

thus tries and acquits itself. A very legal and a very constitutional proceeding; one very great merit of which is, the maiden modesty and absence of bold effrontery which, in its execution, it displays.

This conduct of the Committee reminds me of the very similar conduct displayed by it, at the few public meetings of the profession which it convened, and which was so heartily disgusting. I allude to its endless self-laudation. Congratulating you on your signal triumph over your enemies, the enemies alike of the profession and the public,

I remain, very faithfully yours,

ARTHUR HILL HASSALL.

* * Not less absurd than the conduct displayed by the committee in voting confidence in itself, in constituting itself counsel, judge, and jury, in its own case, is the assertion which it has made in reference to the motives which have determined your unceasing and admirable exposure of its mal-practices, that it has resulted from "personal pique," "disappointed vanity;" disappointed vanity at what, I should like to know? At not forming one of a committee, made up, to a great extent, of apothecaries!—a race but little better than the ancient medical barbers. Occupying, as you do, a high political and social position, the condescension would surely have been on your part, had you consented to have acted with a committee thus constituted; and well would it have been, both for that committee and the profession, had you formed one of it. You would have saved it from the disgrace which has accumulated so fast and thick upon it, and the profession from the danger which threatens it. "Disappointed vanity," indeed! Gross absurdity!

THE "M.D. CANTAB."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Perceiving in your last number an opinion expressed regarding the use of the term "M.D. Cantab.," which has evidently been elicited from you by the uncandid and ungenerous statements of a malevolent "Inquirer," I should feel (in common with others similarly circumstanced amongst my friends) greatly obliged, if you would inform the profession in your next number, if there be any other mode of obtaining the degree of "M.D. Cantab." than by residence, and passing from "M.B. of five years, or M.A. of seven years standing," performing the exercises, and passing the examinations, (excepting the case of honorary degrees conferred "without either examination or residence on such individuals of mature age as are illustrious, not on account of their birth only, but also for the services they have rendered to the state, or to literature,") and by passing *ad eundem* from Oxford or Dublin, which, equally with Cambridge, require, in medical degrees, residence, examination, &c., and the previous degree of M.B. or M.A. with a similar standing? Are not M.D. graduates in both the last cases, equally with the first, legally and equitably empowered to use the title "M.D. Cantab.," without risking comparison either with a Giessen (*non-resident*) graduate or a Cambridge shoemaker? If not, then Macartney, Abercrombie, Prichard, and a host of others, (and many of our highest prelates have transferred *ad eundem* their D.D.) have used a title to which they had no right.

If the *ad eundem* degree does not equitably, honourably, and legally, entitle the possessor of it to append the name of the university to which he has transferred them, for what purpose does that university require him to present himself before the convocation, perform the exercises, take the oaths, pay the fees, and enter his name on the university register? And for what purpose does it publish his name in its Annual Calendar? Believing that you are desirous of doing substantial justice to all,

I am, yours truly,

M.A., AN HONEST INQUIRER.

P.S.—Does not Sir J. Graham's Medical Bill likewise fully recognise, nay, in some cases enforce, the principle of *ad eundem* degrees?

THE "FELLOWSHIP QUESTION" OF THE COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Mr. Rumsey has *denied*, but not *disproved*, my argument. I would assure that gentleman, however, I have too high an opinion of his former zeal in behalf of our profession to write a line with the remotest wish or desire of its being offensive to him. But on the question at issue he has taken up a position which I believe to be a false one, and doubly pernicious to the profession as coming from himself. Sophistry, then, from such a source, must be combated with energy; but, as far as I am concerned, though the language of decision may be employed, it shall be done

with that kindly and elevated feeling which should characterize him whose only object is *truth*.

I would entreat all those who take an interest in the matter—and all should do so—to read Mr. Rumsey's first letter* again. The more I think of his proposition, the more monstrous does it seem. Why, Sir, if the College were to adopt his suggestion, (and the profession know enough of their readiness to earwig the minister to aid their monopoly,) all the surgeons to her Majesty's gaoles, all the Poor-law Union surgeons, and a host of other able and efficient men, whom I need not particularize, would be excluded for ever from the "honour," paltry and useless though it be. No matter how high their pretensions, how exalted their intellect, a Brooks, a Carpue, a Kiernan, or a Key, might be made to succumb to the flimsy pretensions of every ignorant numscull, who, practising perhaps on two patients a year, would be contented to live upon "herrings," unless his friends could continue him a collegiate idler. Mr. Rumsey admits having acted as an assistant apothecary. His name, too, stands in the list of the licentiates of the Hall. He is then *legally* and *actually* an apothecary. He is a surgeon, of course, besides. There is nothing inconsistent with "common sense" in this. A man may be a member of Parliament, and yet not do the duties of his calling—a clergyman, and yet not preach—an apothecary, and yet not practise.

But this, despite Mr. Rumsey's argument, can never be a just ground of exclusion from the fellowship. If it were, I again assert that gentleman should share the fate of his confrères.

The ensuing session of Parliament seems likely to be a stormy one, and full of trouble to the ministry. If, therefore, they determine to pursue the subject of medical legislation in its present crude and undigested state, they will find plenty of volunteers as ready as ever to give them battle on some knotty points.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Weobley, Dec. 7th, 1845.

WM. HEMPSON DENHAM.

VACCINATION.—THE BRENTFORD UNION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As one of the "vaccinators" who have not affixed a signature to what is called a "remonstrance," I consider it but correct that you should know the cause of the reduction by the "Board of Guardians of the Brentford Union" of the vaccination fee.

Some of the vaccinators have placed (as I understand) the names of many of their private patients in the pauper list, and thus charged the board with the fee. Some of them stoutly maintain that the act of Victoria sanctions this charge, and they may be correct in the opinion they entertain. The majority, however, have merely returned the names of paupers, charging alone for them. If the law sanctions the charge for every patient, those who have not placed the names of their private patients amidst the rest, have been mulcted of their due; and *vice versa*, those who have done so, have received double payment for a simple duty, which scarcely seems fair. I would not let it be supposed that I consider 1s. 6d. enough, for the half-crown is fairly earned, and but for this double charge, would not have been reduced. Perhaps you will insert this in your next number, and inform the profession whether the double charge is legal. I can suppose the act requires all the names sent in, but I cannot comprehend that A and B should both pay the same bill.

Yours faithfully,

Twickenham, Dec. 8th, 1845.

THOS. LITCHFIELD.

* * The double charge is decidedly an illegal one.—ED. L.

MEDICAL ASSISTANTS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As the general body of medical practitioners view you as the strenuous upholder of the dignity of the profession, which, to use your own words, "has acquired the first importance in society, and whose members are gladly received as honoured guests in the mansions of our nobility," pray suffer me to call your attention to the *Morning Herald* newspaper of Monday, Dec. 1st, 1845, wherein you will find a report of the evidence of a Mr. Whitfield, surgeon, in a trial of Wright *v.* Walker, for a breach of promise of marriage, which runs thus:—"Mr. Whitfield.—I am a surgeon. The defendant was my assistant. He gets no salary. *Thirty pounds a year is a fair salary for a surgeon's assistant!*" Such an assertion, certainly, has not a tendency to *raise* our calling in the estimation of the public, and surely Mr. Whitfield could not have borne in mind the expenses now attendant on the education of our profession, nor the labour and anxiety the duties of it entail even on the surgeon's assistant. The remuneration mentioned by Mr. Whitfield is actually not commensurate with the salary of a