the right of recalling the lease under certain circumstances; and he contended that, under all the conditions of the case, they had no right to deal from an exclusively professional point of view with property thus held. They aimed at excluding quackery, but they could not do it by such a resolution. Quackery did not consist in any particular plan of treatment, however absurd, but in the way in which such a plan of treatment was pursued and adopted. It was quite possible to practise what they all termed legitimate medicine in a way absolutely quackish. Legally, the resolution left the question where they found it: for it was legally impossible to find the gentlemen to whom it was intended to apply. Apropos of this point, Mr. Fletcher quoted the recent decision of the Tribunal of Paris, before which the homœopathic trial for libel was heard. The judges there laid down, that where a libel was directed against a class of men who could be legally and distinctly defined, no one member of that body might bring an individual action for libel; but that where a libel was directed only against those known as a separate class, by adhesion to one scientific dogma, it was absolutely impossible so distinctly to define them as to make it possible for them to bring a specific action for libel. Reverse the case, and it exactly applied to the present case. What was a homœopath? In any court of law he would be dealt with according to the exact meaning of the word. It was quite possible to practise upon the theory of "like curing like," absurd as it might be, by using the ordinary therapeutic means, and *vice versa*. It was quite possible for a gentleman giving himself out as a globulist to practise all those points which the public believed to be the distinctive points of homœopathy, and yet to deny that he was a homœopath because he gave infinitesimal doses which the public regarded as the principal part of the doctrine of *similia similibus curantur*. Therefore, in either way they could not legally exclude the homœopath. It was inexpedient, also, because it gave the Council the right of inquiry as to opinions, which was an improper power for a governing body to wield. It was also inexpedient because it implied that the society, as a whole, was responsible for the opinions of its members. Lastly, it was entirely unjust, because it fixed a penalty to the holding of a certain erroneous opinion; and he most strenuously maintained that it was un-Christian, un-English, and unjust to brand a man with dishonesty because he professed views which he (the speaker) and others might believe to be erroneous. He claimed fair play for the wrong side as well as for the right, and he would say with Milton,—

"Let truth and error grapple, and have no fear
That truth will come out uppermost."

Dr. Turnbull had said, that they had nothing to fear from medical error. They had nothing to fear. Legitimate medicine must go on in its triumphant onward course; and nothing was more derogatory to the honour of their profession than taking notice of these things which they all viewed as absurd. [Cheers.]

Dr. NEVINS said he felt imperatively called upon to make a few remarks, and they would be exceedingly few, in consequence of the observations which had been made by the mover of the resolution voting for the medical journals, and calling upon the meeting to separate itself from the spurious liberalism of those who countenanced the homœopathic quackery. The speakers in favour of the resolution had spoken of themselves as coming forward to protect the honour and dignity of the profession in making the change; and another gentleman had spoken of the twenty-nine as men who were the apologists of the followers of this error. Similar language had been used by the medical journals which addressed themselves to this subject. Therefore, as one of the twenty-nine, as he opposed the resolution on the last occasion, and intended to vote in favour of the amendment now, he thought it was due to themselves to say that they were as much concerned and had laboured as strenuously for the honour and dignity of their profession as those who were endeavouring to effect this change; and, so far from being the apologists of this or any other error, they were influenced by the same honourable desire for the truth as those who brought forward this change. He thought it was quite unnecessary in Liverpool to allude to the position of Dr. Duncan, or to ask whether he was likely to be the apologist of error: indeed, his name was almost suffi-

cient to settle the question. For the information of the many strangers who were not known in the society, he would mention what were the charges against the twenty-nine. They were accused of being the favourers of quackery, the apologists of error, regardless of the honour of the profession. Now their contributions to the medical knowledge of the day ["*Oh, oh, and cries of "Vote, vote."*"] He claimed the indulgence of the meeting ["*Question, and "Vote, vote."*"] Their contributions had been ["*Cries of "Vote, vote," "Divide," and "Question."*"]

Dr. DICKINSON. If we bear in mind the quality as well as the quantity of the contributions, I think we may allow the gentleman to go on. [*Laughter.*]

Dr. NEVINS (continuing). Their contributions have been ["*Question, question."*"]

Dr. CHALMERS called upon the chairman to consider the question before the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN could not interfere with the debate; but perhaps Dr. Nevins would consider the fatigue of the meeting, and kindly keep as near to the question as he could.

Dr. NEVINS would do so. The contributions of the twenty-nine to the medical literature of the day ["*Question, question."*"]—exclusively confined to the Medical Journal ["*"Vote, vote."*"]—within the last four years ["*"Vote, vote."*"] He demanded as patient and fair a hearing as had been accorded to the speakers on the other side.

Dr. CHALMERS. What have contributions to literature to do with the question?

Dr. NEVINS said he should not detain them five minutes, if he was not interrupted. He then proceeded to say that, during the time he had mentioned, while only seven contributions to medical science had been made by their opponents, twenty-eight had been made by the twenty-nine. So much with regard to the medical knowledge of the profession. [*Hisses, and cries of "Vote, vote."*] Having again repelled the charge that the twenty-nine, by their conduct in this matter, had favoured quackery and other dishonourable practices, Dr. Nevins said, if Dr. Turnbull, on behalf of the gentlemen who had made those charges, would withdraw the expressions, he would sit down. [*Cries of "No, no," and interruptions.*] He was proceeding to state the number of times that the twenty-nine had attended the Committee of the Institution, in contrast with the forty-one, when he was stopped by cries of "*Question*" and "*Divide.*"

Dr. CHALMERS thought a history of the Institution had nothing to do with the question before the meeting.

Mr. FITZPATRICK thought that perhaps a vote of thanks to Dr. Nevins, for his great exertions at the Institution, would meet his views. [*Laughter.*]

Dr. NEVINS again insisted on the withdrawal of the charge that the twenty-nine were the apologists of error, etc. [*Cries of "Vote, vote," and "Question," in the midst of which Dr. Nevins resumed his seat.*]

Dr. CHALMERS said, the reasons given for this measure, as stated at the last meeting were very clear and very plain. They had had two gentlemen as members of this society, who were homœopathic practitioners, for a very long time. It had been a source of great grief to himself, and, he dared say, to many others. The thing was, however, done; and they could do no more: they had been elected, and had not broken the laws of the Institution, and could not be excluded. Recently, however, a council was called together, and it was decided to invite sundry homœopathic practitioners to a public *soirée* of the profession—recognising them before the whole public as professional men in legitimate practice. And not only so, but a sort of address was delivered by Dr. Inman to the meeting, which he (Dr. Chalmers) held to be entirely infidel, on the resources of the profession. That address was published throughout the newspapers; and this, too, conjointly with their beautiful connexion with homœopathic practitioners. Was it not natural that they should feel strongly on the matter; and that they should look forward to the adoption of some course to prove to the public that they did not participate in this feeling—some step by which the public might recognise what was true and what was false—by which they might see that the great body of the medical profession in connexion with this Institution did not come forward through their Council as the inviters of these men? Under these circumstances, they thought themselves bound to enter upon this course; because they felt that the next thing, after inviting them to a *soirée*, would be an attempt to gain admission for them into the Association.

Dr. INMAN was greatly astonished to have to answer then for an address delivered some time ago. His colleague Dr. Chalmers

had completely misunderstood that address, the intention of which was to show the desirability of medical men extending their field of observation, and examining questions of medical science more closely than they were accustomed to do, in which case they would find greater results than were anticipated. He brought forward a number of illustrations proving that, by widening the field of inquiry and observation, an invention had been discovered which had entirely escaped other persons' knowledge. To say that, because he wished to extend the bounds of their knowledge, and to gain experience on a broader basis, therefore he was an infidel in medicine, was downright outrageous.

Dr. CAMERON, as one of the members of the Council who had the arrangements of the *soirée* in their hands, stated that the names of gentlemen to whom invitations were sent were taken from the *Directory*, in which there happened to be the names of six homœopathic practitioners, only two of whom, besides the two who were members, were included in the invitation-list. As one of the Superintending Committee, he repudiated the idea that, by inviting any one, they had an intention to insult any of the profession in the town. The Superintending Committee included Dr. Macintyre, Mr. Waters, and Dr. Stookes; and both these latter were present when the invitations were issued. Now, it went to the world that, in consequence of the Council inviting two men of an objectionable character as practitioners, they did not vote a censure upon the Council or the Superintending Committee, but that they entered upon a crusade against the very guests that they invited. [*"Hear, hear," "Vote, vote."*]

Dr. MACINTYRE said he was a member of the sub-committee, but he was not present when the invitations were issued, nor should he have known, had he heard the names, who were homœopathic practitioners.

Mr. WATERS said he had no recollection of being present when the list of invitations was prepared, and he believed he was not present. At the same time, he was a member of the Superintending Committee, and, he presumed, responsible; but he distinctly asserted that he did not know the names of the homœopathic practitioners of Liverpool, had they been called over in his presence, except the two members of the Institution. Had he been present, and known, when the names were read, that practitioners of homœopathy were invited, he should at once have entered his protest against such an invitation. Mr. Waters begged also to state that the question which was now before the meeting was not the result of what had occurred at the *soirée*, but had been mooted in the Council of the Institution as early as August last.

The amendment was then put to the vote, and lost by 20 to 95.

The original motion was then put, and carried by 96 against 20; the announcement being received with acclamation. The voting was as follows:—

For the motion:—Richard Y. Ackerley; John Arnold; Joseph Allen; Francis Ayerton, M.D.; Francis Bailey; James H. Barnes; Barnabas Barrett; Edward Batty; Robert Batty; John Bevan; Edward Robert Bickersteth; Thomas Bickerton; John M. Blizzard, M.D.; Benjamin Blower; James Bruce, M.D.; John Burrows; William Callon; David Chalmers, M.D.; Thomas Dale; Thomas Dawson; George B. Denton; Lorenzo Edward Desmond; Joseph Dickinson, M.D.; King Ellison; Edward L. Falloon; John Fenton; James Ferguson, M.D.; William H. Fitzpatrick; John J. Flinn; Richard Formby, M.D.; Robert Fryer; George Gill; N. S. Glazebrook; J. R. Gray, M.D.; William J. Gruggen, M.D.; J. Prince Halton; William Hamilton, (Rock Ferry); John Stuart Hawthorne; James Henry, M.D.; Thomas Hensman; William Hewitt; Chas. Hill, M.D.; Sam. Hodgson; Cecil Hughes; J. Sheridan Hughes, M.D.; H. Hulme; J. Johnson; J. Johnstone; D. Jones; Ellis Jones; R. Kay; P. Kelly; Thomas Lewtas; Charles Lister; Edward Lister; Henry Lowndes; Andrew McCaul; William McCheane; John McNaught, M.D.; William H. Manifold; Nicholas Marsh; John Marshall; Arthur P. May; George M. Millett-Davis; John L. Minshall; Hugh Neill; Thomas Norris; Geo. F. Ogle, M.D.; Edward Parke; Alfred Parr, M.D.; Thos. Pennington; Henry Pritchard; Wm. Rowe; T. Skinner, M.D.; Christopher N. Spinks; R. D. Statter; Arthur B. Steele; Alfred Stephens; Alexander Stookes, M.D.; Henry Stubbs; Henry Swift; Edward Swinden; Charles Taylor; John Taylor; J. Stopford Taylor, M.D.; William Taylor, M.D.; Thos. R. H. Thomson, M.D.; Benjamin Townson; James Turnbull, M.D.; James Vose, M.D.; Thomas S. Walker;

A. T. H. Waters; John W. Watling; Alfred Whittle; C. Wilson; F. Worthington.

Against the motion.—John Cameron, M.D.; Cuthbert Collingwood, M.D.; John Drysdale, M.D.; Thomas Eden; Frederick D. Fletcher; Robert Gee, M.D.; James Hakes; Alfred Higginson; Thomas Inman, M.D.; Peter Macintyre, M.D.; John Moore; J. Birkbeck Nevins, M.D.; David Paterson; John Pope; John Sinclair, M.D.; Henry Slack; James S. Smyth; Hibbert Taylor, M.D.; Ewing Whittle, M.D.; and John H. Wilson, M.D.

The same gentlemen who voted for the first motion, voted against the amendment, with the exception of Mr. T. Dawson, who was absent when the amendment was put.

The voters for the amendment were those who voted against the resolution, except Dr. Drysdale and Mr. Moore, and with the addition of Mr. Grimsdale and Mr. Harris, who were absent when the first resolution was put.

Dr. CAMERON requested that a protest against the motion be entered on the proceedings, on behalf of himself and those who had voted for the amendment.

Mr. GLAZEBROOK moved that the protest be not received.

Mr. FITZPATRICK seconded the motion.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved as an amendment, that the protest be received.

The amendment was seconded, and on being put to a show of hands, was lost, and the original motion, "that the protest be not received", was carried by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN said the next business was to read the second resolution.

The resolution was read by Mr. WATERS, as follows:—

"That no minutes or proceedings of any meeting of the Institution, shall be reported or published without the consent of the majority present at such meeting; and any member who shall violate this law shall *ipso facto* be subject to immediate expulsion; provided always, that this law shall not be so interpreted as to deprive any member of the power to 'reserve his right of publication' in reference to any paper which he may read before the Medical Society."

Mr. CALLON, in moving the resolution, said:—I shall not detain the meeting at this advanced period of the night; but, in introducing the resolution, I may be allowed to premise a few observations as to the circumstances connected with a measure so strange as this may appear, and for the purpose of showing its necessity. It will be in the recollection of most of the gentlemen present, that in November last an extraordinary general meeting was held. After that meeting, the proceedings, contrary to the expressed wish of the majority, were reported in the daily local papers. At the annual general meeting, a vote of censure was passed on a proceeding so much in opposition to the sentiments and feelings of the majority. During the debate, a contumacious threat was held out that the proceedings of that meeting also would be published, notwithstanding such grave censure. A report of the proceedings was published, Mr. Chairman—false, garbled, and one-sided! I may, perhaps, be allowed to refer to some little documents which have appeared in the public press upon this subject, showing that such reports were false—glaringly false, and unfounded imputations and threats were contained in those papers, which were simply ridiculous. [*Hear, hear.*] In a paper (*Mercury*), of January 22nd, appeared an article, headed, "ANOTHER GREAT BATTLE OF THE DOCTORS"; and I will cull from it one or two of the *morceaux*, which were thus given to the public:—

"Public feeling was strongly expressed in opposition to the narrow-minded and bigoted section of the profession."

There's a compliment, gentlemen. [*Laughter.*] Here is another extract:—

"But this is not all, the bigoted section have been beating up for recruits; not one half of the medical men in Liverpool are members of the Medical Institution; but since the defeat in November last, a strong canvass has been going on. It is said—but surely this cannot be true—that in order to induce the profession to join the Institution, a subscription was entered into to pay the entrance fees of those gentlemen who were not inclined to spend three guineas for that object."

A VOICE. The meeting is not likely to waste much time upon that.

Mr. CALLON. Here is another extract:—

"The liberal members were not aware of the canvass which was going on until it was too late; and, consequently, at the last moment, the 'bigoted doctors' displayed a list of forty six gentlemen, who are, no doubt, ready and willing to vote for the proposition of the party that induced them to enrol their

names in connection with an Institution the existence of which they had virtually ignored. The forty-six new bigots added to the forty-one old bigots, will give a voting power of eighty-seven against the liberal members."

Very complimentary, gentlemen—very nice compliments to introduce into society. [*Laughter.*] Now, gentlemen, these are some of the assertions put forward. Here is a little bit of a threat in another article, which appeared on the 24th of January:—

"Doubtless the public, whether professional or otherwise, will look with no little curiosity for the names of the proposer and seconder of the last named law, and scan the arguments they adduce as they would the nether garments of the first savage who wore breeches." [*Great laughter.*]

Now, gentlemen, these are some of the specimens of the veracity of the publishers of the transactions of this Institution; and I will now give you a sugar-plum, the sweet rewards for such publication. This appears in to-day's paper. After a long rigmorale article, abusing the "bigots", one would have imagined that all the virus had been expended; but it concludes thus:—

"Of course, I would except that small but glorious band who have taken a more enlightened view of their duties and responsibilities as healers. All honour be to them."

There are the names of a few gentlemen who figure in this matter.

A VOICE. Read them out. [*Hear, hear.*]

Mr. CALLON. Out of a feeling of delicacy, the names of these gentlemen had better be omitted.

A VOICE. Proceed with the extract.

Mr. CALLON (continuing the extract). "All honour be to them." I will read the names. [*Cheers.*] "Drs. Inman, Cameron, and the rest." [*Tremendous hissing, mingled with cheers.*] "Few, perhaps, can appreciate the self-sacrifice that is required to stand up as the champions of justice and right in such an assembly as will meet in the Medical Institution to-night. If the public is wise, it will foster and protect these men." [*Derisive applause and laughter.*] "The names of the minority should be preserved in every house in Liverpool [*ironical cheers*], by great and small; and when the hour of sickness and peril comes [*laughter*], it will be well to bear in mind that there is far more chance of obtaining good advice from men who dare to think for themselves, and accord the same right to others, than from those who go howling and whining about, and bow down terror-stricken before a system which they profess to believe owes all its success to doing nothing."

There, gentlemen, are some of the specimens for you.

Mr. HAKES. A very clever article.

Dr. CAMERON rose to make some observations; and the Chairman having secured him a hearing, he said:—I have a right to protest against my name being introduced in connection with that paragraph. I have no connection with it in any way. I have never yet advertised myself in a paper. I despise those who advertise themselves, directly or indirectly. [*Hear, hear.*]

Mr. CALLON. I don't attribute the article to Dr. Cameron at all; it purports to give the sentiments of men outside the profession, which sentiments are given in consequence of garbled and false reports. [*Hear.*]

Dr. CAMERON. You connected names with it.

Mr. CALLON. I merely wished to show the fruits of such publication of one sided reports; I have shown the necessity that such garbled and false statements should not go forth to the public. The ordinary law appears inadequate to restrain such publications, and it is, therefore, necessary to adopt a more stringent regulation. This Institution has not hitherto deemed it necessary to blur the pages of its statute book by anything bearing the semblance of restrictiveness. Penal laws are generally ungracious; but there are times when even penal laws become necessary, and this is one of those occasions, gentlemen. [*Hear, hear.*] If gentlemen who pursue this system of advertising, contrary to the expressed opinion of the majority, cannot be restrained by the usual laws, we must have more stringent measures. [*Cheers.*] I believe there are members of this Institution who, in medical matters, seem to take a sort of glory in catering for the curiosity of the public, [*hear, hear,*] who pander to the cravings of hungry newspapers, who, in return, bespatter them with their laudation. [*Cheers.*] There are gentlemen, too, who appear to seek a sort of pseudo-reputation out of the pale of the profession, to which, by a more patient and dignified course their talents would entitle them in the profession; who hold up to the public sneer every-

thing which does not meet their sage approval; and who, in fine, would not scruple to sacrifice, at the shrine of popularity, the best interests of the profession. [*Cheers.*] It is gratifying to see this goodly accession to our members; it is a good proof of hearty vitality, notwithstanding the open apostasy of some, and the secret machinations of others. [*Hear, hear.*] The gentlemen who have now joined our ranks feel, that although they have hitherto been passive spectators of the movements of this Institution, they are called upon to rise from their supineness, feeling that our outposts have been assailed by the intrigues of those from within. Leaving any further observations to the seconder of this motion, I shall now conclude, carrying out the pledge that I would not detain you long. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. BATTY, in seconding the resolution, said: My experience of the profession has been this: There have been various discussions in medical societies—and I have found it the same in all societies—where it has been advisable to maintain silence out of doors; keeping the discussion entirely within doors. I remember cases where gentlemen in the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh have carried their discussions to such a pitch, that parties have left the room with the intention of publishing minutes of the proceedings, but they have fallen back directly, and not exposed themselves before the public. Therefore it becomes us as medical men, and it is due to our professional character, not to expose anything of a divided nature, but to maintain our honour before the world, and secure peace within the professional pale of the Society. I therefore second this motion, in order that we may have nothing further outside the building.

Dr. MACINTYRE said: I was just going to ask, Mr. Chairman, if it be possible that any gentleman shall be allowed to get up to speak upon this question without embroiling himself, and bringing himself under the ban of the mover of this resolution—a disgrace that would attach to his name, if he identified himself with a difference of opinion to that which has been laid down. I don't like, for myself, to say one word upon the matter, because I may suppose—I suppose it possible that a man may have an opinion against the introduction of this motion, without being suspected of being one of those dreadful members of our degraded profession, as it has been depicted; because I would not venture, I would not dare, to say a single word just now that would prolong this horrible discussion. It seems to me that our profession was never painted in such a form and such a way before this; I never heard such language applied to any member or number of members of our profession connected with the society I am a member of before; and I never will attempt to defend a position such as has been pointed out. I would not degrade myself by opposing this resolution. I do hope that the gentleman who gave notice of the motion, will, after thinking upon the question, withdraw it altogether from discussion here, because it is certainly beyond what I expected.

Mr. CALLON. My observations do not apply to any individual member or members; for I know not from whom the reports emanated. I merely take them as I find them in the public prints, and vindicate my right to say such things of them as I think; especially after those reports were published in defiance of the great majority. [*Hear, hear.*]

* Dr. INMAN. I wish to make some observations respecting the motion. I think the profession have behaved up to the present time very unworthily; and as I knew that I should have to speak to-night, in order that I might not allow my temper to get the better of my words, I have done as Dr. Turnbull did—written down what I intend to say. [Dr. Inman then proceeded to read as follows:] I object to the present motion, and I do so on the ground, that it is one calculated to bring the Institution into contempt with the public generally, and to damage the profession in this town more than any other proposition possibly can do. What is it but a declaration, that discussions take place in this building amongst medical men, of which they are positively ashamed? [*No, no.*] that speeches are uttered so full of hot hate and fiery intolerance, that they would damn not only the utterers but the hearers if they were to see the light? [*No, no.*] Do the supporters of the new law mean deliberately to affirm, that publicity is incompatible with their interests, and that they will visit, with the severest punishment in their power, any individual who ventures to believe that others, besides the members of the Institution, have an interest in medical matters? [*Interruption, and loud cries of "Vote, vote."*] Dr. Inman, leaving his notes, proceeded as follows: I say, gentlemen, that the meeting of this night is on a par with the "nidering"

conduct—and for the word "nidering" you may look at Waverly, fifteenth chapter—is on a par with the nidering conduct of the profession at the last annual meeting, when a vote of censure was brought forward, as upon the present occasion, without due notice being given. I say that this motion is brought forward to night in the same manner, and in the same spirit; and the same individuals who voted for it, will vote for this motion. Mr. Callon has referred to a number of articles in the newspapers; without attempting to prove that any of those articles were dictated by, or came from the pen of any single member of the Institution. We are requested to adopt a law which will for ever stamp infamy upon our proceedings. Suppose the law passed, and that a meeting has been reported, at which the majority were so extremely vexed that they were determined to turn the person out who published it. Let us hear the arguments adduced at the last meeting: they were, that homœopathy was a "cheat," a "humbug," and the like; that it was the "tall bully which lifted up its head and lied;" that it was an extremely dangerous quackery, against which the public ought to be guarded to the utmost extent; but as soon as the public are told the sentiments of those gentlemen, you are up in arms. [*Cheers, and counter cheers.*] You say at one time, that you are actuated entirely by a wish to benefit the public; and at another, you are equally determined that the public shall know nothing about it. But suppose that you do stultify yourselves, and put a law of that kind on the book; of what earthly value is it? Is it possible for the council, or for any member to bring home the report to a single individual? Has the council authority to ask a single individual whether he communicated that report? Does the law give any power whatever to members of a medical body to examine any person on oath? Certainly not—no law whatever can prevent any gentleman taking a note.

A VOICE. A sense of honour would—a sense of honour would. [*Cheers.*]

Dr. INMAN. A sense of honour!

The same VOICE. Yes, a sense of honour would. [*Cheers.*]

Dr. INMAN. I said, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing whatever to prevent a person from taking notes of a meeting. In consequence of there being no notes of the last meeting taken, the proposer of this resolution has told you what is untrue. There was no vote whatever at the last meeting against its being reported. I ask Mr. Callon to what report he can refer as a contravention of any motion to the contrary. I say that there is nothing whatever to prevent any individual taking notes of any meeting, and still further, that there is nothing whatever to prevent him telling his friends what has taken place. [*Oh, oh.*]

Dr. MACNAUGHT. There was a vote of censure at the last meeting passed by a large majority against the individual or individuals who published the first report contrary to the wishes of the great majority of the society.

Dr. INMAN. Then I say, knowing nothing whatever of that—I am afraid to trust my lips to express terms sufficiently strong to designate what that was—I say it is a still further injustice (I will not use an adjective), first to pass a vote of censure on the reporter, and subsequently to bring forward a law to endeavour to expel him. [*Interruption, which lasted for a few seconds.*]

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Inman had better continue.

Dr. INMAN. I say that no law will prevent any member from taking notes of a meeting; there is nothing to prevent a gentleman from recollecting what took place; if he has a retentive memory, there is nothing to prevent his putting memoranda on paper; and if he has a medical friend, there is nothing to prevent his lending those memoranda to him. [*Oh, oh!*]

A VOICE. And so get memoranda into the newspapers. [*Hear, hear, and hisses.*]

Dr. INMAN. Suppose that his friend without his knowledge puts that into the public paper; I should like to know what law will reach him then? [*Hisses.*] I say the law is absolutely imperative; and that to put a law of that kind on our statute-book would be one of the most damning the institution has ever done, and would do more to put a far darker stain on the medical profession of Liverpool than it has ever yet got.

Dr. MACNAUGHT: I have to say to Dr. Inman that he is in error when he says no resolution of censure was passed at the last meeting. I maintain there was a vote of censure, and I had the honour to occupy the chair.

Dr. INMAN: Dr. Macnaught has misunderstood me. I said no resolution was passed at the meeting in November against reporting.

Dr. MACNAUGHT: The sense of the meeting was taken.

Dr. INMAN: It was taken as to the exclusion of professional reporters.

Dr. MACNAUGHT: You said it would not prevent any gentleman from taking notes; there was a conversation upon that, and the sense of the meeting was against it.

Dr. INMAN: I say the sense of the majority was never taken at all.

Mr. ELLIS JONES: I protest against Dr. Inman's assertion, for I was the means of getting that majority on that occasion on the question, that no proceedings of that meeting should be published in the public prints: there was a very large majority who came to that decision.

Dr. MACNAUGHT: Look at the effect of publishing the transactions of our society. Here we meet during the session, fortnight after fortnight, reading papers, bringing forward cases, and exhibiting pathological specimens. Allow any gentleman to publish the proceedings, and what would be the effect out of doors? Would it not create a large amount of anxious feeling on the part of sensitive people, who would suppose that some relation had been exhumed, and that we were examining a piece of his kidney. It would be an indecent detail before the public. We have hitherto given our details through a medical journal. Why should a local paper, read by everybody, take up the proceedings of our society when they have never reported them before? I again repeat, that the sense of the meeting was taken on the question, and that a large majority were against the publication in local papers.

Mr. SINCLAIR said, I am one of those who think that it would be well if the present movement had been postponed until the strong personal feeling has somewhat subsided, so that the question may be discussed with more calmness and judgment. My own impression is, that the more we keep our discussions from the local papers the better. [*Hear, hear.*] If our discussions are to be published, the proper place for them is the medical journals. But still I am sure that at other times the strongly expressed feeling, evidence of which we have heard to-night, especially against one individual, would not be listened to. He is a most honourable man, although I think his judgment has been a little at fault in giving to the town a report of our proceedings. [*Hear, hear.*] I trust that whatever difference of opinion there may be amongst us, and there is a large majority on the opposite side from the view which I entertain, yet still I hope that upon this subject of the second motion they will never consent to its being passed. Much as I am opposed to the publication of our proceedings in the local papers, the idea of expelling one of our members for such a matter is out of the question, and I hope the large majority will be found opposed to such a motion.

Mr. GLAZEBROOK said: Dr. Inman has said that no man could prevent a member taking notes of proceedings. There can be no question whatever that there is hardly a medical man present who is afraid of publicity in any sense of the word; but it is not professional that we should have our proceedings published in the local papers in the way they have been; and if, sir, Dr. Inman can inform us by what principles of honour and government any society can regulate its meetings where there is such a breach of its rules, I for one shall be glad to know. If this law—which is about to be passed, and which would not have been requisite had it not been for the reports the nature of which has been described—if this law is of a damning nature, Dr. Inman has only himself to thank; for after contumaciously setting at defiance a positive resolution to prevent the issuing of these reports, Dr. Inman immediately got up and asked,—Who shall prevent its being done? It is only by a law of this nature, therefore, that we can meet the case. [*Cries of "Vote! Vote!" and "Go on!"*]

Mr. FLETCHER said:—I wish simply to protest against one or two things that Mr. Callon has stated, but which I hope he did not mean. He said that those most scurrilous effusions which he read from the articles in the newspapers, were examples of the veracity of the publishers of the report. Now, there was not a tittle of evidence shewing that any member, particularly any one particular member, has had anything to do with these letters which Mr. Callon read. I beg this meeting to postpone the consideration of this subject, knowing perfectly well that in any conflict it is next to impossible for people to retain their temper and good judgment; and it is a serious question where feeling is exhibited upon both sides, and where those in the minority have reason to be aggrieved by slanders [*hisses and interruption*]; and I appeal to gentlemen here, whether they do not know, of their own knowledge, of the slanders which have been propagated with regard to one or more of the promoters of this amendment—charging us

with being "rotten" individuals. That is the very word used. I can prove it, if necessary. I did disapprove, and disapprove still, of the publication of the original report; but I do say most strongly, that it was as fair a report as any report under the circumstances could be. [*No, no.*] I have also just to say this: this resolution, if carried, converts this into a secret society. [*No, no; yes, and confusion.*] It says that no member shall "report" or "publish"; these words have a different signification; and therefore this resolution literally forbids us to report or say anything about the proceedings of any meeting, unless permitted to do so by special consent. [*No, no.*] I don't mean to say that that is what you mean. [*Vote, vote.*] If gentlemen mean merely that they don't want these proceedings reported in the local papers, why don't they say so in that resolution. [*Cries of "Vote, vote!"*]

Mr. HAKES wished to propose, as an amendment to the resolution, that the consideration of the subject be postponed to a future meeting. [*Cries of "Vote, vote!"*]

Mr. BAILEY seconded the amendment.

Mr. PARKE thought that Dr. Inman had acknowledged himself to be the reporter on the last occasion. [*Laughter.*]

Dr. INMAN. Excuse me; I never said anything of the sort.

Mr. PARKE understood that Dr. Inman had acknowledged it; at all events, he had been informed so. If Dr. Inman would acknowledge his error [*laughter*], they would go on better. [*Vote, vote.*]

The amendment proposed by Mr. Hakes, was put to a show of hands, and lost by a large majority.

After a few words from Mr. CALLON, who urged that, owing to the contumacious threat held out at a previous meeting, the time had arrived for such a change in their rules as that which he had proposed,

Mr. HAKES said, in this matter he should take his own course, and not vote; if, hereafter, he published anything, he should not act as a man wanting in honour, but wanting in respect to their opinions.

The motion was then put and carried, by 83 to 14.

For the motion.—R. Y. Ackerley; J. Arnold; J. Allen; F. Ayrton, M.D.; B. Barrett; Robert Batty; E. R. Bickerteth; T. Bickerton; John M. Blizard, M.D.; B. Blower; J. Bruce, M.D.; John Burrows; W. Callon; D. Chalmers, M.D.; Thomas Dawson; G. B. Denton; L. E. Desmond; J. Dickinson, M.D.; T. Eden; King Ellison; E. S. Falloon; John Fenton; James Ferguson, M.D.; W. H. Fitzpatrick; John J. Flinn; R. Formby, M.D.; Robert Fryer; G. Gill; N. S. Glazebrook; J. R. Gray, M.D.; W. J. Graggen, M.D.; J. P. Halton; J. S. Hawthorne; J. Henry, M.D.; T. Hensman; William Hewitt; Cecil A. Hughes; J. S. Hughes, M.D.; H. Hulne; J. Johnson; J. Johnstone; D. Jones; Ellis Jones; R. Kay; P. Kelly; T. Lewtas; C. Lister; E. Lister; H. Lowndes; A. McCaul; W. McCheane; J. Macnaught, M.D.; W. H. Maunford; N. Marsh; John Marshall; A. P. May; George M. Millett Davis; J. L. Minshall; H. Neill; T. Norris; Geo. F. Ogle, M.D.; Edward Parke; T. Pennington; H. Pritchard; W. Rowe; T. Skinner, M.D.; C. N. Spinks; A. B. Steele; Alfred Stephens; Alexander Stookes, M.D.; Henry Stubbs; Henry Swift; E. Swinder; J. S. Taylor, M.D.; W. Taylor, M.D.; T. R. H. Thomson, M.D.; B. Townson; J. Vose, M.D.; T. S. Walker; A. T. H. Waters; J. W. Watling; C. Wilson; F. Worthington.

Against the Motion.—J. H. Barnes; J. Cameron, M.D.; J. Drysdale, M.D.; F. D. Fletcher; J. P. Harris; A. Higginson; C. Hill, M.D.; T. Inman, M.D.; John Moore; D. Paterson; J. J. Pope; J. Sinclair, M.D.; J. S. Smyth; and J. H. Wilson, M.D.

The CHAIRMAN announced the result, amidst general acclamation.

On the proposition of Mr. FERGUSON, seconded by Dr. INMAN, a vote of thanks was accorded to Dr. Vose, for his impartial conduct in the chair.

The meeting then separated, after sitting four hours and a half.

The following is the protest referred to at p. 140.

In recording the following protest, those whose names are attached thereto beg to assert most emphatically that they disclaim all confidence in the doctrines of homœopathy—a system which they believe to be erroneous in theory and inefficient in practice. They recognise the impossibility of acting in concert with those to whom they are diametrically opposed on fundamental doctrines; but they do not consider that there is any

inconsistency in meeting them at a Society devoted to scientific inquiry, in which perfect freedom of opinion is equally essential to the discovery of truth and the refutation of error. They protest against the enactment of the new law on the following grounds:—

1. That it is *unnecessary*, the existing code being amply sufficient to exclude or to expel from the Institution those whose presence might compromise its professional character.

2. That it is *unconstitutional*, as being, in their opinion, opposed to the intentions of the founders of the Institution, and to the conditions of the trust-deed under which the property is held.

3. That it is *inexpedient*, since it confers on the Council a right of inquiry into the opinions and practice of members, which ought never to be granted to the governing body of any scientific association, and implies, on the part of the Institution, a responsibility for the opinions of individual members, which, by the nature of the Institution, does not and cannot exist.

4. That it is *unjust*, since it establishes a disability with regard to those whose practice is based upon a particular theory, and inflicts a penalty upon those who may hereafter adopt it, without there being, in either case, any proof of dishonourable conduct on the part of such individuals; thus punishing the adoption of a scientific error as though it were necessarily a breach of medical ethics.

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| J. CAMERON, M.D. | CUTHBERT COLLINGWOOD, M.B. |
| THOS. INMAN, M.D. | H. W. SLACK. |
| F. D. FLETCHER. | DAVID PATERSON. |
| JOHN SINCLAIR, M.D. | R. HIBBERT TAYLOR, M.D. |
| ROBERT GEE, M.D. | RICHARD HUTCHINSON. |
| ROBERT HAMILTON. | EWING WHITTLE, M.D. |
| ALFRED HIGGINSON. | H. IMLACH, M.D. |
| P. MACINTYRE, M.D. | JOS. JOHN POPE. |
| J. H. WILSON, M.D. | JAS. HAKES. |
| W. L. COCKS, M.R.C.S.Eng. | J. P. HARRIS, F.R.C.S.Eng. |
| J. B. NEVINS, M.D. | T. F. GRIMSDALE, M.R.C.S.Eng. |
| J. S. SMYTH, F.R.C.S.Ed. | J. NEWTON, M.R.C.S.Eng. |

POOR LAW MEDICAL REMUNERATION.

WE, the undersigned Union medical officers, and others, practitioners of the town and neighbourhood of Rotherham, after due deliberation on the subject, have come to the following conclusions:—

1. That the medical officer's appointment is one of the most important in the Poor-law Union.

2. That, in order that the appointment may be efficiently carried out, it is expedient that medical men be properly remunerated.

3. That a scheme has been promulgated by the Hon. Mr. Estcourt, intended to carry out the above object, which we, as medical men, with due respect, cannot exactly agree with.

4. That, all other officers in the Union being appointed on liberal terms, it is derogatory to medical men to suffer themselves to be appointed in any other manner.

5. That it would be more satisfactory, in all medical appointments, to contract on equitable terms for attendance on permanent paupers; and, in the case of casual paupers, to be paid for visits and medicine on a reasonable scale (*e.g.*, 1s. per mile for each visit, and 1s. for medicine), to be agreed on between the medical officers and the Poor-law Board.

6. That, in order to carry out the above resolutions, a weekly report shall be made by each medical officer of the visits and medicines supplied to paupers, both permanent and casual.

7. That workhouses shall be contracted for on equitable terms, with medicines supplied by the Union at the suggestion of the medical officer.

8. That extras for surgical operations and midwifery shall be determined by the Poor-law Board, with the assistance of the Medical Council under the new Medical Act.

(Signed)

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| HENRY WILKINSON. | GEORGE HOPPER. |
| ROBERT O. BLYTHMAN. | WILLIAM SAVILLE. |
| J. G. WADE. | BENJAMIN ROBINSON. |
| JAMES BURMAN. | EDWARD ROBINSON. |
| ERASMUS STONE, JUN. | JAMES CROWTHER. |
| CHARLES NEWTON FOOTE. | HENRY DARWIN. |

P.S. The above resolutions are intended to indicate a liberal principle of action; but we leave the details in other hands.

Rotherham, February 7th, 1859.

MEDICAL REGISTRATION.

THE following memorial has been addressed to the President of the Medical Council by the Committees of the Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire Registration Association.

"TO SIR BENJAMIN BRODIE, BART., Pres.R.S., D.C.L., *etc.*,
President of the Medical Council.

"SIR,—We, the undersigned members of the Committees of the Northamptonshire and the Bedfordshire Medical Registration Associations, respectfully solicit your consideration of this memorial.

"By Section XV of the New Medical Act, three modes are prescribed for the Registration of members of the profession.

"I. By 'producing to the Registrar the document conferring or evidencing the qualification' of the applicant.

"II. By the applicant 'transmitting by post to such Registrar information of his name and address and evidence of the qualification, *etc.*, *etc.*, and of the time or times at which the same were obtained.'

"III. 'It is lawful for the Registrar (upon receipt of the fee), provided the name, qualifications, and residences appear in the certified list of a licensing body, to enter in the register such names, *etc.*, *etc.*, without other application.'

"We beg most respectfully to express our opinion that the first and third modes of carrying out the registration are most insecure and unsatisfactory, for the following amongst other reasons, namely:—

"That the Registrar must be a stranger to the great majority of the applicants; that he cannot be acquainted with their age, their residences, or that they are the veritable individuals whose names appear in any produced documents, nor can he have any knowledge that such documents were 'lawfully obtained', or, in cases of suspicion, has he the time or opportunity to institute satisfactory inquiries.

"That the several Licensing Bodies can have little or no reminiscence of their members; for though the *Pass Lists* may contain the places of their education or birth, these are seldom the places in which those members commence or continue the practice of their profession; consequently the said bodies can have no exact knowledge of the residence, change of residence, deaths, or other circumstances connected with those members, or the identity of parties bearing names appearing on their lists.

"That there has been but an imperfect, if any, revocation of diplomas of deceased members, so that numbers of such diplomas must be in existence, bearing a high marketable value, and affording strong temptations to fraudulent impersonations.

"The very easy and lax mode adopted during the first few weeks of registering may entail many deplorable prosecutions in order to remove improper names from the register.

"Your memorialists beg to express their opinion that the second mode of registration is the more secure and may be rendered satisfactorily so, by a rigid construction of the phrase '*evidence of qualification*'; that the Executive Council has the power not only to enjoin such a construction, but also to empower their Registrar forthwith in all cases to demand the same.

"Your memorialists beg to subjoin the system they have adopted in receiving (under the sanction of the Registrar) applications for registration; and, without presuming to dictate or recommend any one plan, they respectfully express the hope that the above objections will be taken under the serious consideration of the President and the Executive Council.

"We have the honour to remain, sir,

"Your very obedient servants,

"D. J. T. FRANCIS, M.D. } *Physicians to the North-*

"JOHN HENRY WEBSTER, M.D. } *ampton Infirmary.*

"H. TERRY, F.R.C.S. } *Surgeons to the Northampton In-*

"J. MASH, F.R.C.S. } *firmary.*

"JOHN M. BRYAN, M.D., F.R.C.S., Northampton.

"BENJAMIN DULLEY, F.R.C.S.Lond., Wellingborough.

"T. FOSTER GRAY, M.R.C.S., Northampton.

"ROBERT S. STEDMAN, M.R.C.S., L.S.A., Sharnbrook, B

"G. F. D. EVANS, M.D., L.R.C.P., *Chairman of the Be*

"T. HERBERT BARKER, M.D. } [Comm

"H. W. SHARTIN. } Bedford.

"C. E. PRIOR, M.D.

"January 31st, 1859."

LONDON MEDICAL REGISTRATION
ASSOCIATION.

MEETING IN LAMBETH.

On Friday, February 4th, the second of a series of metropolitan meetings of the medical profession, convened by the Association, took place at the Vestry Hall, in Lambeth; Dr. Odling, Medical Officer of Health for that parish, and a member of the Committee of the Association, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN, having opened the proceedings by stating the objects of the Association, called on Dr. Ladd, the Honorary Secretary, to read the report of its proceedings to the current date, which was accordingly done. At its conclusion, he read the following resolutions, carried unanimously at the last meeting of the Lambeth Medical Registration Association:—

"That the Lambeth Medical Registration Association, believing that there no longer exists any necessity for such an Association in Lambeth, as there is now a powerful and influential Association for *all London*, styled the London Medical Registration Association, and being convinced that the great object of these Associations will be better obtained by *one central Association*, do hereby accept the invitation of the London Medical Registration Association, and agree to join the same, and to pay the extra sum of 2s. 6d. per member, and that the balance in the hands of the Treasurer (if any) shall be handed over to the London Medical Registration Association."

"That the following gentlemen do represent the practitioners of Lambeth on the Committee of the London Medical Registration Association—viz., Dr. Pursell; David Taylor, Esq.; F. B. Garty, Esq."

[By a vote passed at the meeting of the General Committee of the London Medical Registration Association, on Wednesday, February 2nd, the Committee thankfully accepted the addition of the above-named gentlemen to their body.]

Dr. PURSELL moved—

"That this meeting having heard the report of the progress hitherto made by the London Medical Registration Association, thoroughly acquiesces in the principles by which the course of that Association has been guided, and recognises the importance of its receiving the support of all qualified medical practitioners in the parish of Lambeth, both for their own advantage and the interests of the profession."

In his remarks, he stated that the great necessity there was for such an Association as the present, was proved by the case now pending in Dublin (*Reg. v. Evans Reeves and Protheroe*).

Dr. BUSHELL in seconding this resolution, expressed his opinion that the Medical Council had not treated the Association courteously in declining an interview with its Committee.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY eulogised the great efforts of Dr. Ladd in his zealous performance of his duties as Honorary Secretary of the Association. He said it had been a great thing to see the new Medical Act passed, but it was an equally great thing to get the profession to bestir themselves to see its provisions fully carried out.

This resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. BULLEN proposed the second resolution, which was seconded by Mr. JEFFREE—

"That in the opinion of this meeting, it is highly desirable to augment the number and influence of the members of the London Medical Registration Association, so as to enable it effectually to carry out its objects, and give weight to its proceedings with the Medical Council; and that this meeting pledges itself to use every exertion to secure that end."

Dr. KIRBY remarked that the Act provided for three things—medical education, medical registration, and the means of preventing illegal practice. It was with the two latter objects only that this Association had to do. He did not wholly approve of the constitution of the General Council, but we were now on the right road to get a better, and the Government was prepared to listen to the representations of that Council. They were not, however, to be allowed to take £30,000 out of the pockets of the profession for doing nothing, and it would be the business of the Association to prevent that being the case.

The second resolution was unanimously carried.

Mr. W. B. EVANS moved—

That this meeting recognises the exceeding importance of acting, and submitting to the London Medical Registration

Association, all possible information concerning persons practising medicine illegally in the parish of Lambeth."

This was seconded by Mr. Pocock, and supported by Mr. LAVIES, who considered that the Association would prove very valuable in affording necessary information to the Registrar, and carried without a dissenting voice.

Mr. MISKIN moved, and Mr. DODD seconded—

"That, in the opinion of this meeting, the mode of registration as at present conducted is quite inefficient for the purposes contemplated by the Act, and does not afford sufficient protection against unqualified persons becoming enrolled upon the Medical Register."

Dr. KIRBY stated that he feared the Registrar, Dr. Hawkins, was not at all aware of the amount of illegal and fraudulent medical practice that existed; and he trusted that the Association would be furnished officially with proof-sheets of the Register before it was finally printed.

Mr. POCOCK, Mr. W. B. EVANS, Mr. BULLEN, and Mr. BOTTOMLEY made observations on the resolution, which was ultimately carried with one dissenter.

A vote of thanks to the chairman, proposed by Mr. LAVIES and seconded by Mr. Pocock, terminated the proceedings.

THE CASE OF DR. STORRAR. *Court of Queen's Bench*, Saturday, January 29th, 1859. (Before Lord Campbell, and Justices Wightman, Crompton, and Hill.) *Regina v. Storrar*. The Attorney-General stated that he had been instructed on behalf of the Senate of the University of London, to show cause against a rule which had been obtained, calling upon Dr. John Storrar to show cause why an information in the nature of a *quo warranto* should not be filed against him, on the ground that he had been unduly elected to the Medical General Council. He felt the question to be so important, as affecting the rights of a large body of influential persons, and their lordships would probably be of opinion that there was so much force in the arguments adduced by Mr. Edward James in moving for the rule, that he did not feel that he could make such a serious opposition as to induce their lordships to discharge the rule, and he should therefore not resist its being made absolute. The rule was therefore made absolute; the result of which is that a step is gained for the graduates, and it is clearly shown that the question is not regarded, either by the Court or by the Attorney-General, to be so simple or so clearly in favour of the views held by the Senate as seemed at first to be the somewhat general impression. The final argument will take place early next term.

A VERY SLOW POISON INDEED. A lady (resident of Lindfield) having lately placed herself under homœopathic treatment, was, of course, supplied with a bottle of the well known globules, about 200, with directions to take "two" for a dose. One of her children obtained possession of the bottle last week, swallowed the whole of the contents, which, of course, created alarm in the family; but, up to the present time, the globules have taken no effect. (*Brighton Examiner*.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

POSTAGE OF MANUSCRIPT AND PRINTED MATTER.

Any amount of manuscript or printed matter, singly or together, provided it contains nothing in the form of a written letter, is transmitted through the post, in packets open at the ends, at the following rates: not exceeding 4 ounces, one penny; above 4 and not exceeding 8 ounces, twopence; above 8 ounces and not exceeding 1 pound, fourpence; for every additional half-pound or under, twopence.

ANONYMOUS CORRESPONDENTS should always enclose their names to the Editor; not for publication, but in token of good faith. No attention can be paid to communications not thus authenticated.

F.R.C.S. According to the present regulations of the Society of Apothecaries, no gentleman practising in England or Wales can give his apprentice a legal title to examination unless he is himself legally qualified to practise as an apothecary under the provisions of the act of 1815. But an apprenticeship for not less than five years to a surgeon practising as an apothecary in Ireland or Scotland gives the apprentice a title to be admitted to examination.

Communications have been received from:—MR. PROPERT; MR. H. THOMPSON; DR. J. WAY; DR. F. PAGE; MR. G. M. HUMPHRY; DR. A. WYNNE WILLIAMS; DR. R. U. WEST; MR. A. T. H. WATERS; MR. H. ALFORD; "HOPEFUL"; MR. S. DREW; MR. G. MAY, JUN.; A QUALIFIED ASSISTANT; F.R.C.S.; MR. F. GARDNER (South Molton); MR. J. ROYSTON; DR. J. WATSON; MR. T. HOLMES; DR. OKE; DR. GAIRDNER; MR. T. M. STONE; DR. W. B. MUSHET; DR. J. SLOANE; DR. W. NEWMAN; MR. J. V. SOLOMON; MR. W. COLLINS; THE SECRETARY OF THE LONDON MEDICAL REGISTRATION ASSOCIATION; DR. GOODE; THE SECRETARY OF THE HARVEIAN SOCIETY; DR. G. HARLEY; FAIR PAY; A. Z., NOT A MEDICAL MAN; DR. G. HEWITT; DR. R. FOWLER; MR. B. W. BROWN; MR. J. L. GREEN; MR. J. G. APPLETON; MR. T. L. PRIDHAM; and DR. A. P. STEWART.