

Examination of the president and examiners of the Royal College of Physicians of London ... : with an analysis of the evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons; and suggestions for an improved system of medical government / [Edwards Crisp].

Contributors

Crisp, Edwards, 1806-1882.

Publication/Creation

London : E. Wilson, 1849.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/fm93kbn>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

11

E X A M I N A T I O N
OF THE
PRESIDENT AND EXAMINERS
OF THE
ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS
OF LONDON,
AND OF THE MEDICAL AND SURGICAL CORPORATE BODIES
OF THE UNITED KINGDOM,
WITH AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE GIVEN BEFORE THE
SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS;
AND
SUGGESTIONS FOR AN IMPROVED SYSTEM OF MEDICAL GOVERNMENT,
BY
EDWARDS CRISP, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.A.C.

MEMBER AND LATE ONE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE PATHOLOGICAL AND MEDICAL SOCIETIES
OF LONDON; MEMBER AND LATE ONE OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE PHYSICAL SOCIETY
OF GUY'S HOSPITAL; ONE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE SOUTH LONDON
MEDICAL SOCIETY, AND A REJECTED CANDIDATE AT THE ROYAL COLLEGE
OF PHYSICIANS OF LONDON.

"There are a sort of men, whose visages
Do cream and mantle like a standing pond;
And do a wilful stillness entertain,
With purpose to be drest in an opinion,
Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit;
As who should say, "I am Sir Oracle,
And, when I ope my lips, let no dog bark!"
* * * I do know of these,
That therefore only are reputed wise
For saying nothing: who, I am very sure,
If they should speak, would almost damn those ears,
Which, hearing them, would call their brothers fools."—*Shakespeare.*

L O N D O N :
EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

MDCCCXLIX.



PREFACE.

It is but right to inform the reader that if I had not been rejected, and I believe *very unfairly treated*, at the College of Physicians, the following pages would never have seen the light; let him not infer from this that any alteration has taken place in my opinions respecting Medical Reform. I have always been an advocate for a Faculty of Medicine, Election by Concours, and the Representative Principle, and during my recent examination, when a friend suggested that I might change my opinions on becoming a member of the College of Physicians, I replied, "I hope I shall never so disgrace myself." I must also beg the reader to bear in mind that my only motive for wishing to join this College, was the difficulty of obtaining any public appointment* without its licence, and the refusal of the licentiates to meet those who are not members of their own body. Let no one think that I am actuated by vindictive feelings towards my examiners,—I have no desire to injure them in any way; and my only motive for again alluding to my own case is the belief that it has an important bearing upon the subject of Medical Reform, and shows in an especial manner the necessity for Public Examinations. In this enquiry I have to deal with systems, and I only notice individuals when I believe that such a course is necessary for the proper elucidation of the subject.

* The day before my rejection, some friends began to canvass for me for the office of Physician to the Surrey Dispensary, and probably I should have obtained the appointment, had not a law of this Institution required that the Candidate should be a Licentiate of the College of Physicians.

There is one class of readers I neither expect nor desire to please; they are all "tarred with the same brush," all cling like the bat to the buildings where they are well fed and sheltered. I shall be equally unsuccessful in gaining the approbation of a second class: gentlemen who talk of self-reform, who have filled their own coffers, and think that things had better remain as they are. I trust, however, that the third and largest class of my readers, although they may not agree with all my views, will give me the credit of not being influenced by feelings of disappointed pride and mortified ambition, and do me the justice to think that my chief motive for the publication of this pamphlet is the belief, that at this particular crisis it will be of service to the profession at large. Let the reader put my case entirely out of the question; let him think that although some of the Examiners refused me their licence, for what they called want of "practical knowledge," I had no right to subject them to the same ordeal, and reject them on their own written and deliberate "practical opinions;" that, although the Examination was unfairly and (as I believe) illegally conducted, I should have patiently submitted to the injustice, and, as Dr. Sutherland kindly suggested, "I should, at the end of twelve months" (after squaring my views with those of the examiners) with humble mien and downcast look, have submitted to a second catechising by Dr. Paris, and to the bland and practical corrections of Dr. Todd. This, I am aware, would have been the more politic course, but policy is not a word in my vocabulary.

I will now direct the reader's attention exclusively to the important subject of Medical Reform, and ask him whether a great part of the evidence given before the Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons is of such a nature as to enable the Government properly to frame a Bill upon it? Should he have any doubt upon the subject, I entreat him to turn to the Parliamentary Report itself. The evidence is one-sided, prejudiced, and often false. It would be as fair for Parliament to listen only to those especially benefited by the construction of a railroad, as to legislate upon the statements of these interested Corporators, whose object has always been to encourage the present divisions in the profession. *Divide et impera*, has been their motto, and Fellows, not fellowship, their cry.

But who are these men that arrogate to themselves the right of dictating to the majority of their brethren? Are they properly educated? Have they the knowledge that a well-qualified practitioner should possess? I fearlessly assert that many of them have not. They are like the parish beadle; they assume the same amount of authority, and are as badly dressed; for, if you strip them of their gilt and livery, you will find them deficient in one important garment,—they are only half clad.

In conclusion, I beg the reader to weigh well the plan I have advocated, and ask himself whether there is any insurmountable difficulty in its accomplishment, and whether rotten and time-worn Corporations ought to retard the progress of medical science and the general good of mankind? Should he agree with me, I would urge him to lay aside all self-interest, apathy, and indifference, and unite with those who reject with indignation and scorn the assertion, that a body of intelligent and enlightened men are not competent to govern themselves; we must remember that a Bill is about to be introduced into Parliament, that the crisis is important, and the victory ours, if we exert ourselves to win it.

The fight is a noble one! not for the shedding of blood, but for the preservation of human life. The Government, if we show ourselves united, will not dare to pass a Bill in opposition to the wishes of the great majority of the profession; but should we remain lukewarm and indifferent, a measure will again be smuggled through the House of Commons, like the present charter of the College of Surgeons, which, should it become the law of the land, will obtain our execration, although it may be too late to amend it. The following account of the proceedings of the College of Surgeons in 1796, by Mr. Lawrence, the late President, should teach us a useful lesson:—"In July, 1796, by the death of one of
 "the Governors, and the illness of another, a sufficient number could not
 "be obtained to constitute a legal Court for the election of Officers for
 "the ensuing year, and it was said that the Corporation, owing to this
 "circumstance, became dissolved. This appears to have been merely a
 "pretence; for, in the next session of Parliament, a bill was introduced
 "to get indemnity for the past, to erect the said deceased Corporation
 "into a College with greatly increased power and authority, and to obtain

"a monopoly of lecturing on the practice of surgery. By the secrecy
 "with which this measure was conducted, the bill had passed the House
 "of Commons, and had been twice read in the House of Lords before the
 "Commonalty knew that any legislative measure had been proposed.
 "When, however, its provisions and tendency were known, the indigna-
 "tion of the members was roused. They commenced a vigorous and ulti-
 "mately a successful resistance. In the proceedings before the Com-
 "mittee, it was elicited, that from 1745 to the period when this Act was
 "applied for, £80,000 had been paid in the shape of fees, of which
 "£16,500 had gone directly into the pockets of the Examiners, and that
 "the greater part of the remainder had been dissipated in useless extra-
 "vagance. It was proved also, that not any institution for the advance-
 "ment of science, or the benefit of the Corporation, had been promoted;
 "that the theatre was without lectures, and the library without books.
 "The bill itself excited the derision and contempt of their Lordships, and
 "Lord Thurlow designated it as a miserable and wretched performance
 "in which the arrogance of the provisions maintained an equal contest
 "with their absurdity. It is scarcely necessary to add that the bill was
 "rejected."

If this pamphlet should fall into the hands of the non-professional
 reader, let him not suppose that I intend to throw the slightest ridicule
 on the practice of Medicine. The science, if properly cultivated, is a
 noble one, and has numbered amongst its sons some of the brightest
 examples of philanthropy. To use the words of Celer, a writer of the
 seventeenth century—"It is not my intention to expose Physic, but those
 who have done it—not to reprobate the art for the crime of the artist;"
 and I will address most of the Medical and Surgical Corporate bodies of
 the United Kingdom in the same words that Celer in 1698 applied to the
 College of Physicians—"You may go on in your defiance, but never
 "prosper long in opposition to Justice; she has indeed leaden heels, especi-
 "ally when clogged by you and hindered in her course, but you may at
 "last, as you deserve it, feel her iron hands."

21, PARLIAMENT STREET,

24th May, 1849.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Preface. Motives for publishing. Class of readers. Medical Reform. Necessity for exertion at the present crisis. Mr. Lawrence's speech. Celer's address to the College of Physicians (page 4.)

Examinations at the College of Physicians; degrees, how obtained. Mr. Lawrence's opinion of the "Heads of the profession." Dr. Lankester's pamphlet. Oxford and Cambridge graduates. The University of St. Andrew's. Dr. Hastings's case. Dr. Lankester's rejection. The Author's case; burning of the papers; grounds of rejection; definition of practical knowledge. Dr. Paris's works, review of; his estimate of practical knowledge; errors in anatomy; quack medicines; master-builders in chemistry; yellow turnips and Colchester oysters. Medical Jurisprudence; Swiney Prize, adjudication of; emblem of Justice. (5 to 17).

Dr. Todd's works. Gout and rheumatic fever, identity of the diseases; Diabetes; rheumatic fever; metastasis; perspirations; red corpuscles; phlebitis; chorea; bellows-sound; acute dropsy; practical experience; irritated state of kidney; connection between the renal arteries and those of the skin; compound jalap powder; diuresis; misrepresentation of Bouillaud's statements, and of the case of rheumatic fever in the Medical Gazette; case treated by Dr. Todd; spirits of turpentine; inflammation of the kidneys. Dr. Todd's practical corrections; introduction of the case mentioned in the Medical Gazette into the examination. Dr. Todd's interference with the President; examination in chemistry; catalysis, isomorphism, chloric ether. (17 to 20.)

Dr. Sutherland's titles and works; clinical lectures; *Annales Medico Psychologiques*; polite enquiries; mania and phrenitis; the Doctor's diagnosis of phrenitis and insanity; delirium; quantitative analysis of the urine not "worth his while." Dr. Alderson's book. Carcinoma and scirrhus; ulcerated carcinoma of the pylorus; gall-stones; osteosarcoma; cholesterine; hydatid tumors; hysteria; perforation of the stomach. Dr. Nairn's opening enquiry. The Author's writings; practical knowledge. (21 to 22.)

Medical Reform. British Medical Association; reasons for joining. Present state of the medical profession; nineteen licensing bodies; Archbishop of Canterbury; self-election, nepotism, and corruption; antagonistic bodies. Principles of the British Medical Association. One Faculty; the General Medical Senate; high qualification; equal rights and privileges; sale of drugs; general practitioners; chemists and druggists; general register of medical practitioners. Features of the Bill that should be introduced by government; additions suggested by the Author. Concours; register of cases; benefit to the public; identity of interests in the profession; industrious students; drones; importations from Scotland. Career of Dupuytren; contrast between the mode of obtaining hospital appointments in this country and in France. Cambridge and Oxford graduates. Catholics and Quakers. (22 to 26.)

Author's proposals; no Bill can be acceptable to the profession, unless founded on the representative principle; general registration essential; why objected to by some of the corporate bodies. Pure surgeons will register as surgeons, and practise as physicians. No difficulty in carrying the representative system into effect; mode of election proposed by the Author; the chief obstacles to the progress of medical reform; the plan suggested supposed, in a great measure, to remove these. Number of medical practitioners in London, and their qualifications; degrees, number of, and where obtained; probably greater variety of qualifications in the provinces. No attempt made by the corporate bodies to redress grievances. Union surgeons; penny clubs; naval surgeons. Professor Jacob's advice to students. Board of Health. Quack medicines; sale of poisons; illegal practice; examination of chemists and druggists. (26 to 31.)

College of Physicians, history of; *vulgar invasions*; gentlemen's sons ran away from London; names of physicians persecuted. Harvean Oration. Dr. Greenfield's committal to Newgate. Dr. Gideon Harvey's opinion of this College. Medical cardinals. Dr. Isaac Schomberg's rejection. Mr. Kennedy's sketch of Medical Monopolies; excluding bye-laws of the College; Plague, great mortality; only a few physicians remained in London to assist the diseased multitude. Dr. Wells's opinion of the Fellows; the last batch; refusal of the fellowship by Drs. Clarke, Clutterbuck, and Arnott. Professor Grant compares the acts of this College to those of Eastern despots. (31 to 34.)

Parliamentary evidence of Dr. Paris not to be relied upon. Cockney and country physicians. Dr. G. Burrows; the absurdity of many of his statements; his reception by his class. Dr. Seymour's prejudice in favor of the Universities. Dr. Holland's academical education, and the disorders of the higher classes. St. Luke's Hospital report; fractional statistics; thanks to the London Hospital, and the praise due to the Lunatic Asylum. Drs. Connolly, Winslow, and Prichard. Dr. Hawkins's evidence; his highly educated order of physicians. Some of the best men in the profession not members of Oxford or Cambridge; the education of a physician at these Universities inefficient; importance of the study of modern languages; ancient authors, little to be learned from them. The Aphorisms of Hippocrates. John Hunter's opinion of a University education. Comparison of Oxford and Cambridge graduates with other physicians practising in London—names. (34 to 40.)

College of Surgeons; history of; arbitrary and tyrannical proceedings of; back-door entrance; museum and library; sale of examinership. Treatment of Brooks, Bennett, King, Dermott, and others; burning of the Hunterian manuscripts; New Charter smuggled through Parliament; retrograde movement; the pure surgeons undergo no medical examination, although nine-tenths of their practice is medical; difference in hospital practice. The ignorance of the public respecting the qualifications of medical practitioners; recent appointments. Absolution from surgical knowledge. Members of the College not examined in Latin; inefficiency of the examination; grinding. Reformers in the Council; Messrs. Grainger and Key. Mr. South's Household Surgery. Midwifery practitioners excluded from the Council. Parliamentary evidence; Sir B. Brodie's objections to. Mr. Green's statements. Mr. Guthrie's opinions. Mr. Lawrence's observations respecting the University of St. Andrew's. Dr. Read's reply. Extracts from Mr. Lawrence's speeches at the Freemasons' Tavern, 1826. (40 to 48.)

Scotland. State of medical institutions and of medical practice. Nine licensing bodies. University of Edinburgh; injurious effects of the present mode of election; grinders; examination questions; surgical; pathological; Homœopathic examiner. Students driven to Scotland in consequence of restrictions in England. Illiberality in Scotland. Evidence of the Scotch physicians; that of Dr. Christison likely to mislead; nearly all in Scotland general practitioners, and very badly remunerated. (48 to 53.)

Ireland. Dublin College of Surgeons and the Apothecaries' Company. Lying-in and Fever Hospitals. Sale of Hospital Appointments. Evidence of the Dublin physicians and surgeons. Medical apothecaries. (53.)

University of London. Examination at, the best in this country. Evidence of its graduates. Evidence of Messrs. Bottomly, Cartwright, and Ottley. (54.)

National Institute of Medicine uncalled for. The Apothecaries' Company. the most useful of the corporate bodies; objections to the title, and to its connection with the sale of drugs. Evidence of Messrs. Ridout and Bird. Mistaken principles of the Council of the National Institute. Second examination in surgery by the "Pures." Claim of the general practitioners; physicians; prizes. Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians. Inscriptions for the latter. Recapitulation. (54 to 57.)

EXAMINATION.

THE reader must suppose that I am under examination before the Parliamentary Committee at the House of Commons, and that the examiner is Lord John Russell, or any Prime Minister of England, who is anxious to correct the many glaring abuses that exist in the medical government of this country. The medical examination may be conducted by the reader.

You were a rejected candidate at the Royal College of Physicians, December 21st, 1848?—I was.

May not your evidence on that account be liable to suspicion, and will it not be thought that you are influenced by revengeful feelings?—You are aware of this circumstance at the commencement of the enquiry, and can, therefore, draw your own conclusion; but nearly all my statements admit of direct and positive proof. They are not matters of opinion.

You have published this examination?—I believe I have given a correct and faithful account of the whole transaction.

Had you any precedent for the publication of this examination; and what were your motives for making it public?—I thought that I had been unfairly treated; and I believed that the publication of it, at this particular crisis, would be of service to the profession.

Can a correct opinion be formed of the College examinations from the one you were subjected to?—Oh, no! many have become members of this College who have had scarcely a dozen questions put to them; and if I could with propriety mention names, I could make some curious disclosures respecting these examinations.

Can this College make a man a physician?—No, it can only give him a license to practise.

How are the degrees obtained?—Some at the English universities, some in Scotland, some from foreign universities, and others from bishops or archbishops.

How are the foreign degrees procured?—Many of them are bought of a London wine merchant for £40.

Are gentlemen with these degrees at once admitted to examination?—Yes; the following dialogue will explain it:—

Candidate.—I should like to become a member of your College; but how can I manage it?—*Fellow.* My dear sir, buy a Giessen or Erlangen degree, and you will be let through “easy.”

Some gentlemen, probably, who have passed the College of Physicians and College of Surgeons, have been instrumental in putting large fees into the pockets of the examiners?—I believe so.

Can you suppose that gentlemen, who state that they exercise a high “moral power” over the profession, could be so biassed?—I will not say so; but I will quote the words of Mr. Lawrence, late President of the College of Surgeons, published by himself in 1826. —“But if, gentlemen, any of you should wish to have the honor “of a personal interview with those to whom I have alluded, I “think I could show you how to accomplish that purpose. If you “suggested an appointment, with the view of obtaining their superior “professional judgments, I pledge myself to you, that, whatever “dislike might be indulged or expressed on other occasions, you “would be sure not merely of a polite, but a most cordial recep- “tion. Not a whisper would be heard of any indisposition to co- “operate with you on such an occasion; if I am not mistaken, the “right hand of fellowship would be extended towards you; every “wish would be shown to cement so pleasing a connexion, and “you would meet with the amplest encouragement to repeat the “visit.”

Have rejections been frequent at this College?—I quote the following from Dr. Lankester’s pamphlet:—“It is not often that “rejected candidates for medical licenses are known, but in the “history of the College of Physicians, the Censors have refused to “recommend for the licence two most distinguished British physi- “cians, Dr. John Mason Good and Dr. John Armstrong, and in “doing so have, I think, laid themselves open to the assumption of “the text, and have also demonstrated the incompatibility of the “construction of the Censors’ board with the spirit of the charter of “the college, which was to prevent ‘ignorant and illiterate’ persons “alone from practising physic. It appears from returns made to “Parliament last year, that the College of Physicians seldom rejects “candidates for its license at all. *During the three years, 1842, “1843, and 1844, for which these returns were made, the Censors of “the College did not reject a single candidate, and the Elects but one.* “If we may infer from these three years the previous conduct of “the Censors, it would appear that the list of their rejected candi- “dates is much more distinguished than that of their licentiates.”

Have Oxford or Cambridge graduates often been rejected at this College?—I believe very seldom.

Can you state the number of rejected candidates at the University of St. Andrews?—In 1843 and 1844 seventy-two candidates were examined; of these, twelve (one out of every six) were rejected.

Can you mention any recent rejections at the College of Physicians that have excited public attention?—Yes; Dr. Hastings, in 1846, was passed by the President and four Censors; he was rejected afterwards at the ballot; the ballot was again tried on the same

evening, but with a similar result. A special meeting of the College was then called, and the result was, Dr. Hastings says, his almost unanimous admission into the body of the licentiates.

Were all these proceedings legal?—I don't know the *laws* of this College.

Will you give an account of Dr. Lankester's case?—Dr. Lankester was distinguished for great industry and talent; he had obtained honors in ten of the classes at University College; he had written an Essay on the Uncertainty of Medical Science, and had contributed numerous papers to the medical journals. Dr. Lankester passed the examination for the extra license at the College of Physicians in 1841; and in 1847 he presented himself to be examined for the license, believing that, as he was a member of the College and had passed one examination, he would only be called upon to answer "practical" questions. The doctor, however, was rejected; and the most amusing part of the affair is, that one of the examiners had, six years before, given him the following certificate:—"I can fully testify to his competency to fill the office of physician to a Dispensary, with credit to himself and much advantage to the objects of the institution.

C. J. B. WILLIAMS, M.D."

Dr. Lankester, I suppose, was not thought by the Censors to be up to the London standard?—Exactly so; he was considered fit to physic the inhabitants of Richmond, but not those of Putney or Puddle Dock. The subjoined is from Dr. Lankester's pamphlet:—"If I were a young man who had only had the five years' study which the College requires, I might consistently have been sent back for a year; but what must be thought of the value of the College examination which supposes that the knowledge it requires may be got up in twelve months, but could not be gained by eighteen years of hard study and diligent observation. At the same time, however, I am not ignorant of the fact, that there are gentlemen in London who, in less than a year, would engage to prepare me, as they have done hundreds of other members of the College, in such a manner as to ensure my passing their examinations. I have never, however, condescended to the practice of cramming in the four examinations that I had previously submitted to and passed. I conscientiously regard myself at this moment as fitted to practice my profession, and if the College examinations are of a nature rather to test the schoolboy qualifications which may be got up by a cram, than those which have been gained by reading and experience at the bedside, I can only express my regret that public confidence should have been given to examinations which every member of the College must feel are not worthy of it."

Does not Dr. Lankester lecture on *Materia Medica*?—Yes; and he was examined by a lecturer at a neighboring school.

Will you give a brief account of your own case?—I had been

in general practice for eighteen years, and as my health became indifferent, I determined to quit this laborious part of the profession, and become a consulting practitioner. My taste inclined towards surgery, a department of practice to which I was always much attached, and I had never hesitated to perform any operation that came in my way. But here some insuperable barriers presented themselves: I had been, with many of the members of the College, snubbed and insulted by the Hunterian Orator, Mr. Lawrence; I had seen boys placed over my head for the fellowship, whose only recommendation consisted in their having put money into the pockets of those who elected them fellows; and I had been uncourtously* and scurvily treated in another matter, connected with my Jacksonian Prize Essay. I then turned towards the College of Physicians, I knew the dark pages of her history; I knew that they were full of arrogance, bigotry, tyranny, and pride; but I thought of late that she had shown a disposition to open her portals, and that she began to prefer the light of modern science to the dust and lore of antiquity; but the chief, and probably the only reason that

* The subjoined note to the Council will explain the matter :—

Gentlemen,—Although the circumstances to which I am about to refer cannot now affect me individually, I am, nevertheless, induced to recall them to your notice, with the hope that this may possibly have the effect of securing to other members of the College the courtesy and consideration which have been denied to me.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,

EDWARDS CRISP.

The grounds of complaint which I am prepared to substantiate are embodied in the following statement :—

1st. That having obtained the Jacksonian Prize Essay (awarded April, 1845), which Essay was illustrated by twenty-one preparations; these preparations were kept for nine or ten months in one of the garrets of the College, and that such of my friends as were desirous of seeing them, had no opportunity of doing so.

2nd. That in Oct. 1845, having applied to the Council of the College (by letter) for permission to take the Essay from the library for a short period, for the purpose of having it transcribed and the drawings copied for publication (believing, when I made the request, that it was not an unreasonable one, and that it had been granted to others, and even to one of your own Council,) the reply I received was, that "I could not be allowed to take the Essay out of the library, but that I might send a person to transcribe it, and that an artist might copy the drawings at the College." To this decision I was obliged to submit, although it put me to much trouble, inconvenience, and expence. The grounds for the refusal were not stated by the Council; but Mr. Belfour informed me that "there was *no precedent* for it, and that a prizeman might alter his essay, and perhaps never return it."

In April, 1846, the Jacksonian Prize was awarded to ——. This Essay was not in the library for three or four months after the adjudication of the prize, and I learned that it was kept for the *express purpose of alteration*.

3rd. That being desirous in my Essay of alluding to several of the preparations in the *Hunterian Museum*, and having waited for the catalogue for more than eighteen months, I, in February, 1846, (not being able to obtain a catalogue of any kind), applied to Mr. Paget (by letter), who "doubted whether he was at liberty to lend the manuscript copy of the catalogue, which he had prepared for the press, without the consent of the Museum Committee; telling me, at the same time, that the old manuscript copy could be referred to," (this, however, could not be found.) Mr. Paget, in addition, kindly offered to meet me, and explain any of the preparations. Not being desirous of taking up Mr. Paget's time, and wishing to trust to my own observation, I applied to Mr. Swan (one of the Museum Committee), whom I saw in the library. Mr. Swan at first made some objection, but on my telling him that I thought that no obstacle should be thrown in my way, as I was preparing a College Prize Essay, he said the Council was then sitting, and he would make enquiry. He did so, and I was informed that I might have the manuscript catalogue in the Museum on the following day *for three hours*. I availed myself of this liberal offer, and was obliged to hurry over the preparations, assisted by a friend (a member of the College.) Disgusted with the whole proceeding, I consoled myself with the belief that the catalogue would soon be in print; but although more than a year has elapsed, the catalogue is still unattainable, and I have been obliged to print my Essay without alluding so fully to many of the preparations as I could have wished.

The receipt of this communication was acknowledged by the Secretary.

induced me to desire her license was this,—in London, nearly all public appointments to hospitals and dispensaries are shut out from those physicians who are not licentiates of this College; and these licentiates refuse to meet in consultation the graduates of other British Universities.

Had you any difficulty in obtaining permission to be examined? —Yes; I had a correspondence (which I have published) with Dr. Hawkins, the Registrar; and after the following letter was submitted to the Censors'-board, I was allowed to put my name down for examination.

March 14, 1848.

SIR,—I laboured under the impression (an erroneous one it appears) that all general practitioners of forty years of age, could be admitted to examination at the College of Physicians. I have, on the other side, inserted the number of my Essays, &c., on various subjects. Will you be kind enough to bring the matter before the Censors' Board, and inform me, at your earliest convenience, whether I can be admitted to examination without attending the medical practice of a British hospital?

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
EDWARDS CRISP.

Francis Hawkins, M.D.

Cases of Cerebral Disease, with Observations. *Lancet*, March 7, 1840.*
 Essay on Dry Gangrene, endeavouring to show that it arises from Arteritis. May 15, 1841.
 Perforations of the Stomach (from simple Ulceration), with Statistical Deductions. Uterine Derangement supposed to be the Predisposing Cause. Aug. 5, 1843.
 Essay on Gall-stones, with Statistical Deductions. Dec. 11, 1841.
 Cases of Melæna, with Observations. Feb. 7, 1846.
 Infantile Pleuritis, Diagnosis of, with Cases. Jan. 16, 1847.
 Intestinal Obstructions, recommending Surgical Operation in some Cases. March 6, 1847.
 Puerperal Convulsions, with Albuminous Urine (1844); and several published cases not alluded to. Numerous morbid specimens exhibited at the London, South London, and Pathological Societies.
 Case of Large Polypus of the Uterus occurring during Parturition. *Trans. of the Medical Society of London*. 1846.
 I obtained the Silver Medal at the Medical Society of London; and the Jacksonian Prize at the Royal College of Surgeons, on the Structure, Diseases, and Injuries of the Blood-vessels, Dec. 1844. Published March, 1847.
 I have also a Pathological museum of my own formation. After passing the Hall and College (1829), I spent several months at the Parisian Hospitals.

After obtaining permission to be examined, I studied at the Edinburgh and Dublin Schools; and having taken my degree in Scotland, I returned to London a fortnight before the examination.

How was this examination conducted; and what have you to complain of?—1st. That the verbal examination was commenced by impertinent questions by Dr. Paris. 2nd. That I had been expressly told by the Secretary that I should only be required to translate verbally some medical Latin author. I was expected, however, to answer verbal and written questions in Latin, although the examiners knew that I appeared at their Board under a law affecting those above forty years of age. I expostulated with the President, Dr. Paris, and quoted the London Medical Directory; Dr. Paris, in an angry tone, said, "We have nothing, Sir, to do with the London Medical Directory." I learn, however, from the editors that this very passage was sent by the College. "If he declines this, he is

* The reader must remember that I could not obtain my object without this exhibition.

at any rate expected to construe into English a portion of the works of Celsus or Sydenham, or some other Latin medical author." 3rd. That a case about which I differed in consultation with Dr. Todd (one of the Censors), was introduced into this examination, and that Dr. Todd, when he thought that my answers were wrong, was especially careful that the other examiners should know his opinion. 4th. That I was told on Wednesday, by the President, that the board was satisfied with my examination; although, at this very time, my papers were burnt, contrary to an express law of the College, which says, "*Hiscæ quæstionibus responsa ut literis illico mandentur et inter annales nostros conserventur, curet Registrarius.*"

What were the grounds of your rejection?—The President said, that the Board could not allow me to emanate as a physician from their College, for want of "practical knowledge."

What is meant by "practical knowledge?"—It would be as difficult to define honesty, or to discover the philosopher's stone, as to give a proper definition of practical knowledge; probably the Censors' definition would be "deference to Collegiate Authority."

Who were your examiners?—Drs. Paris, Todd, Alderson, Nairne, and Sutherland.

Will you state what these gentlemen have done for the advancement of medical science, and what indications they have given of possessing superior practical knowledge, and of their qualifications to act as Censors?—Dr. Paris has published four works,—A Treatise on Diet; Pharmacologia; Elements of Medical Chemistry; and Medical Jurisprudence.

Have you read Dr. Paris's book on Diet?—Yes; but it would be scarcely fair to notice some parts of this work, as the improvements in chemistry and physiology which have taken place since its publication put it out of the pale of fair criticism; but I will quote one passage from the introduction which shows *Dr. Paris's estimate of "practical knowledge."* "Upon this occasion, at least we may 'with Diderot, ridicule the popular adage, 'the more heads the better counsel;' because 'nothing is more common than heads, and nothing so unusual as good advice.' Suppose an unprejudiced reader, my assumption I admit is violent, were to wade through the discordant mass (works on dietetics) to which I allude, would he not inevitably arrive at the mortifying conclusion that 'nothing is known upon the subject in question; or rather that there does not exist any necessity for such knowledge.'"

Has Dr. Paris, in his anatomical description of the lungs and abdominal viscera, shown that he possesses a "*practical knowledge*" of anatomy?—No; I could quote numerous errors, but observe the following:—"The vena portarum is formed by the concurrence of 'all the veins of the abdominal viscera.'" "Minute anatomy is of little service to the physician, but without a knowledge of the positions and localities of the different organs, which constitute the

“seats of the diseases he may be called upon to cure, he will be inevitably led into error.”

Do you think a knowledge of minute anatomy important to the physician?—Yes; most essential. It is the mainspring of pathology; in the minute structures, morbid changes and disorganizations first occur, and a physician without a knowledge of minute anatomy is like a watchmaker, whose acquaintance with the piece of mechanism he has to repair, is confined to the large wheels.

Has not Dr. Paris's *Pharmacologia* undergone six editions?—Yes; it has been a useful book for chemists and druggists.

How so?—The Doctor has inserted 183 formulæ for the benefit of the “inexperienced prescriber,” and he has honoured nearly all the quacks with a supposed analysis of their medicines. He says, “the Duke of Portland's powder for the gout, as it is a combination of bitters, might, without doubt, be serviceable in certain cases of gout. That to produce a speedy and bulky evacuation, experience has fully established the value of Lady Webster's Pill, and that Dalby's Carminative is constructed upon philosophic principles.”

Does the Doctor then recommend quack medicines?—Oh no, he generally condemns them, but I think he has fallen into a great error in noticing them at all, and that this notice has tended much to increase the spread of quackery in this country.

Has not Dr. Paris, in this book, defended the University of Cambridge from the assertion of Professor Brand: “That chemistry is but superficially and imperfectly taught in the English Universities, and that the London Pharmacopæia is a record of the want of chemical knowledge where it is most *imperiously* required?”—Yes; he says “Is Mr. Brand acquainted with the discipline of our University? Is he aware that the chemical chair has been successively filled by Bishop Watson, Milner, Wollaston, and the late lamented Mr. Tennant?—master builders in the science.” Dr. Paris adds, “That the greatest degree of heat ever produced was effected at Oxford, and the highest temperature at Cambridge.”

Can you mention any original ideas in this work?—Yes; two. “Yellow turnips contain but little if any bitter principle, and Colchester oysters are green.”

You have read Paris and Fonblanque on Medical Jurisprudence?—Yes. State your opinion of this work. It is a quarter of a century behind the knowledge of the age, and a student could not refer to it without being misled, the tests for the poisons, for example as well as other subjects connected with medico-legal science, contain numerous errors. “In reference to jurisprudence, it directs medical men to shape their evidence by statutes which have been for many years repealed; and the statutes passed in the reigns of George IV. William IV. and Victoria, on poisoning wounds, child murder, abortion, rape, and insanity, are necessarily absent.” *

When was this work published?—In 1823.

When published, was the medical part of the treatise distinguished for any important practical discovery?—I am not aware that it contains any thing original.—Dr. Paris and Mr. Fonblanque have just had awarded to them a service of plate and a hundred guineas for this work. Can you give the particulars of this award?—Yes; the following is an abstract from the London Medical Gazette, February 9th, 16th, March 2nd, 1849:—“Dr. Swiney was a wealthy physician, “(not a member of the College,) who died on the 20th of Jan., 1844, “and among other bequests for scientific purposes, left by his will “a certain sum of money, as a prize, to be awarded on every fifth “anniversary of his death, to the author of the best published work “on Jurisprudence, to be adjudged by the members of the Society “of Arts, and *the Fellows of the College of Physicians, with the “wives of such of both as may be married.* This will, among other “strange requests, contains the following—I desire my pall may be “of yellow cloth. Also I desire that three little girls, dressed in “white, for which dresses I have left the sum of twenty pounds; “also a legacy of twenty pounds each to the little girls, who may “precede my coffin in procession, which procession is to be on “foot, &c. The Doctor desired his executors to publish one edition “of the following manuscripts. 1. A romance entitled *Agmodil.* “2. A volume of *Fables.* 3. A treatise on Jurisprudence. A sum “of £500 is left for establishing a Lectureship on Geology; the “lecturer to be an M. D. of Edinburgh.”

Is it stated in the will that the adjudicators are to be the Fellows of the College of Physicians of *London*?—No; the Fellows of the College of Physicians, with the wives of such of them as may be married.

How was the decision made, and who were the adjudicators?—The following extract from the Gazette will explain:—“Notwithstanding this, Dr. Paris, President of the College of Physicians, “exercises the sole power of nomination, in a question in the result “of which he is most deeply interested; and appoints as judges of “the work or works on Medical Jurisprudence, three gentlemen, all “of whom hold office with himself in the College—namely, Dr. F. “Hawkins the Registrar, Dr. Monroe the Treasurer, and Dr. Nairne a “Censor!”

Did these gentlemen give the prize to Dr. Paris and Mr. Fonblanque?—Yes.

Was this decision legal?—I must leave this to the lawyers.

Do you think Dr. Swiney was of sound mind?—I refer this question to the learned physicians of the College, who have had an “academical” education.

Was any public notice given of this prize?—I believe not. Dr. Swiney died in 1844—the adjudicators were appointed October,

1848, and the prize awarded January 17, 1849. In the Catalogue of the Society of Arts, under the head of Competition, appears the following:—"The Society will have observed, that for three years past, a prize of twenty guineas has been offered for the best design for a silver cup, of which the design should be emblematical of *Justice*. The Council felt, that in having to present a cup according to the will of the late Dr. Swiney, it was peculiarly within the province of the Society to provide that it should be an appropriate and fine work of art."*

Do you attribute corrupt and improper motives to Dr. Paris and the adjudicators of this prize?—No; I suppose these gentlemen acted as they thought right, but I think the circumstances were rather peculiar; and if the Editor of the Medical Gazette has not been misinformed, some explanation is demanded.

What are Dr. Todd's works?—Dr. Todd has written several articles in the Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology, of which he is the editor; he is also joint author, with Mr. Bowman, of a work on Anatomy and Physiology; likewise the Anatomy of the Brain and Spinal Cord. A Treatise on Gout and Rheumatism, papers in the Med. Chir. Trans., and Lectures in the Medical Gazette. I will only notice, however, the *practical* works. Dr. Todd deserves credit for great industry.

Have you read Dr. Todd's practical remarks on gout and rheumatic fever?—I have read this book with great attention, and there is scarcely a page that does not contain a debateable point. Dr. Todd asserts "that rheumatism and gout are blood diseases, and that they are identical;" but probably Dr. Todd could not name a disease in which the blood is in a normal condition. I can discover but little identity between these diseases; they attack generally a very opposite class of patients, the symptoms are not identical, and the causes different. The strong athletic countryman (who has never experienced a symptom of indigestion, and who, perhaps, has boasted that he never took physic) is exposed to wet and cold,—rheumatic fever follows; his sinewy joints and strong limbs are racked with pain, his heart and its envelope are next inflamed, and the iron frame and ruddy cheek are seen no more; he is an invalid for life. But contrast this man's condition with the gouty subject, whose constitution, perhaps originally good, has been gradually undermined by luxurious diet and enticing drink; whose kidneys, liver, and skin have had double duty to perform; observe the slow but progressive disorganizations which occur in various parts,—and surely the practical man cannot conclude that these diseases are identical. I admit, that in many cases the resemblance is much greater than that above described, but I believe the diseases are separate and distinct.——"In the confirmed stages of diabetes, the morbid matter is generated at every part of the body. The occurrence of cardiac affection, as a feature of the rheumatic state of constitution, must surely be admitted to be completely opposed to,

* Lancet, April 14, 1849.

“and utterly inexplicable by the doctrine of metastasis.—^s In some instances, where the heart-affection was very extensive and serious, I have remarked that the limbs were free, as if the strong attraction to the heart overcame that to the joints.”

“In rheumatic fever it has always been remarked that the perspirations do not give relief to the pains.”——“As to the proportion of the red corpuscles, I should say that it must be considerably diminished in rheumatic fever; that the *nutritive phenomena* in the blood are arrested.”——“There are two diseases, to the earlier stages of which it (rheumatic fever) presents a still more striking resemblance, these are infections of the blood (from phlebitis or any other cause) and glanders.”——“Some confirmation to these views may be derived from the fact, that with chorea (a disease of very common occurrence in debilitated or ill-nourished constitutions), disease of the heart is frequently associated, a bellows-sound being audible at the apex, or over the base of the heart, according as the disease affects the mitral or aortic valves. Is not this cardiac disease of a rheumatic kind? I cannot doubt that it is so, as we have abundant evidence to prove that chorea and the rheumatic diathesis, or even rheumatic fever, may co-exist.”——I will make no further comment, but leave the “practical reader” to digest the above conclusions of Dr. Todd, and then ask himself the meaning of “practical experience?”

Have you read Dr. Todd's Lectures?—Yes; and I could fill many pages by noticing what I believe to be practical errors. The lecture on acute dropsy is a good illustration, I think, of the fallacy of practical experience. “This dropsy,” Dr. Todd says, “arises from an *irritated* state of kidney and an abnormal state of skin. It is in this stage of the disease, that as I think most benefit is derived from the occasional application of one or two leeches to the region of the kidneys, care being taken not to allow of too much loss of blood.” How much blood would one leech extract, and what is the connection between the artery supplying the kidney and the vessels on the surface? I will leave Dr. Todd to answer this question; and will only notice another instance of his practical experience. “I ordered,” he says, “a purgative, choosing the compound powder of jalap, on account of its hydragogue properties, and because the bitartrate of potash which enters into its composition, favors diuresis.” What do you object to in this statement?—The student at the Apothecaries' Company might be asked whether one dose of a hydragogue cathartic would be likely, also, to increase the flow of urine; and whether, if the cream of tartar produced this effect, it would be prudent to give it in an irritated state of kidney?

Did not Dr. Todd, in his Lecture on Rheumatism in the London Medical Gazette, allude to the case which formed a part of your examination?—Yes; and he has entirely misrepresented this case, as well as the statements of Bouillaud. As an example of the im-

portance of clinical instruction, and of the difficulty of defining "practical experience," I quote the following from Dr. Todd's Lecture on Hæmaturia.—"A girl, sixteen years of age, had hæmorrhage from her bladder, and she had pains in her limbs, flying about from one part to another, which were supposed to be rheumatic. The blood was uniformly mixed with the urine." The following is Dr. Todd's account of the case:—"From the long duration of the hæmorrhage in this case (two months), and the state of extreme debility to which the girl was reduced, I was anxious to improve the state of her blood as much as possible, and to check the hæmorrhage. She was well supported, had a moderate allowance of port wine daily, and took astringents, lead, gallic acid, tannin, and the tincture of the sesquichloride of iron. The hæmorrhage, however, showed no disposition to stop; it diminished for a little while, but returned again with as much intensity as before. She is now again taking gallic acid in large and frequently-repeated doses. If the hæmorrhage does not soon cease, I intend to try some of the terebinthinate medicines, which are supposed to exercise a styptic influence. There is no doubt that they do act favorably as styptics in intestinal hæmorrhage, but in renal hæmorrhage their power is much less certain, and moreover they are very apt to excite irritation."—But I beg especial attention to the following (I suppose unimportant) note to the above case. The account of the post mortem examination is rather meagre, but it might, I think, have formed a useful subject for a clinical lecture, and such is the uncertainty of medical inference, that practical men cannot say that the abstraction of blood from the arm, in the first instance, would not have been serviceable.—"The necessity for great caution in the use of these remedies is shewn by the sequela of this girl's case, which terminated, some time after this lecture was given, in her death. The hæmorrhage resisting all the ordinary remedies, five drops of spirits of turpentine were given three times a day. In the course of two days this remedy was followed by strangury, and a great diminution in the quantity of the urine. This was followed by a low febrile state, with oppressed brain, in which the patient died. The kidneys were in a state of chronic nephritis."

You say that Dr. Todd, when he *thought* that your answers were wrong, was especially careful to let the other examiners know his opinion. What were his corrections?—I said I had not often heard Ægophony. Dr. Todd replied, "it was *very generally heard*." I thought inflammatory dropsy was not a common disease. Dr. Todd said, "*it was a very common disease*, and was described by Dr. Blackall long before Dr. Bright's papers." I thought percussion would not assist much in the diagnosis of dilatation of the right ventricle of the heart. Dr. Todd replied, "*Oh yes, it would*." I did not know that there was any difference between the locus niger and the other grey matter of the brain. Dr. Todd told me the vesicles were "*caudate*." I said the cerebellum had two lobes. Dr. Todd replied, "*three*." When speaking of the functions of the cerebellum,

I stated that I had lately seen a case where a great part of the cerebellum was destroyed, and there was no lesion of the motive power. Dr. Todd politely answered, "*Not observed, you mean.*" And when the President, Dr. Paris, was hesitating about answering my question respecting the unanimity of the examiners as to my deficiency in practical knowledge, Dr. Todd rudely interfered, and said, "*I don't think, Sir, Dr. Crisp has any thing to do with this.*"

Had you any other evidence than that stated in your pamphlet for supposing that the case alluded to had been introduced into this examination?—Yes.

If the same questions in the verbal examination were put to you again, would you answer them in a similar manner?—I should make but very little alteration; I could have added much, but the examination was so conducted that the subjects were seldom finished. The questions were, many of them, of a speculative character, and would admit of various answers.

Perhaps you think if these questions had been put to the examiners, that Dr. Paris could have rejected Dr. Alderson; Dr. Alderson, Dr. Nairne; Dr. Nairne, Dr. Sutherland,—and Dr. Todd might have rejected the whole of them?—I have no doubt about it.

Have you any remark to make about the examination in Chemistry?—Yes; the examiners put questions which they could not understand themselves, Catalysis and Isomorphism for example; and they asked the elementary composition of a body (Chloric ether) which does not exist.

Can you account for this?—I think the Fable of the Bull and the Frog will explain it. Since the establishment of the University of London, the examination questions at the College of Physicians have been greatly altered, and on this occasion I think the examiners got out of their depth. Their knowledge did "so overflow that it was none at all."

Who is Dr. Sutherland?—In the London Medical Directory for 1844, he states "that he is specially engaged in the treatment of insanity." In the Street and Commercial Directory he dubs himself F.R.S. and F.G.S. In the London Medical Directories for 1848 and 1849, he says he is "Contributor of Clinical Lectures on Insanity." Med. Gaz. 1843, "Annales Medico-Psychologiques. Med. Gaz. 1845, "Analysis of Urine of Insane Patients."—Paper on the Medical treatment of Insanity, with Lunacy Commissioners' Report, 1847.

What do you mean by a clinical lecture, and how many of these were published?—A clinical lecture is a lecture at the bedside, and Dr. Sutherland has published three of these lectures.

How many students attended the practice of St. Luke's Hospital in 1843?—I am not aware that any students attend this Hospital.

Have you any remarks to make respecting these lectures?—I do not feel competent to give an opinion, but I know that most

of the conclusions are of a speculative character, and would admit of various opinions.

Did not the subject of insanity form part of your examination?—Yes; Dr. Sutherland enquired whether I had seen much of insanity? and on my replying that I had seen but little of it, he politely said, “Oh, I thought, perhaps, you had in your travels,” and then asked me the difference between acute mania and phrenitis?*

Did he give his own diagnosis?—No; but the following is the Doctor's diagnosis between phrenitis and insanity, extracted from one of the clinical lectures:—“It very seldom happens that we find “in insanity, *acute* inflammation—what would serve to distinguish “the disease from phrenitis? If symptoms of acute inflammation “were present; if there were fever, great intolerance of light and of “sound, contracted pupil and hard pulse, the ancients, and indeed “the moderns have, in their definitions of insanity, always referred “to the absence of fever. It is nevertheless sometimes present, and “this will guide you in your diagnosis. The fever precedes the “delirium in phrenitis, but follows it in mania. In delirium “the mind is occupied solely with the past, in madness with the “past and present also. In phrenitis the blood presents the buffy “coat, in mania it does so but very seldom.”

Is it a correct opinion “that in delirium the mind is occupied “solely with the past?”—I must refer this question to an Hospital nurse.

What does Dr. Sutherland mean by the “*Annales Medico-Psychologiques*?”—This is a French Journal, published in Paris, and I suppose these lectures have been noticed in this publication.

Was not the paper on the “Analysis of the Urine of Insane Patients” written conjointly with Dr. Rigby?—Yes; the authors state at the commencement, “that the analyses have been chiefly “*qualitative*, and that *quantitative* analysis would not have elicited “so much additional information as to have made it worth their “while.” As this is a joint production, I do not feel myself justified in commenting upon it.

Who is Dr. Alderson?—He was formerly a Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and has been but a short time in London: he has written a book on Diseases of the Stomach and Alimentary Canal, 1847.

Have you read this book?—Yes.

* I scarcely need remind the reader that there is no disease about which there is more difference of opinion than phrenitis. I quote the following from Craigie's Practice of Physic, p. 291, vol. ii.:—“The subject has since undergone revision and consideration with the aid of “morbid anatomy, by Baillie, Rostan, Lallemand, Bouillaud, Abercrombie, Hooper, Bright, “Andral, Carswell, and Cruveilhier; but, notwithstanding the researches of these authors, “this question is involved in as much obscurity as before. It is to be observed, however, that “this difficulty refers chiefly, if not altogether, to the necessary connexion between the “external symptoms and the acute seat of the lesion, whether in the substance of the brain “or in the membranes. It is, indeed, chiefly a difficulty in diagnosis, and which, from the “nature of the subject, will probably remain long, if not always, in a most conjectural and “uncertain state.”

What is your opinion of it?—It is a strange composition, full of practical errors and good plates.

Mention some of the practical errors?—Dr. A. says page 80, "Simple carcinoma or scirrhus stricture does occur at the pylorus, but not frequently."

Is not this opinion correct?—No; Carcinoma, and scirrhus deposit, probably are six or eight times more frequent at the pyloric than at the cardiac extremity. Again, Dr. A. says "Ulcerated carcinoma of the pylorus is, as far as my observation goes, always accompanied by encephaloid deposit in the liver; and in this disease the gall bladder is almost always found to contain gall stones, and the gall stones generally consist almost wholly of cholesterine."—"The case of osteosarcoma which, when it has passed the fibrous periosteum, changes its character and becomes medullary sarcoma."—"In carcinoma of the larger curvature of the stomach there is always deposit of the encephaloid tubera of the liver."—"Hydated tumors (of the liver) also frequently point early, which evidences their character."—"The flatulence of hysterical young women is of a different character; it is accompanied with cold extremities, and by a tendency to chilblains." But I beg especially to direct the reader's attention to chapter 12, on perforation of the stomach.

Has Dr. Nairne favoured the world with any of his literary productions?—No; in this respect he has the advantage over some of his colleagues.

Did not Dr. Nairne commence the examination by saying, "I suppose you have opened a few bodies?"—Yes.

Might not much fault be found with your own writings?—Yes; and I dare say deservedly so; but my object in the above critique has been to show the difficulty of understanding the meaning of "practical knowledge," and to use the words of the learned President before quoted, "we must inevitably arrive at the mortifying conclusion, that nothing is known upon the subject in question."

MEDICAL REFORM.

Have you always been a medical reformer? Yes, I was one of the first members of the British Medical Association.

Would not this circumstance alone be sufficient to ensure your rejection at the College of Physicians? I believe so.

State your reasons for joining this Association? I had for a long time witnessed the injurious effects of the present state of medical government both as regards the public good and the welfare of the profession at large.

Give a general outline of the present state of the medical profession? In this country there are nineteen licensing bodies, (including the Archbishop of Canterbury) who grant diplomas; these institutions not only require a different course of study, but their diplomas vary in price from 25 shillings to 70 guineas. The members of these corporate bodies are most of them self-elected and irresponsible, and their chief desire appears to be to put money into their own pockets. Thus, they are not only well paid for the examination of candidates, but they compel these candidates to attend certain Hospitals to which many of them are attached, and to enter to certain courses of lectures, which they deliver, and for which they are paid by the students. These antagonistic bodies have acted as clogs on the wheel of science; they have looked only to their own narrow circles and petty interests, and the little good they have done has not been voluntary, but it has been forced upon them by public opinion and pressure from without; and I believe that the old rotten borough system was not so corrupt as that which now exists in the medical and surgical corporate bodies of this country. That these bodies have beheld with indifference and unconcern the many wrongs and insults to which the profession has been subjected, and until the present system of self-election, nepotism, and corruption is entirely changed; there is no possibility of the profession taking that position in the country, which its great usefulness and importance entitle it to.

For what purpose was the British Medical Association formed? For the purpose of effecting a change in the Medical and Surgical Institutions of this country.

What were the principles of this Association? The following extract from the *Lancet* will explain them.

At meetings of the Council of the British Medical Association, held at Exeter Hall, on the 9th and 16th of July, 1839, a Report of the Sub-committee, appointed to take into consideration the preamble and clauses of a Bill for carrying into effect a general measure of Medical Reform for Great Britain and Ireland, having been read, and discussed at great length,—

The following resolutions, embodying the fundamental principles on which

the British Medical Association was established, were unanimously declared to contain those on which the said Bill ought to be founded, viz :—

1. "That it is expedient and necessary to unite all the legally qualified members of the medical profession, of the British dominions, into 'ONE FACULTY,' to be entitled 'THE BRITISH FACULTY OF MEDICINE.'

2. "That this 'Faculty' shall have the power to elect periodically, by ballot, a governing body, to be called 'The General Medical Senate,' consisting of a Senate in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, to be elected by the respective members of the Faculty in each country.

3. "That these National Senates (of England, Scotland, and Ireland), elected as aforesaid, shall each be subject to the same regulations: and that their members, or a part of them, shall meet from time to time, to consult together, and act unitedly as 'The General Medical Senate,' in framing and administering all necessary laws for the government and protection of the Faculty.

4. "That the General Medical Senate, so constituted, shall alone have power and authority to frame, adopt, and promulgate all necessary bye-laws, for—

1st. Regulating the said Faculty.

2nd. Defending the respective rights and privileges of the members.

3rd. Superintending the medical police of the country.*

4th. Advising Her Majesty's Government on all subjects connected with the public health.

5. "That the members of the Councils or Boards of the several existing Medical Corporate Bodies in England, Scotland, and Ireland, shall be invited to take part in the preliminary steps towards the formation of the first General Medical Senate.

6. "That all future candidates for practice in the healing art, shall be examined by a Board elected under such regulations as the General Senate shall enact for that purpose.

7. "That an uniform high qualification—the result of an extended course of preliminary and professional education—shall be required of all the candidates: to be tested by one or more public examinations—theoretical and practical.

8. "That all persons examined and recognized by the Senates, and admitted members of the Faculty, shall receive the same title or denomination; enjoy equal rights and privileges; and alone have the power to exercise any or all the branches of the healing art in any part of the British dominions; subject to such regulations as may or shall be established by the General Senate for the interests, welfare, and respectability of the profession.

9. "That no member of 'the British Faculty of Medicine,' shall be permitted to *sell* drugs; or to compound medicines, unless prescribed by himself, or by others in consultation with him, and for his own patient or patients, except in rural districts and by special license from the Senates.

10. "That members of the Faculty, who may continue, or wish to act as general practitioners, and supply their own patients with medicines, shall be authorised to charge for their attendance, in addition to the cost of medicines so supplied.

11. "That in future, all persons purposing to exercise the calling of chemist and druggist, or compounders and sellers of medicines (to whom the title of apothecary shall henceforth be limited), shall undergo a suitable examination before a Board appointed by the General Senate, and be licensed accordingly, exception being made of persons already so engaged.

* The question of quackery; the granting of patents for particular medicines; and the sale of poisonous substances, will form parts of this department.

12. "That a general and continuous register of all persons who are now legally practising, or who shall in future be legalised to practise the healing art, shall be kept in each of the three kingdoms, under the direction of their respective Senates, as also of those who are now allowed, or who shall in future be licensed to act as chemists and druggists, or compounders and sellers of medicines; and that such general registers shall be the only great public documents to be referred to, in order to establish the legality of any medical practitioner, chemist and druggist, or compounder and seller of medicines.

Resolved unanimously, "That the foregoing resolutions be forthwith printed, with a view of apprising the members of the Association, and the profession at large, of the intended measure of Medical Reform, and of affording them the opportunity to consider the same, and to communicate any suggestions to the Council of the Association."

GEO. WEBSTER, M.D., President.
C. H. ROGERS HARRISON, Hon. Sec.

Exeter Hall.

Ten years have elapsed since these resolutions were passed, have you altered your opinion respecting them?—No; I think these resolutions embody the leading features of the Bill that should be introduced by Her Majesty's Government, but there is much that I would add. Thus, all hospital appointments should be made by Concours; and those appointed should be compelled to keep a proper register of all cases under their care, and a summary of these should be published every year. The dressers and clinical clerks should also be elected by Concours. The examiners should not be teachers, and should be paid a fixed stipend.—Would it not be difficult to accomplish the changes you propose?—If you consult what some people call "the heads of the profession," they will tell you that the scheme is visionary and utopian, and that the difficulties are insurmountable; but it is to the interest of these men to support the present system, and therefore their evidence should be received with great caution.—What benefit do you think would accrue to the public and to the medical profession, if a Bill, framed upon these principles, were to become the law of the land?—The benefit to the public would be incalculable; they would have a better class of practitioners, and the improvements in the practice of medicine and surgery, which would necessarily follow this new state of things, must benefit the community at large. The members of the profession would become more united, and their interests would be identical. The humble and industrious student, who has now but little chance of rising by his talent, would meet with his reward; the many drones that at present infest the hive would get their deserts, and hospital surgeons and physicians would not be imported from Scotland.

Have you had any experience respecting the election by Concours in France?—Yes; I have been present at several of the examinations in Paris.—Could this system be easily brought into operation in this country?—Yes; if the Government had the firmness and independence to enforce it. Much opposition would for a time exist in certain quarters, but plenty of competent men might be found to act as examiners, and the oppositionists would soon be too much alive to their own interests to withhold their support.—

Can you give any examples of the benefit which has arisen from this mode of election? I could adduce numerous examples, but the following short abstract of the career of Dupuytren, forms an interesting contrast to that of one of our hospital surgeons and physicians. "In the autumn of 1804 there was a vacancy for a surgeon of the second class in the Hotel Dieu, for which Roux, Tartra, and others, competed with Dupuytren: but the last was the successful candidate. In 1808 he gained another step; and when, in 1811, the death of Sabatier left the chair of operative medicine unoccupied he offered himself, and the *Concours* again decided in his favor. On this occasion he selected "lithotomy" as the subject of his thesis. Having thus obtained the object of his ambition, and an independent position, he soon distinguished himself in the department of clinical surgery, of which he may be regarded as the founder in the French school.

"From the period of his nomination to the Hotel Dieu, until ill health obliged him to seek change in Italy, he rose daily at five o'clock, and paid his first visit to the hospital from six to nine in the morning, and his second from six to ten in the evening. After traversing the wards, he delivered a clinical lecture in the amphitheatre appropriated for the purpose."*

How are hospital appointments obtained in this country?—The successful candidate is often a hanger on about the hospital for some years, and too frequently a kind of jackal to the lions, whom his money, in the shape of large apprenticeship fees, has served to feed. If he happen to be the protégé of a lord,—in the west his success is almost certain; if east of Temple-bar, city aldermen are of great assistance. A Cambridge or Oxford degree for a physician is always a great recommendation; and, sometimes, if the candidate can dub up £500. or £1000. his election is gained. A Quaker or a Catholic has no chance; but should the latter run his opponents hard, the cry of Jesuit† will settle his business. If the office sought be that of surgeon, a knowledge of medicine will be a barrier to the candidate. An assistant surgeon to one of our London hospitals was recently objected to because he was a member of the Apothecaries' Company. The electors too, it must be borne in mind, are quite incompetent to judge of the qualifications of the candidate.

Will you briefly state the plan you propose to substitute for the present system of medical government?—The plan I advocate is based upon the representative system, without which no Bill can be acceptable to the profession. There must also be equality of education in the three kingdoms, as regards attendance upon hospitals, lectures, and the price of the diploma, so that all who enter the profession, will be compelled to undergo a medical and surgical examination, and will start upon a like footing. Would you have all, as in Scotland, general practitioners?—No; this must be

* Clarke's edition of the Clinical Lectures of Baron Dupuytren.

† A ruse of this sort not long since lost a physician his election.

left to the taste and inclination of the individual. Some would devote their attention almost exclusively to medicine, and others to surgery, but the great majority would be, as at present, general practitioners.

Do you approve of a *general* registration?—Yes, this would be the first step towards a reformation; some of the corporate bodies are aware of this, and hence their opposition to it.—What objections do they urge against it?—They would have the kind of registration which exists at present, viz., the published lists of the corporate bodies.—Would not this plan be an efficient one?—I believe it would not be of the slightest use; I will give an example of the inadequacy of the present system of registration. The College of Surgeons, a few years since, wished its members to send in their names and residences, but I believe not one-twentieth of the members complied with the request. How do you account for this?—The majority of the members were disgusted with the proceedings of the College, and therefore took no interest in the matter.—Would you then have but one list of registered practitioners in each country?—Yes; and the qualifications of each should be fully stated.—Can you mention any other reason for the opposition of some members of the profession to a general registration?—Yes; these gentlemen would not be proud of their qualifications, and they do not wish the public to be enlightened.—How would the gentlemen who call themselves pure surgeons register?—They would register as surgeons, and practise, I suppose, as physicians.—What other objection is there to the mode of registration recommended by the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons?—That there must be a dozen lists instead of one, the graduates of the different Universities would also desire a separate registration.

Would it not be difficult to carry the representative system into effect, and would not great confusion be produced?—I believe it could be accomplished without the slightest difficulty. There is no confusion at Oxford and Cambridge, nor at the many learned societies that annually elect their own councils.—In the medical profession the voters would not be upon an equality as to qualification; how could this difficulty be obviated?—Very easily. The Senate in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, should consist of sixteen members; four examiners in Greek, Latin, and modern languages; these to be elected by all the registered practitioners in each country. Four examiners in the practice of medicine, to be elected by the medical graduates of the British Universities, who are practising as physicians. Four examiners in anatomy, physiology, and surgery, to be elected by the members of the Colleges of Surgeons, of London, Edinburgh, and Dublin. Four examiners in chemistry, materia medica, botany, and midwifery, to be elected by the licentiates of the Apothecaries' Company of London and Dublin.—Do you propose that a practitioner residing in England should have a vote for the Scotch or Irish Faculty of Medicine?—Yes, if he belong to one of the Colleges or Universities of Scotland or Ireland.—Would these examiners form the General Senate in each country?—Yes;

or the Senate might be elected in the manner described, and they might elect the examiners; but I think the plan first proposed the more simple. Once establish the representative system on a *fair basis*, and the matters of detail would easily be arranged.

What has been the great obstacle to the progress of medical reform amongst the members of the profession?—Want of unanimity; nearly all are agreed as to the necessity of a change in the present form of medical government, but there are various opinions as to what the alteration should be.—What do you believe to be the chief cause of this disunion?—The variety of qualifications of the different practitioners.—Would the plan you have proposed tend to remove these differences?—I believe it would to a great extent; indeed, I can see no just grounds for complaint under this system, for all would have their qualifications made public by registration, and the number of each person's votes would be determined by his diplomas.

Is the medical press generally in favor of reform?—Yes.

Can you state the number of medical practitioners in London, and their qualifications?—According to the London Medical Directory for the present year there are 2,567 practitioners in London.

About 275 are practising as physicians, and probably there are about 90 who call themselves pure surgeons, but of these the greater number prescribe in all cases. The remaining 2,202 are general practitioners. Of the 2,567, 1,670 are members of the College of Surgeons of London, (of these, 935 are members of the Apothecaries' Company also;) 536 are practising with only the College license; the remaining 199, in addition to the College licence, have taken degrees at British or Foreign Universities, 251 are licentiates of the Apothecaries' Company only; and of the remaining 281, 71 were in practice before 1815. 150 have refused to give their qualifications, and the rest are variously qualified.*

How many of the above have obtained degrees from British or Foreign Universities?—538.—Can you state the number from each University?—Yes; Oxford 26, Cambridge 46, London 63, Dublin 18, Edinburgh 171, St. Andrews 61, Glasgow 39, Aberdeen 22, Foreign Universities 92.—Have you made any analysis of the Provincial Medical Directory?—No, but I believe the variety of qualifications is greater in the provinces than in London.

You stated that the corporate bodies had not endeavored to redress the many grievances under which the profession labors. Will you mention some of these grievances?—1st. The many hardships and indignities that the union surgeons have been subjected to under the present poor-law system. The medical officer, in many instances, has not been paid the cost of his medicines, and the village farrier is often better remunerated for attending a pig than the parish doctor for physicking a pauper. 2nd. The esta-

* There may be some trifling errors in this analysis, but all must be aware of the difficulty of obtaining a correct classification.

blishment of medical clubs has, I believe, been very injurious to country practitioners, and these clubs have not benefited the poor man.—Did you not take an active part in endeavoring to prevent the formation of these penny clubs in your own neighbourhood in 1837?—Yes; and many of the evils which I anticipated have occurred. The following is part of a resolution lately carried at a meeting of the South Eastern Branch of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association:—

“That the admission of master tradesmen, and persons of independent property into such clubs, is a gross imposition upon the profession, and tends greatly to lessen its usefulness and respectability.

“That the members present at this meeting pledge themselves to discountenance medical clubs, unless this latter class of persons are altogether excluded; or that a scale of insurance is adopted with regard to them, more commensurate with their means of payment, and their position in society.”

But does not the fault in a great measure rest with members of the profession?—Yes; if they had been true to themselves, they would have escaped many of the hardships under which they now labor. The Poor Law Commissioners and Guardians knew that there was no *esprit de corps* amongst them, and that if one practitioner refused their offer, another would accept it.

Was there not lately a meeting of Poor Law Delegates in London?—Yes; but I think that, if these gentlemen would spend their time in endeavoring to produce an improvement in medical legislation, they would sooner effect their object. Want of unanimity is the great curse of the profession, and discord and disunion must always exist until the present system of corporate misrule is abolished.

3rd. Another gross piece of injustice is the treatment of assistant surgeons in the navy. These gentlemen are compelled to mess with the midshipmen; they have no separate cabin, no servant, and only one epaulette.—You think the gun-room then is not a very suitable place for study?—Yes; there is but little chance of a man's improving himself in his profession in such a place.—Are the assistant surgeons in the army treated in the same manner?—No, they are not; whilst the army assistant surgeon on board ship is dining with the captain, his naval brother is messing with the “middies.”

Have the corporate bodies protested against this injustice?—The Edinburgh and Dublin Colleges of Surgeons, at the eleventh hour, have protested against it. But, in October last, I was present when Professor Jacob delivered his introductory lecture at the Royal College of Surgeons of Dublin, and he addressed the students nearly in the following words:—“Gentlemen, much has been said “about the treatment of naval assistant surgeons, and certainly they “have not been fairly used, but I advise you all to rough it, and “take all you can get.” This advice was given at the very time when petitions were presented for an alteration in the system, and when some of the best men were leaving the service in disgust.

Will you state the improvements likely to be effected by the establishment of a Board of Health properly constituted?—If this Board were properly constituted, and its members did their duty, they would have to enquire into the many evils which at present exist. Such as the injurious effects of illegal practice; the sale of quack medicines, poisons, and spurious drugs and chemicals. Their business would also be to report upon unhealthy districts, and, in fact, to investigate all matters relating to the public health.

In what manner do you suppose quack medicines act injuriously?—I believe that numerous lives are annually destroyed by the use of these medicines; the proprietors, who are for the most part ignorant persons, promise that their nostrums will cure nearly all diseases, and the public often trust in these empirics until disease has made too much progress for the regular practitioner to arrest it.

Has not England been called the paradise of quacks?—Yes; but Dr. Paris, the President of the London College of Physicians, says, in his *Pharmacologia*, “But with as little truth as candour: if “we refer to the works of *Ætius*, written more than 1300 years ago, “we shall discover a similar infirmity with regard to physie.”—Are not some notorious quacks members of the College of Surgeons? Yes.—Has the College taken any steps to expel them from its body?—I believe not.—Are quack medicines licensed on the continent?—No; but unfortunately in this country the Government has paid but little attention to the public health, the chief object has been to increase the revenue.—Could quackery be entirely suppressed?—I think it might be, to a great extent, but not entirely; there are a certain number of people who will always be gulled; and it is natural for the afflicted to fly to those who promise the most aid; but it is not creditable, I think, for any Government to derive a profit from this kind of fraud and deceit, and to stamp it with its approbation.

What alteration would you make respecting the sale of poisons?—I would allow no poison to be sold without an order from a clergyman, a magistrate, a medical practitioner, or the registrar of births, deaths, and marriages.—What benefit would accrue from this?—I believe many murders would be prevented, and suicides would be much less frequent. The murderer could not procure his deadly potion without chance of detection, and the individual bent upon self-destruction, if thwarted in his wish to obtain a poison, might afterwards repent of his folly; for there is a taste in self-destruction as well as in other matters, and many a man who would swallow poison would shudder at the mention of hanging or drowning. On referring to seventeen cases of poisoning, which have come under my care during the last fourteen years, I found that the deleterious substance was generally procured a short time before it was swallowed, and obtained without difficulty. Of the ten persons whose lives were saved, I have not heard of one who has made a second attempt at self-destruction.—Would not much incon-

venience arise in obtaining these orders?—Some little trouble might be occasioned; but trouble and inconvenience are not to be taken into account where the preservation of human life is concerned.

Do you think that illegal practice is carried on to any extent in this country?—Yes; to a great extent. Could it be prevented; I believe that a proper registration of medical practitioners would tend much to diminish it; the public would then be able to distinguish the qualified from the unqualified.

But do you object to a chemist and druggist prescribing a pill and draught for a customer?—No; this is not the evil I complain of. In London and many of the large towns, persons who have had no medical education, do what is called "counter practice," and many of them visit sick persons at their own houses.

Do you think that chemists and druggists in future should be compelled to undergo an examination? Yes; and I think the most respectable members amongst them are of the same opinion. What should be the nature of this examination?—All should be required to possess a sufficient knowledge of the Latin language to enable them to read a prescription, and to know the composition and properties of the medicines they dispense. Is there now any restriction? No; a blacksmith who is entirely ignorant of drugs and chemicals may open a chemist's shop, and dispense the most deadly poisons to the public.

Is it your belief that chemists and druggists are an ignorant body of men? No; I speak of individuals, not of the general body; the majority I believe would be as anxious as myself to effect a change. Do not some of the apprentices undergo an examination at the present time?—Yes; but this is not compulsory.

COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

You stated that you knew the dark pages in the history of the College of Physicians, will you give a brief outline of the history of this College?

The charter was granted in the reign of Henry VIII., for the purpose of preventing *ignorant* persons practising physic and surgery.

The following is the conclusion of an account of the Institution published by the College in 1686. "The present College have taken all imaginable care, so to regulate the practice of physic as that no person may be neglected and aggrieved. The known poor and meaner families are abundantly and prudently provided for by a late order for that purpose. It is well known that in families of middle rank, that physicians are moderate in their expectations and demands; and for those that are rich and noble, liberality is inseparable from their quality and breeding. We are also fully resolved for the public good, to encourage and protect those two necessary instruments of physic, the surgeons and the apothecaries, (the latter of which owe their charter and knowledge of medicines to the favor of the College), so long as they shall contain themselves within the limits of their own professions; and in short, to do all things for the vindicating and perpetuating the faculty of physic, that so the young students in our universities may not be discouraged from applying themselves to the study of a science so useful to the common-wealth; nor that profession be invaded by the *vulgar, which hath been the usual support of the younger sons of the gentry of this kingdom.*"

What did these gentlemen's sons do during the plague?—The greater number of them ran away from London, and left their dying patients to the care of the vulgar apothecaries, or of those physicians whom they persecuted for practising without their licence. Can you name some of the physicians who have been persecuted by this College? Drs. Letch, Goddard, Askew, Fothergill, Archer, Stranger, Schomberg, Bonham, Wright, Greenfield, Burgess, Wells, Mason Good, Armstrong, Harrison, Lankester and others.

Dr. Elliotson in his Harvean Oration, says "This very College imprisoned one of its fellows for differing in opinion with Galen, and another (Dr. Greenfield), for applying cantharides internally, both which sins we now all, daily and openly commit."—Dr. Celer, 1698, says "Dr. John Greenfield, a member of the said College, who having been accused by a vexatious woman, of ill practice several years before, was twice acquitted by the preceding censors. But these gentlemen proud of their authority, and having no regard to the judgment and justice of their predecessors, and in contempt of two consecutive acts of grace from the king and parliament,

“ did, notwithstanding, fine the aforesaid Dr. Greenfield for that
 “ imaginary crime, without suffering the said Doctor to clear him-
 “ self by witnesses, and having signed a warrant, and appointed
 “ an officer of their own creation, did commit him to Newgate,
 “ without bail or main prize, and there detained him till the first
 “ day of the ensuing term, when and where the Honourable the
 “ Judges of the King’s Bench, convinced them of their illegal pro-
 “ ceedings, and discharged the said Dr. Greenfield in open court.”
 Dr. Gideon Harvey, physician to the king, 1686, says, “ This
 “ famous conclave is the eldest quack synagogue, consisting of a
 “ physick pope or patriarch, and a competent number of medical car-
 “ dinals, who being grown ancient, covetous, and, through forget-
 “ fulness, ignorant, are to govern the rest, and, whenever they are
 “ consulted, they are to impose upon the juniors their pretended
 “ long experience, which they are to embrace with the same implicit
 “ faith the Turks do their Alcoran. But, if refractory, they are to
 “ be convened before Il Consiglio Piccolo, which is their purgatory,
 “ whence they may be received again into the bosom of the con-
 “ clave; but if, afterwards, they prove incorrigible, the conclave sits
 “ upon them, and they are then damned, and utterly expelled, with-
 “ out redemption. Thus, in my time, I have known several poor
 “ wretches damned.”

Dr. Isaac Schomberg, 1750, was examined by three censors, two of them thought him qualified, the third, Dr. Battie, did not think him fit to be admitted into the number of candidates. The sense of the College was taken by ballot, the numbers were fifteen against the Doctor, and two in his favor. Dr. S. having been asked previously by the President, whether he desired to be admitted as a matter of favor, or as a matter of right, answered, he demanded the same right as the other graduates of our universities.

Mr. Kennedy in his sketch of Medical Monopolies, 1836, says,
 “ From the moment the College determined that the number of
 “ its members should not exceed *twenty*, it ceased to be in a condi-
 “ tion to afford those benefits to the public which might have been
 “ reasonably expected to flow from the rational provisions of the
 “ charter of Henry VIII. Instead of following the rational pro-
 “ visions and legal tendency of that charter, the College was thence-
 “ forward a Close Monopoly, ruled solely by its own statutes or
 “ bye-laws. The charter directed that all persons properly quali-
 “ fied to practise physick should be admitted, but the invariable
 “ effect of the above bye-law was, that no person however qualified
 “ could obtain admission *when the select number was filled up*. It
 “ mattered not in those days whence the candidate came, or where
 “ he had been educated, or the amount of his qualifications, the
 “ number *twenty* could not be exceeded, and therefore the applicant
 “ must be rejected. The rejected candidate, however, was not
 “ made aware of the *real* ground of rejection. It has always
 “ been an object of the most watchful solicitude with the College
 “ to keep its *excluding* bye-laws concealed from the knowledge of
 “ every individual who had not been admitted within the narrow

“pale of its monopoly, and consequently when admission was refused to a qualified candidate, it was always done on the plea of his *incompetence* to pass the customary examination. Thus a candidate possessing every qualification that could adorn his profession, or do honor to the College itself if enrolled among its members, was sure to be rejected on the pretence that he was ‘ignorant,’ when in reality it was under a private bye-law which condemned the candidate to exclusion before he had entered the College-hall. It would be superfluous to dwell upon the injustice of this proceeding, or to attempt to describe the feelings of a deserving man who had been rejected, not only without any reasonable cause, but left with a cruel stain on his reputation, calculated to ruin his hopes of professional advancement.

“As an instance, it may be mentioned that, in 1663, the number of the members belonging to the College practising in London and elsewhere was limited to forty. Of these, probably not more than half resided in the metropolis. The terrible inroad of the plague occurred in 1665, during the progress of which seven or eight thousand persons were known to have died in one week. When we call to mind that at this period only about twenty members of the College were practising in London, and few or no licentiates, the great mortality can scarcely be a subject of surprise; but it is said that even of twenty, not more than a minority remained in town to lend assistance to the diseased and panic-stricken multitude. The greater part to prolong a luxurious existence, fled to the country, leaving their former supporters at the mercy of the consuming pestilence.”

Dr. Wells in his letter to Lord Kenyon observes, “the three physicians who, to my poor apprehension, have appeared to have the weakest understandings, and the smallest extent of knowledge, of all those with whom I have happened to converse, either in this or any other country, are fellows of the College of Physicians of London.”

Will you mention the names of the gentlemen who were last created Fellows?—Dr. Francis Boot, Gower-street; Dr. T. Bell Fletcher, Birmingham; Dr. Samuel J. Jeafferson, Warwick; Dr. Alfred Lochèe, Canterbury; Dr. F. Weber, Norfolk-street; Dr. E. Lloyd Birkett, Cloak-lane; Dr. C. West, Wimpole-street; Dr. T. Blackhall, Queen-street; Dr. W. W. Gull, Guy’s Hospital; Dr. T. K. Chambers, Hill-street; Dr. H. Munro, Harley-street; Dr. G. E. Day, Upper Seymour-street.

Has the fellowship been refused by any of the licentiates?—Yes; Sir James Clarke, Dr. Clutterbuck, and Dr. Arnott declined it.—Is the library of the College of Physicians open to the licentiates?—No, they are denied the use of the library, and have no voice in the proceedings of the College. Professor Grant, in his Oration on Medical Reform, 1841, compares the acts of the College to those of Eastern despots, and he says, “It *has been* the grave of *intellect*, as it is notoriously of justice and honor.”

PARLIAMENTARY EVIDENCE.

~~~~~

You have read the evidence given before the Parliamentary Committee (June, 1847) by Dr. Paris, the President of the College of Physicians of London?—I have.—What is your opinion of this evidence?—That it is garbled, one-sided, and not to be depended upon.—State your reasons for this assertion.—*Ques.* 8. Dr. Paris says, that “the Committee was appointed by the College at large. “That the efficiency of a physician has been sufficiently tested by the “College of Physicians, or by one of the two English Universities. “That the candidates are examined in Latin and *Greek*. That if “the fellows or licentiates conduct themselves in an unprofessional “way, they are summoned, censured, and fined. That no complaint “has been made of any abuse of power or authority as exercised “by the College. That the members of the profession, who rise to “pre-eminence in the College and practise in London, have gone “through a long course of literary study. That the general practitioner practises in medical cases, and, to a *certain extent*, in “surgical cases. That he treats medical and surgical cases to a “*certain extent*. That the College of Physicians has not abused its “powers. That a higher order of physicians should be secured for “the metropolis. That there is no distinction between the examination of licentiates and extra licentiates.”

It is then your opinion that the above statements are incorrect?—I can adduce positive and indisputable evidence to prove that they are so.

What do you suppose Dr. Paris means by moral power?—I cannot understand University morality; but I know that the Committee was not appointed by the College at large; that the efficiency of a physician has not been always sufficiently tested by the College examinations; that all the candidates are not examined in *Greek*; that all the fellows and licentiates who conduct themselves in an unprofessional manner are not summoned, censured, and fined; that numerous complaints have been made of abuse of power; that all the members of the College who practise in London and rise to pre-eminence, have not gone through a long course of preliminary study; that nineteen-twentieths of the surgery of this country (operative and constitutional,) is in the hands of general practitioners, and that they act as physicians in ninety per cent. at least of the medical cases; that no sufficient reason can be shown why a cockney should have better medical advice than a countryman; and, lastly, that the licentiates and extra-licentiates do not undergo the same examination.

Do you infer that Dr. Paris has been guilty of wilful and deliberate falsehood?—Oh, no; but I think he is troubled with a short memory.



You have read the evidence given by Dr. G. Burrows, and what is your opinion of that evidence?—I object to the greater part of it, but especially to the following:—"That *five neighbouring practitioners might club together to ruin a man, although there may be no truth in the charge, and very little evidence to support it.*—We are bound, in the words of our charter, to exercise considerable moral control over the members of our body.—That the interests of the public would be damnified by the present classification.—Our profession stands at an advantage over other countries.—If only one grade, a certain portion would not betake themselves to pure surgery and pure physic.—That general practitioners do not realize the same incomes as those that commence practice as physicians.—That most of the physicians from the universities have graduated in arts.—I *think* the licentiates have made complaints.—That the education of a general practitioner may be inferior to that of a physician with safety to the public.—The general practitioner is merely expected to practise his profession.—When a physician is called in, in consultation, he is expected to teach.—Not necessary that the general practitioner should have a strict knowledge of pathology; and that he has not such severe and complicated cases to deal with as the physician.—That the majority of those who enter into the profession of medicine enter into what is commonly called the lower grade of the profession, and they are persons generally of humble means; their means have not allowed them to obtain an extended education; their preliminary education has generally been very much neglected, and they just get as much medical knowledge as will enable them to fill certain public situations, such as surgeons under the poor-law, or assistant surgeons in the navy, or they commence practice in a small way.—That if a highly educated gentleman went into a country village, or into a part where education was not so much diffused, the people would not appreciate those high qualifications, but it would be rather a bar to the success of the individual among that class of persons.—That a surgeon does not require so much patient thought and cool deliberation as a physician.—That the distinction between the practice of the physician and surgeon is as clear as night and day."—Have you any remarks to make on these statements?—The greater number of them, I think, are so absurd, that it would be waste of time to comment upon them, I will merely allude to the last, viz. "That the distinction between the practice of a physician and a surgeon is as *clear as night and day.*" Every tyro in the profession knows that it is as difficult to penetrate as a London fog; a hundred diseases may be surgical to-day, and (so called) medical to-morrow, and that a well-educated practitioner should possess a good knowledge, both of surgery and medicine.—How was this evidence of Dr. Burrows's received by the profession?—The doctor was hissed in his lecture-room, at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, by his own class, and thought it right to make an apology.

Have you any remarks to make respecting Dr. Seymour's evi-



dence?—Dr. Seymour says that his part of the profession is principally composed of members of the Universities, but not one member in six of the College of Physicians, is a member of a University. Dr. Seymour also attaches too much importance, I think, to a University education.

Dr. Holland urges, as one of the advantages of an academical education, the treatment of that class of disorders exceedingly prevalent among the "*higher classes*" depending upon mental and moral causes.—Is there any evidence to show that University physicians have particularly distinguished themselves in the treatment of insanity?—No; but there is abundant evidence to prove, that some who have been appointed physicians to lunatic asylums, have made but little use of the opportunities afforded them.

Have any valuable reports been published by the physicians to St. Luke's or Bethlem?—The following are extracts from the Physicians' Report of St. Luke's Hospital, for the present year. Signed A. J. Sutherland, M.D. Oxon. F. R. Philp, M.D. Cantab:—"The proportion of recoveries this year has been less than that of 1847, and more than that of 1846. In 1847 it was  $64\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. being certainly above the average, while in 1846 it was  $57\frac{2}{3}$ . The per centage of cures from 1751 to 1760 was 59 and a fraction; that from 1831 to 1840 was  $58\frac{3}{4}$ , so that the per centage of the present year is a fair average one compared with that of former years.—Of the individual cases to which the attention of the General Court should be directed, two are those which came specially under the notice of the Commissioners in Lunacy. Of these, one continues precisely in the same state; the other, viz., a fish salesman, was in July last attacked with great depression of spirits, and violent pain in the head, this was followed by a paroxysm of excitement, during which he broke some squares of glass, and asserted that he was commanded by the Almighty to do so; he tore his clothes to shreds, was indecent in his conduct, and dirty in his habits.—But whilst we have to lament the loss of one officer, we have to congratulate the Court upon the appointment of his successor. The London Hospital has again sent us from its school a gentleman qualified in every respect for the discharge of the duties assigned to him.—We are ready to admit that the elevation of our building is not ornamental, that its situation is not desirable, but it is the greater praise to the Institution, if with these disadvantages it is able to restore an equal, in some years, a greater proportion of patients, in sound mind to their friends; and it calls upon us to be more attentive to what is of greater importance, viz., that which passes within, for kindness and attention to the patients' best interests are the true principles of what is termed the moral treatment."

"Is Dr. Connolly a member of a University?—No.—Is Dr. Forbes Winslow?—No; he graduated at Giessen.—Where did Dr. Prichard graduate? At Edinburgh.—Have you read the evidence in the lunacy of Mr. Dyce Sombre?—I have.



Have you any thing to say about Dr. Hawkins's evidence?—Dr. Hawkins says (1069) that the physicians belonging to his College are the most highly educated order of physicians in the United Kingdom; and he quotes Friend, Mead, Akenside, Heberden, Sir G. Baker, and Sir H. Halford, as examples, but my definition of a well educated physician does not consist in his possessing a good knowledge of Latin and Greek only; these are points, I think of secondary importance.—Which part of a physician's preliminary education do you consider of the most importance?—*A thorough knowledge of the structure of the human body.*

Did Jenner, Cullen, W. Hunter, Mason Good, Armstrong, Monro, Pringle, Pitcairn, Rutherford, Murray, Hope, Gregory, Duncan, Hamilton, graduate at Oxford or Cambridge?—No; and the greater part of them had been general practitioners.

Did most of the eminent men connected with the College of Physicians obtain their knowledge in this country?—No, they studied on the Continent. Thus Chambre, Harvey, Linacre and Mead graduated at Padua; Huxham, Pringle, and Sir Thomas Browne at Leyden; and Caius at Bononia.

Are you in favor of such a University education for a physician as is obtained at Oxford or Cambridge?—No, I think a great deal of valuable time is lost at these Universities; there are no proper medical schools; words are studied instead of things, and a student is little better than a school boy.

But you would have all who enter the medical profession well-educated?—Yes, and in addition to a knowledge of mathematics, Latin, and Greek, I would encourage the study of modern languages, especially of French and German, which are likely to be infinitely more serviceable to the practitioner than Latin or Greek.

Are there any of the ancient authors from which a student is likely to gain information that may assist him in his practice?—No; for one correct opinion there are fifty errors.—You have read the Aphorisms of Hippocrates?—Yes, and I think that an experienced hospital nurse would be more correct in her notions of disease than Hippocrates; but in speaking of these writers it is necessary to take into account the period at which they lived, and their limited knowledge of anatomy.—Was Jenner a member of the College of Physicians?—No, he graduated at St. Andrew's.—Was John Hunter educated at a University?—No. Sir A. Carlisle, says Hunter, told him, when speaking of his friends who were desirous of sending him to Oxford, "they wanted to make an old woman of me; or that "I should stuff Latin and Greek at the University; but, (added he "significantly pressing his thumb nail on the table,) these schemes "I cracked like so many vermin as they came before me." What do you suppose would have been the effect of a University education upon a mind like Hunter's?—It would have been crippled by form, ceremony, and precedent. John Hunter did not seek assistance from others, but he investigated for himself, and only recorded what he believed he had seen.—But are all Hunter's opinions found to



be correct?—No; very few of them will bear the light of modern science.—Have the Hunterian orators, who annually sound Hunter's praises before bishop and noble, said this?—No, on the contrary, these orators have spoken of Hunter's opinions as if they were immutable.

Will you give the names of those physicians practising in London, who are members of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge?—Drs. Alderson, Aldis, Babington, Barclay, Barker, Barlow, Birkett, Black, Blackall, Brooke, Brown, Budd, Burrows, Burton, Chambers, J. K., Cohen, Cox, Davis, Day, Dyer, Elliotson, Farre, A., Farre, F., Fincham, Frampton, Fuller, Goolden, Guy, Hare, Hawkins, B., Hawkins, F., Heberden, Jeaffreson, Jones, C., Jones, H., Lambe, Latham, P., Latham, R., Lee, Leeson, Merriman, Meryon, Monro, Nairne, Ormerod, Page, Pardoe, Paris, Philp, Pitman, Power, Ramage, Roe, Roots, Roupell, Scott, Seymour, Spurgin, Sutherland, Todd, Twining, Venables, Waite, Ward, Watson, S., Watson, J., Wegg, Williams, A., Williams, W., Wilson, Woodfall.

How many of these seventy-one gentlemen are fellows of the College?—Forty-eight.

How many have taken the degree of Master of Arts?—Nine.

Can you form an estimate of the comparative merits of the University and non-university physicians?—I believe without intending the slightest offence towards any of the gentlemen above-named, that the comparison is greatly in favour of the latter. Will you name some of the London physicians who have not graduated at Oxford or Cambridge?—Drs. Addison, Arnott, Baly, Bennett, Bennet, Billing, Bird, Bright, Burnett, Sir W., Carpenter, Chambers, W. F., Chown, Clark, Sir J., Clutterbuck, Copland, Farre, J. R., Ferguson, Forbes, Sir C., Forbes, J., Garrod, Grant, Granville, Gregory, Hall, Marshall, Hodgkin, Holland, Johnson, Lankester, Lee, Lever, Little, Locock, M'Gregor, Sir J., Morrison, Sir A., Murphy, Parkes, Pereira, Prout, Quain, Rees, Rigby, Scudamore, Sir C., Smith, J. S., Smith, W. T., Taylor, A., Thompson, Theop., Thomson, A. T., Tweedie, Webster, J., West, Williams, C. J. B., Winslow, Waller, Walsh.

Have you omitted the names of many non-university physicians who have advanced medical science?—Yes, probably some not mentioned are more distinguished than many in the above list, but I do not intend the selection to be an invidious one.



## COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

---

Will you give a brief account of the history of the College of Surgeons.

The history of this College, like that of the College of Physicians, is full of bigotry and persecution; a few self-elected individuals have governed the rest, and some of their proceedings have been most arbitrary and tyrannical. Thus up to a late period, the members, although they underwent the same examination as the council and examiners, were compelled to enter at the back door of the College, and the library and museum were closed to them. Examinerships have been made matters of pecuniary arrangement, and those possessing superior qualifications to the council or examiners, viz.: Brooks, Bennet, King, Dermott, and others, have been persecuted and insulted. The burning of the Hunterian manuscripts is also an indelible disgrace. But one of the blackest stains in the history of this College, is the recent charter which was smuggled through Parliament, although the council knew that nine-tenths of the members were decidedly opposed to it.

Is not this charter likely to benefit the members of the College, and to advance surgical science?—I believe the movement is a retrograde one, and not a step in advance, for although the qualifications for the fellows are expected to be of a higher order, those for the members are less stringent; for example, before the introduction of this charter, a student was required to have been engaged for six years, in the acquirement of surgical knowledge, and to be twenty-two years of age, before he could be admitted to examination, but now only five years are required, and the candidate need be only twenty-one years of age. What is the object of this difference?—The motive is evident enough, and it accords with all the past proceedings of the College. A house of lords is to be formed, and the plebeians are to submit to its dictates, but the parliamentary evidence to be considered hereafter will explain this.

Do members of this College undergo a medical examination?—No; although nine-tenths of their practice is medical. In hospital practice do the pure surgeons, as they are called, confine themselves to the treatment of surgical cases?—Yes, if a patient have what is called a “medical disease,” he is passed over to the physician, but in private practice most of these gentlemen take what they can get. You stated that the fellows and licentiates of the College of Physicians refuse to meet physicians who are not members of their College. Do these gentlemen refuse to consult with pure surgeons in medical cases?—No; these consultations are constantly held. Am I to understand that surgeons practising in London have not undergone a medical examination, although nine-tenths of their



practice is medical?—Yes, and so ignorant are the public of these matters, that most important medical appointments are often given to surgeons. Thus Mr. Grainger is superintendent medical inspector to the Board of Health, and Mr. Simon has recently obtained the appointment of officer of health to the City of London.

When a member of the College of Surgeons joins the College of Physicians, is he still considered a member of the former College?—No; he should pay ten guineas to this College, and forfeit all the rights of membership. What are these rights?—The only one I know of is the admission to the library and lectures, but these advantages can only be enjoyed by a few.\* Do you know any of the licentiates of the College of Physicians, who have paid this fine?—Yes. Would you have paid it if you had been admitted a member of the College of Physicians?—No. What is the object of the fine?—I suppose it is a kind of purification and absolution from surgical knowledge.

Are the members of the College of Surgeons examined in Latin?—No; but according to the New Charter the fellows of the College are to be examined in this language; the examination for the membership, will not shew that the candidate can write a common prescription.

Are the examinations at this College, as at present conducted, a sufficient test of a man's qualifications to practise his profession?—I believe not; and as a proof of the correctness of this opinion, the examiners, not long since, passed a pastrycook from Taunton.

What is meant by grinding?—Stuffing and cramming for examination; a process undertaken by gentlemen, whose business it is to get acquainted with what are called "examination dodges," and all the pet subjects and crotchets of the different examiners. Thus, the candidate is told, if he "get under" Mr. ——— he must say black, but if Mr. ——— should ask the question, white.—Do you speak from your own experience?—No; but I have heard a great deal from many who have been sharpened in this way.

Are there any reformers in the Council of the College of Surgeons? I cannot answer this question; the late Mr. Liston and Mr. Grainger were members of the British Medical Association; Mr. Grainger, since his election, has given no public proof of his desire to effect a change in the present order of things.

Did not Mr. Aston Key, before he was a councillor, write a paper upon the necessity of reform in the College?—Yes; but since his election I am not aware that he has said any thing about reform. The following passage is from his first Letter to the Editor of the

---

\* I have referred to the admission book since 1847, and I find that there are seldom more than twenty names entered on one day; frequently not more than seven or eight, and many gentlemen are almost daily visitors, so that this splendid library is scarcely used by the members of the College.



Medical Gazette, Nov. 1839 :—" A third course, by which alone its  
 " strength (the College of Surgeons) can be permanently increased,  
 " is to rest its claim for support on the attachment and esteem of  
 " its own members. This can only be done by allowing to each  
 " member a vote in the election of the members of the Council.  
 " Such a measure would make the College what it has not yet been,  
 " —a representation of the whole body of surgeons; instead of  
 " being, as it now is, a small self-elected section, taking into its  
 " own hands the management of its internal concerns, and the  
 " legislation of the whole profession. The Council and the members  
 " would form one powerful body, acting in unison for the common  
 " good; the feelings of the members now diverted from the College  
 " would be concentrated towards it. They would join in measures  
 " for its advancement, and in defending it against attacks which, if  
 " made, would then be few and feeble; honourable ambition would  
 " be encouraged; and those who work for the profession would  
 " replace those who do nothing for science."

Has not Mr. South, one of the examiners, written a book to instruct the public in what he calls "Household Surgery?"—Yes.—Was Mr. South elected an examiner after the publication of this work?—He was.—What are the contents of this Treatise?—Poultices, Fomentations, Lotions, Washes, Liniments, Ointments, Plasters, Blood-letting, Blistering, Vaccination, Tooth-drawing, Lancing Gums, Wounds, Hæmorrhages, Scalds and Burns, Chilblains, Broken Bones, Bent Bones, Sprains, Ruptures, Piles, Protruding Bowel, Whitlow, Ingrowing Nail, Bunions, Corns, a Styne in the Eye, Tumors in the Eyelids, Inflammation of the Eye, Pustules in the Eye, Breathing or Respiration, Stifling, Chafing, Things pushed into the Nose and Ears, Dress, Exercise and Diet of Children, Typhus Fever, Small Pox, and Scarlet Fever.

Is Mr. South a friend of yours?—Yes; and I believe him to be a very estimable man; but in this enquiry I hope I know neither friends nor enemies. I allude to this book for the purpose of showing how elections are conducted at the College of Surgeons.

Are gentlemen who practise midwifery allowed a seat at the Council Board of this College?—No.—Do you approve of this law?—No; I think it very absurd and arbitrary; many surgeons in the provincial towns who practise midwifery are, I believe, superior to some of the present members of the Council; and I know of no operation in surgery that requires so much coolness, deliberation, and judgment, as a difficult case of midwifery. A knowledge of the diseases of women and children is also most essential to *every* practitioner,



## PARLIAMENTARY EVIDENCE.

---

Will you state your opinion of Sir B. Brodie's evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons?—Sir B. Brodie said (1997) that “the College examination was as good an examination as could be.—That the surgeon requires more anatomical study.—At this very moment, at St. Andrew's, they give degrees upon examination without any particular course of study.—That the system of cramming does not apply to so great an extent to the College of Surgeons as to the Apothecaries' Hall.—That the New Charter has worked well.—That there has been no partiality at the examinations at the College of Surgeons.”—Do you believe these opinions to be correct?—No; not one of them.

Do you think the New Charter has worked well?—Hear Mr. Guthrie's evidence, (*Lancet*, Jan. 20, 1849),—“No one ought, therefore, to feel any distress from having been omitted, nor any one any gratification from having been included; the whole thing not being less a failure for any useful purpose, than it has been a source of extreme dissatisfaction to the great body of English surgeons.

“With respect to the examination for the fellowship, I regret I do not entertain the same opinion of their value or utility, as they appear to be supposed to possess by my friend, Dr. John Hall. There is not one of those who have undergone this examination, I should suffer to put his finger on me one whit the more readily, from his having succeeded in obtaining the honor to which he aspired; and, although I do not presume to judge of what the opinion may be of my colleagues of the court of examiners in their collective capacity, I have lately seen three of them, each of whom has filled the office of president, earnestly recommending a very young member of the College, not old enough to be a fellow, for a high surgical appointment—I may even say of the greatest public importance—in preference to three gentlemen, his opponents, all members and fellows of the College, after examinations awarded by themselves, their examiners; and I cannot but conclude, with the greatest respect towards my colleagues, that they do not, therefore, differ essentially in opinion on this point, from

Your very obedient, humble servant,

G. J. GUTHRIE.

*Berkeley-street, Jan. 12, 1849.*

State what you consider to be the most objectionable parts, if any, of Mr. J. H. Green's evidence (2297.)—“That the distinction between fellows and members is not invidious.—That too large a number of fellows were nominated in the first instance.—That the



“ College of Physicians should examine the general practitioners in  
 “ medicine.—That the fees of surgeons should not be regulated by  
 “ law.—That the medical profession in France does not hold a very  
 “ high degree of respectability.—That by the single faculty system  
 “ the education of all would be reduced to the lowest.—That the  
 “ 12,000 members of the College practising generally, are only  
 “ members of our College as far as they are surgeons.—That ap-  
 “ prentices cannot be procured by surgeons or general practitioners.  
 “ —That the meetings of the Council should not be open.—(2527)  
 “ That in the present state of education, the students, from their  
 “ ignorance of language, are incapable of comprehending a consider-  
 “ able part of the lectures delivered to them.”

Has not Mr. Green written a pamphlet on Medical Education ?  
 —Yes ; and his Oration at the College was so learned, that I, with  
 other of his hearers, from our ignorance of language, were unable  
 to comprehend it.

Has Mr. Green done anything towards the advancement of  
 medical science?—Not that I know of ; he has been surgeon to one  
 of the largest hospitals in London for thirty years, and I am unable  
 to point to one single published record of his experience.

Then you think that some of the ignorant students Mr. Green  
 speaks of would have made a better use of their time ?—I hope so.

Mr. Green says, the medical profession in France does not hold  
 a very high degree of respectability ; do you agree with him ?—I  
 dont know Mr. Green's definition of the word “ respectability ;”  
 but I know that in France and Germany merit is better rewarded  
 than in this country.—Was not Flourens created a peer of France ?  
 —Yes.—Are titles and rewards often conferred in this country upon  
 the medical profession ?—No ; and when they are, it is more fre-  
 quently for political services. The medical mayor of a country town,  
 who has served the government, or the man who has been fortunate  
 enough to relieve the gouty-toe or aching brow of a duke or a  
 marquis, is more likely to meet with this reward than the practi-  
 tioner who, by hard labour and patient research, has conferred the  
 most inestimable benefits on his fellow-creatures.—How do you  
 account for this ?—For the reason before mentioned, viz. :—the  
 present state of the medical corporations, and the small number of  
 members in the House of Lords or Commons who take an interest  
 in medical legislation.

How many medical men are there in the English House of  
 Commons ?—I believe only Messrs. Wakley and Hume have been in  
 the medical profession.

What is your opinion of Mr. Guthrie's evidence ?—I cannot  
 understand it ; it defies analysis. There is an apparent show of  
 liberality, but this is combined with so much narrow-mindedness,  
 bigotry, and, I believe, ignorance of many subjects, that the evi-  
 dence is more likely to mislead the Committee than to tend to any



useful results. I especially refer the reader to Questions 6, 7, 9, 24, 26, 29, 39, 44, 55, 70, 71, 74, 80, 93, 146, 175, 198, 293.

Mr. Guthrie objects to public examinations, and his objection is, that young men would be bewildered more than at present. Are you of this same opinion?—No; on the contrary, I believe it would benefit the students generally, and prevent the rejection of a candidate by the whim, caprice, or prejudice of one or two of the examiners. Besides, the system works well on the continent. In Paris the examinations are public, and I never heard such an objection made by a Frenchman. Moreover, the examinations at the Dublin College of Surgeons are open to all the members, and these examinations are more severe than those at the College of Surgeons of London.—You have been examined at the University of St. Andrew's; Mr. Guthrie says, at St. Andrew's they are examiners but not teachers, and that they have no school. Is this correct? No; all the examiners are teachers, and I had a better examination in anatomy and surgery at this University than at the College of Surgeons of London. Mr. Guthrie's objection to there not being a school, I cannot understand; this University, like the other licensing boards, requires that a certain course of study shall be gone through before a candidate can be admitted to examination; and it must be recollected that most of the other examining boards have no schools attached to them. Mr. Guthrie's objection would apply equally to the College of Surgeons, or to the University of London.

You spoke of the whim and caprice of the examiners; can one examiner reject a candidate?—These are Mr. Guthrie's own words, published in the *Lancet*, Jan. 20, 1849:—

“GENTLEMEN,

“I had hoped that another lecture on the treatment of wounded arteries would have been unnecessary, after all I have published on this subject. It has appeared to me, however, that the candidates for the diploma of the College of Surgeons have presented themselves for examination with even less knowledge on this, as well as on other subjects, than when I last made this observation to you; but whether it arises from any defect on the part of their teachers, or from carelessness on their own, I am not disposed to offer an opinion. Hitherto, when I have examined students on this, or any other subject on which I have written particularly, and found them deficient, I have been contented to read a lesson rather than to reject them, supposing that they would like to be treated on the principle which pervaded the mind of the negro when he said, he had no objection that massa should *preachee* or *floggie*, but not *preachee* and *floggie* too. Those candidates who have had a lecture from me, as well as an examination, and that perhaps as they thought with some degree of severity, have experienced this leniency, which they did not expect, nor feel, perhaps, that they deserved. It arose from those principles of justice I acquired at a very early period of my life, which I cannot entirely get the better of; they are, however, subsiding, and I shall soon perhaps learn to smile with the greatest sweetness of manner, and speak with the softest intonation of voice, to the victim I am shortly about to sacrifice, instead of overlooking his negligence, in the hope that the lecture he has received might be an instruction, on the points in which he is defective, he would, perhaps, never forget.”

Do all Mr. Guthrie's opinions agree with those of his col-



leagues?—No; and, as I have elsewhere shown,\* some of the evidence adduced by Mr. Guthrie in favor of his mode of treatment entirely upsets his conclusions.

Have you any objection to Mr. Lawrence's evidence?—Yes. Why?—His evidence respecting the University of St. Andrew's shews great ignorance of the subject, and I especially object to the following: "That the University of Edinburgh never in former  
" times was anxious to make apothecaries.—That the College of  
" Surgeons of London has no privilege in the nature of a monopoly.—  
" That there is a proper mode of registration of medical practitioners  
" at the present time.—That the profession does not want remodelling,  
" Mr. L. would object to any such course.—English physicians have  
" generally been educated at Oxford and Cambridge, with the nobility  
" and gentry of the realm.—In the case of public professional ap-  
" pointments they usually select the persons best qualified.—That the  
" most eminent surgeons were selected for the fellowship.—That a  
" council of health is not necessary.—That the system at the College  
" answers all the purposes very well indeed.—That there is no  
" etiquette of the profession preventing or restraining surgeons and  
" physicians being consulted reciprocally in medical cases.—That  
" the members of the College are too numerous a body for election." State your objection to Mr. Lawrence's evidence respecting the University of St. Andrew's?—The following extract from a letter addressed by Dr. John Reid, Professor of Anatomy, to Mr. Lawrence, is a sufficient proof of the value of Mr. Lawrence's statements.

" The University has already made it publicly known, in a series of resolutions unanimously adopted by the senatus, at a meeting held on the 11th January, 1845, and extensively advertised, that, 'at the three last examinations, seventy-one candidates were examined; and of these twelve, or more than one out of every six, were rejected. Of these seventy-one candidates there were thirteen who presented no diploma from any of the licensing boards of the three kingdoms, but who had all the preliminary qualifications required by the University in their published regulations, and six of these, or nearly one half, were rejected. The other six rejected candidates were all members of the Royal College of Surgeons of London, some of them also held the diploma of the London Apothecaries' Company;' and one of them, it might have been mentioned, was remitted to his studies for the second time. Of the whole seventy-one candidates, forty were members of the Royal College of Surgeons of London, so that rather more than one out of every seven of the members of the College of which you are President, who presented themselves as candidates for the medical degree of the University of St. Andrew's, were deemed unworthy of the honour that you hold so cheap. The statistics of graduation since 1845, would furnish results similar to those previous to that period; but I shall content myself by giving those of the present year. Before doing this, I may mention that, in the August examination of 1846, five licentiates of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh presented themselves for examination, and three out of the five were remitted to their studies. These three gentlemen had received their diplomas from the Edinburgh College very shortly before their rejection at St. Andrew's; and one of them was remitted to his studies for the second time, he having presented himself for examination here previous to his successful attempt in Edinburgh. During the present year forty-nine candidates presented themselves for examination. Of these,

---

\* Structure, Diseases, and Injuries of the Blood Vessels, p. 302.



- 36 were members of the Royal College of Surgeons of London.  
 2 „ licentiates of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh.  
 1 was a licentiate of the College of Surgeons of Dublin.  
 1 „ „ of the Apothecaries' Company of Ireland.  
 1 „ „ of the Apothecaries' Company of London.  
 1 „ „ of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow.  
 1 was a native of Germany, who had studied medicine for four years in Halle, where he had graduated.  
 6 had no diploma, but had the qualifications prescribed by the University in their printed regulations.

—  
 49

“ Of the thirty-six candidates who were members of the Royal College of Surgeons of London, seven, or nearly one in every five were rejected; and one of the rejected was a surgeon, and another an assistant-surgeon in the navy. More than one half of the candidates belonging to the London College were also licentiates of the London Apothecaries' Company. One of the two licentiates of the Edinburgh Royal College, who also possessed the diploma of the London Apothecaries' Company, two of the six who held no diploma, and the licentiate of the Dublin Apothecaries' Company, were also rejected. Out of the whole forty-nine candidates, eleven, or rather more than one out of every five were remitted to their studies.

“ If, then, according to your recorded testimony, graduates of the University of St. Andrew's ‘ are unfit to practise their profession anywhere,’ what must be *your* opinion of the professional qualifications of the members of the College over which you preside, seeing that one out of every five or six of them is rejected when they become candidates for the diploma of the University of St. Andrew's? The bitterest enemy of the Royal College of Surgeons would not have ventured to slander its members in the manner you have thoughtlessly done in your endeavours to injure the reputation of the University of St. Andrew's.”

Was not Mr. Lawrence once a medical reformer?—Yes. Had he at this time any appointment in the College?—No. What were his principles?—The following passages from his speeches delivered at the Freemasons' Tavern in 1826, at two meetings of the members of the College, (and published by himself,) will explain them.

“ Mankind are generally patient under injustice, when not immediately affected; resistance is not offered until individuals suffer, until personal interests are attacked. In the year 1824, the ruling body of the College of Surgeons promulgated some new regulations, most insulting to the members at large, and oppressive to certain individuals, whose injuries and complaints have roused a spirit of resistance, and led to our present meeting.”

“ In the first place, gentlemen, this regulation is drawn up and expressed in a very confused and inaccurate manner: it is no less mean and contemptible in composition and language, than odious in its spirit and enactments.”

“ Should not our power of selection extend to the whole profession?—Is it not a matter of obvious policy, to allow to every individual in the profession the opportunity of raising himself to the honourable and lucrative offices, which are now monopolised upon a different principle; and to hold out to talent, industry, and knowledge, those high rewards as the most powerful incentive to their exertion?—The course pursued by the College has been just the reverse; they look out not in the profession at large, but among some twenty or thirty individuals, for those who are to



“ execute the duties, requiring for their proper discharge, so many  
 “ and such high qualifications. If one or two persons of dis-  
 “ tinguished ability should be found in this small number, it is more  
 “ than we have a right to expect, according to the ordinary average  
 “ of human endowments.”

“ While the science has been extended, and its literature en-  
 “ riched abroad by the Mascagnis, the Caldanis and the Scarpas,  
 “ by the Soemmerrings, Walthers, Prochaskas, Reils, Tiedemanns,  
 “ and Meckels, by the Bichats, Béclards, and Cloquets, we can  
 “ hardly mention a single Englishman whose name is known as an  
 “ anatomist beyond the shores of the island.”

“ I think that all the honours and rewards which the profession  
 “ can confer, should be open to all the members alike, without  
 “ respect of persons or classes, and that the only distinctions which  
 “ ought to be recognized, are those which talents and industry may  
 “ be capable of achieving for themselves.”

“ Professor Pattison, of Baltimore, the friend and fellow-  
 “ labourer of Allan Burns, of Glasgow, whom he succeeded as a  
 “ teacher of anatomy, acquired by his talents, industry, and ardent  
 “ pursuit of knowledge, that professional reputation, which recom-  
 “ mended him to his present public situation in the United States.  
 “ He undertook the education of a nephew, who repaired to America,  
 “ to avail himself of the great opportunities which his uncle could  
 “ afford. This nephew having spent five years in the diligent study  
 “ of all branches of medical science, having undergone a strict  
 “ examination, and having been admitted to the degree of Doctor in  
 “ Medicine and Surgery, returned to England, and wished to become  
 “ a member of the Royal College of Surgeons in London. This  
 “ natural born English subject was not admitted to an examination;  
 “ not because his anatomical and surgical studies had been insuffi-  
 “ cient, for they very far exceeded what the College regulation  
 “ requires; not because any suspicion could attach either to the  
 “ quantity or quality of his professional information: for he had  
 “ undergone in America a much stricter, and more comprehensive  
 “ examination than that of our College; but because he had not  
 “ bought his knowledge at one of the London shops.”

“ The denomination of *pure surgeon* which some so highly  
 “ value, has become rather a term of ridicule and contempt. It  
 “ implies, not a higher, but a lower degree of knowledge and utility.  
 “ *Pure!* free from what? From all knowledge of medicine! If we  
 “ wish to deserve and retain public respect, let us reject the im-  
 “ putation of such purity.”

Mr. Lawrence advises the student to limit his attention to a  
 few cases, and to investigate them carefully; he says “ the annals of  
 “ our profession contain no names more deservedly venerated than  
 “ those of Richter, Scarpa, Von Hildenbrand, Frank and Beer, and  
 “ these distinguished men were none of them attached to an hospital  
 “ containing more than twenty beds,” and he further adds

“ Self-elected and irresponsible bodies have always been found  
 “ the most unsafe depositories of power.”



## SCOTLAND.

You stated that you graduated at St. Andrew's, did you remain long in Scotland?—I spent several months in this country. Did you make it your business to enquire into the state of the medical Institutions of Scotland?—I did. Will you give the result of this enquiry?

Although Scotland has a population of only about two and a half millions, there are nine licensing bodies, and some of them have jurisdiction over certain districts only. Thus the privileges of the College of Physicians are confined to the old town of Edinburgh. The Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow has jurisdiction over four counties; the College of Surgeons of Edinburgh over eight; and nearly one half of the population of Scotland is not under corporate control.

Is the mode of election to Hospitals and Infirmaries as objectionable in Scotland as in this country?—Yes. How are the physicians and surgeons of the University of Edinburgh elected?—By the town council. This body you think is not competent to exercise such a power?—I believe not, and unless the present system of election is altered, the University of Edinburgh, already greatly on the decline, will take a second-rate place in the medical institutions of this country. But this University has had a very high reputation?—Yes; and some of the best men in the profession have graduated there, but of late years internal broils, squabbles, and dissensions have greatly increased, and the number of the students has diminished.

Can you give an example of the injurious effects of the present mode of election?—I will quote a remark recently made by the Professor of Physiology, Dr. Hughes Bennett; this gentleman had been three or four times an unsuccessful candidate for the office of Physician to the Infirmary, but in August last he obtained his present appointment in opposition to Dr. Martin Barry. Dr. Bennett, I learn, has stated since his election, "that he was only successful on this occasion because a better man than himself was opposed to him." Is not the Professor of Pathology a Homœopathist?—He is. Have chairs been openly bought and sold in Edinburgh?—Yes. How are the examinations conducted at this University?—Although many excellent men annually graduate at Edinburgh, I believe that there is great favouritism at these examinations, and several now obtain their degrees, who would not stand the test of a public examination. What leads you to this conclusion?—I was in Edinburgh during the last examination, and the following answers were given a few days before by a successful candidate for the doctor's degree; the questions were put by a grinder, and a friend of mine was present. "What are the contents of the Peri-



cardium?—Synovial fluid!” “Where is the Ligamentum Teres?—In the shoulder joint!” Has grinding been carried on to a great extent in Edinburgh?—Yes, and a great deal of money has been made by this system of cramming. How are the gentlemen who undertake this office paid?—According to the amount of work they do. Thus, if they get a man over the ground quickly, they are better remunerated, and they receive more for writing a thesis than for correcting one. A gentleman who took his degree at Aberdeen last August, was to give the grinder £50. if he got him through his examination. The time was short, and the cramming hard; £25. was drawn before starting, and the degree was obtained. Do you impute any blame to the gentlemen who undertake this office?—No; they are very intelligent and useful men, and according to the present system of examination, but few students can do without them; knowledge must be obtained in a short time, and these gentlemen know the quality and the quantity required. Besides, it is not to be expected that a student can possess much “*practical knowledge*,” this must be acquired in after life.

Have not a great number of the Edinburgh graduates been rejected at the Apothecaries’ Company of London?—Yes. Would not many of the licentiates of the College of Physicians of London share the same fate?—I believe so, and I think there is as much necessity for the apothecary to examine the physician, as the physician the apothecary. How so?—Because many physicians, as is evinced by their prescriptions, shew a lamentable ignorance of the proper method of preparing and compounding medicines. Is the examination at the University of Edinburgh, in any respect superior to that of the London College of Physicians?—Yes, the candidates are examined in surgery and midwifery. Is the surgical examination a severe one?—No; it is very inefficient. Can you name the surgical questions at the last examination?—The following were all the written questions in surgery.

- “ 1. Describe the pathology and treatment of erectile tumours.
- “ 2. The diagnosis of hernia and hydrocele.
- “ 3. The nature and treatment of cancrum oris.
- “ 4. The causes and treatment of retention of urine.”

You stated that the Professor of Pathology, Dr. Henderson, is a Homœopathist, what were his questions?—

“ 1. State the morbid alterations in the proportion of salts in the blood; the diseases in which they occur; their causes and effects.

“ 2. Describe the pathological conditions supposed to result from the morbid agency of oxygen on the body.

“ 3. Describe the several ways in which uric acid may become deposited in the urine, as in gravel.”

How would the professor attempt to remove these morbid conditions?—I suppose by drops, and the millionth part of grains, whilst his allopathic colleagues would use drachms.

How is it that so many of the English students and practi-



tioners have graduated in Scotland?—Because the restrictions at the College of Physicians, and at our Universities, have been so great, that students have been compelled to resort to the Scottish Universities. Are the advantages to the student in Edinburgh superior to those in London?—No; although there are some men of high repute connected with the University of Edinburgh, I believe opportunities of acquiring both medical and surgical knowledge, are much more extensive at some of our London schools. Can you state the amount paid by English students to the Scottish Universities during the last fifty years?—No; but the sum must be enormous. Are the museums and libraries in Scotland open to strangers?—No; I believe there is no country in Europe where so much illiberality exists in this respect as in Scotland. What proof have you of this?—When in Edinburgh, I wrote to the library committee of the University (and my letter was accompanied by a recommendation from a Professor,) to ask permission to be allowed occasionally to consult books in the library. I received no written answer; but on inquiry of the sub-librarian, I was told that I could not be admitted. At the museum of the College of Surgeons I was obliged to pay two shillings and sixpence for a catalogue, none being allowed for the use of the visitors. At the museum of Natural History one shilling is paid on admission. The same sum is demanded at the Andersonian Museum at Glasgow, and William Hunter's Museum cannot be seen without the payment of one shilling, and an extra three shillings and sixpence is demanded for the catalogue. Do you think that these restrictions would be approved of by the Scotch people generally?—No; the Scotch are proverbially liberal and kind to strangers, and I only allude to these matters, for the purpose of directing the attention of those in authority to them.

Have you read the evidence of Drs. Christison, Burns, Weir, Fyfe, Henderson, Alexander, Mr. Wood, and Sir D. Brewster, on the Scotch Universities, &c.?—Yes. What remarks have you to make upon this evidence?—I think some of Dr. Christison's evidence is very likely to mislead the Committee. He says, "The incorporated bodies have been of great service to the country in respect to medical education and practice;" and a very erroneous estimate is likely to be formed concerning medical practice in Scotland from the Doctor's opinions.

Did you make enquiries respecting the mode of practice and remuneration in Scotland?—Yes; I travelled through a great part of Scotland, and obtained all the information I could. What was the result of your enquiries?—That all the medical men in Scotland, with four or five exceptions, are general practitioners, and that the majority prepare their own medicines. That up to a late period, in Edinburgh, nearly all pursued this course; even the learned Professors of the University. That in Scotland, especially in the rural districts, medical practitioners are miserably paid for their services; and that in Glasgow, one of their richest cities, the average charge



for visit and medicine does not exceed one shilling or one and sixpence. How are the doctors in Edinburgh paid?—The greater number send bills; some of them leave a blank sheet for the patient to fill up, and others charge so much per visit. What is the usual charge?—Two shillings and sixpence. Is the general practitioner in England better remunerated?—Yes. A great deal is said about his making a trade of his profession, and being paid by his medicines; can you give any information upon this subject?—Yes; there has been much misrepresentation, and those who have spoken before the Parliamentary Committee have displayed great ignorance concerning it. The general practitioners in this country used to be remunerated in this manner, but the system is greatly altered. The plan adopted by the most respectable of the profession is to charge for visits, and include the medicine, and no bill of items is sent. What is the usual charge for visit and medicine?—This varies from two and sixpence, three and sixpence, to five shillings, according to the patient's circumstances and position in life. Then when a practitioner charges three and sixpence for a mixture, you do not consider that he is paid for his medicine only?—No; he receives about three shillings for his advice, and sixpence for the expense of preparation. Do you object to this mode of remuneration?—Yes; I think it would be better for the medical man to receive a fixed sum for his visit, but this must, to a certain extent, be left to his option. Do you approve of general practitioners dispensing their own medicines?—In country districts the medicines must generally be prepared at the house of the practitioner, and in towns it must be left to the taste and inclination of the medical attendant; some think their prescriptions are better attended to at their own dispensaries. I believe, however, that as medical education improves, the system will gradually get into disuse.

Have you anything further to state respecting the corporate bodies in Scotland?—Their history and occupation may be summed up in a few words; like the greater part of those in England and Ireland (to borrow an expression from Mr. Lawrence), they have been opposition "shops;" their chief object has been to put money into their own pockets; and their prosperity has been in a great measure due to the exclusion and corruption which have existed south of the Tweed. Can you state the price of the diplomas at the various licensing boards in Scotland?—In Edinburgh, the College of Physicians (no examination), resident licentiate, £100.; non-resident licentiate, £55.; the College of Surgeons, ordinary candidates, £7. 5s.; apprentices of fellows, twenty-five shillings; for an assistant surgeon in the navy, £4. 19s. 6d.\* University degree, £25.; St. Andrew's, £25. 3s.; Aberdeen King's College, £26. 5s. 6d.; Marischal College—Glasgow University, for the degree of M.D. £25. 3s.; for the degree of Magister Chirurgiæ, £10. 10s.; Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons, £7 7s.

---

\* Surely the College should have altered this sum before it petitioned Parliament for a redress of grievances?



## IRELAND.

Did you make enquiries in Dublin respecting the corporate bodies, and medical practice generally?—I did. What is your opinion of the state of the medical profession in Ireland?—In some respects it is better than in England or Scotland; the examination at the College of Surgeons is open to the members, and I believe it is a better one than that at the London College. The preliminary examination at the Society of Apothecaries is more extensive than at the Apothecaries' Company in London. The opportunities of seeing practice are very great; and the Lying-in and the Fever Hospitals of Dublin, as regards the internal arrangements, are admirably conducted establishments. But great corruption and nepotism exist in this city. Appointments to hospitals are sold, and but little secrecy is made of the matter. The representative system, and election by Concours, are only wanted to make Dublin one of the best schools of medicine and surgery in Europe.

Have you read the evidence of Drs. Cusac, Collins, Harrison, Maunsell, and Leet?—Yes; and I beg to direct *especial attention* to one statement of Dr. Cusac's, and the circumstance, *I think, should make Parliament take a little more interest in medical affairs than it has hitherto done.* Dr. Cusac says (2982).—"We found that 179 Irish medical practitioners, exclusive of pupils and army surgeons, died in the year 1847,—about 1 practitioner in every 15, and 64½ per cent. of the whole died of fever." Did Government do anything for the widows and children of these gentlemen?—I believe not. How many medical practitioners are connected with the corporate bodies in Ireland?—The College of Physicians, according to Dr. Collins, numbers 52 fellows, and 65 licentiates; the College of Surgeons (Dr. Cusac), 461 fellows and 506 licentiates; the Apothecaries' Company, about 1,249 members. Could the representative system be easily introduced into Ireland, and a Faculty of Medicine established?—Yes, very easily; but unfortunately in Ireland, as well as in England, the party who *would depress the many for the benefit of the few has the most influence with Government.* Dr. Collins says, "We wish to keep lunatic asylums and infirmaries for the benefit of pure physicians and surgeons." But the most laughable part of the evidence is this: the Apothecaries' Company reject candidates for their want of medical knowledge, and they are immediately passed by the College of Physicians, and are only examined in pharmacy. Can you account for this?—Yes; the censors think that apothecaries do not require a knowledge of medicine.



## UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

Drs. Billing, Hodgkin, Storrar, and Barnes were examined on behalf of the University of London. Have you read their evidence?—Yes; and the good sense and liberality generally exhibited by these gentlemen form, I think, a pleasing contrast with the narrow-mindedness and bigotry of some of those whose evidence has been already criticised. What is your opinion of the examination at the University of London?—I think it is the best in this country; and *all* who enter the medical profession should be compelled to undergo such an examination.

Do you agree with the opinions expressed by Drs. Laycock and Johnson, and by Messrs. Bottomly, Cartwright, and Ottley?—Yes; with nearly all of them.

## NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.

Were you, when in general practice, a member of the National Institute of General Practitioners?—No. What is your opinion of this body?—I think the gentlemen composing it have acted upon mistaken principles, and that they would, if they obtained their Charter, greatly increase the evils which at present exist; there is too much of the leaven of the Apothecaries' Company amongst them; they are bound hand and foot to the College of Surgeons and Physicians. Besides the National Institute does not represent the opinions of one-twentieth of the members of the profession. Has not the Apothecaries' Company been a very useful Institution?—Yes, I believe it has done more to improve the profession than any of the corporate bodies. Do you think that the examinations at this Company are superior to those which took place at the London College of Physicians ten years ago?—Yes; and I believe many who have become members of the College of Physicians would have been deservedly rejected by the examiners of the Apothecaries Company.

Is it your opinion that this Company should be abolished?—This will depend upon the course Government means to pursue respecting Medical Reform. If a Faculty of Medicine were established, the abolition of this Company would be desirable, but its members must be properly represented, and take their part in the formation of the examining board. The sooner the term apothecary, and the connexion of the Society with the sale of drugs, are got rid of, the better. Let the examiners be ever so competent, and the examinations of the highest order, both the title and connexion are so objectionable, that the members themselves must be glad to disown them.



Have you examined the evidence of Messrs. Ridout and Bird?—Yes; the former of these gentlemen approves of the plan of registration given in by Dr. Hawkins, but as a proof that he does not see far beyond the walls of the City of London, he says (505) “Surgery is rather an accident, and surgical practice forms but a small part of the practice of the general practitioner, even if he is in very good practice.”

You think the Council of the National Institute have acted upon mistaken principles, will you explain your meaning?—If these gentlemen had advocated a Faculty of Medicine, and steered clear of the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians altogether, they might have succeeded in their object; they should have taken an independent course; they are already thrown overboard by the College of Surgeons, and the College of Physicians when it suits its purpose, will assist in the drowning.

Was it not proposed that this Institute should first examine the student in surgery, and then he was to be finished off by the “Pures”?—Yes; and a more absurd proposition I think could not be entertained. There is no reason why these gentlemen should make themselves subordinate to the Council of the College of Surgeons. Are you of opinion that the general practitioners could form an efficient examining board from their own body?—I have no doubt about it.

Will you state what claim you think the general practitioners of England, have to be considered a scientific body?—Some of the best physicians have been general practitioners, and nearly all the celebrated surgeons in the provincial cities and towns belong to this class, and as I before stated, I believe some of these gentlemen are superior to certain members of the Council of the College of Surgeons. Five-sixths of the graduates of the University of London are general practitioners, and nine-tenths of the prizemen at our hospitals and schools enter this department of practice. At the present time there are seven lecturers and teachers at Guy’s Hospital (whose labors will bear comparison with the University physicians), who are members of the Apothecaries’ Company, and who were the pupils of general practitioners, Drs. Golding Bird, Hughes, A. Taylor, Ashwell, Lever, Oldham, and Mr. Hilton. Many of the Jacksonian prizemen have been general practitioners, and of the twenty-one Fothergillian gold medallists of the Medical Society of London, about seventeen were in general practice.

Is it your wish to place the general practitioner above the pure surgeon and physician?—I wish to shew that, when possessing a medical and surgical diploma, he is the best qualified, and the most useful practitioner of the three, and that his opinion is entitled to more weight and consideration than it has hitherto received.

Do you not think that the general practitioners, if they had had the same amount of influence, would have acted in a similar



manner?—Most likely; for to borrow again from *the* Mr. Lawrence of 1826, “Self-elected and irresponsible bodies have always been “found the most unsafe depositories of power.”

Do you not respect vested rights?—Yes; but not when they are in the hands of a few self-elected individuals, and injurious to the public welfare. The man whose open drain or cesspool is scattering death around, might as well talk of his vested rights.

What would you do with existing Corporations,—the College, of Surgeons and Physicians, for example?—Leave them to take care of themselves, and let those who like join them, after becoming members of the Faculty; but I believe nine-tenths of the members of the College of Surgeons would be anxious to connect themselves with the Faculty of Medicine, and the graduates of the University of London would, probably, be glad to join this Institution, provided the examinations were equal to their own. What is to become of the College of Physicians?—Let those who think highly of an “academic education,” and who object to “vulgar invasions,” after passing the examination of the Faculty, be admitted by ballot, as at the neighbouring Club. The admission fee and annual subscription to be determined by the President and Censors. I also suggest that the face of the building should be turned towards the light of day, and after being washed by the classic fountains of Trafalgar-square, I would place the figure of Dr. Elliotson,\* in the act of mesmerising the President, in the centre, and surmount each of the pillars with a Swiney Cup, upon which the following inscription would not be inappropriate:—

X “Donarem pateras, grataque commodus,  
 — meis æra sodalibus:  
 Donarem tripodas præmia fortium.”—*Horace, Ode viii. Lib. iv.*

For those who prefer our mother tongue, I would add this notice:—

Metropolitan Diplomas may be had here (under certain restrictions) for £71. 17s.; but as human life in the provinces is of little worth, compared with that in the metropolis, *country* parchment may be obtained for £24. 18s.—As the distinction between medicine and surgery is as “clear as night and day,” we disclaim all connexion with the latter science.

---

\* The subjoined note is necessary for the proper understanding of what follows. Dr. Elliotson was appointed by the President, Dr. Paris, to deliver the Harvean Oration (Parliamentary Evidence, question 235). Dr. Paris stated (question 129), “That a higher order of “physicians should be secured for the metropolis.” Dr. G. Burrows (question 953) says, “the distinction between the practice of the physician and that of the surgeon is about the “same as there is between night and day.”—The reader should also be made acquainted with some of the following laws of the College of Physicians:—“If any fellow or licentiate “can be proved, to the satisfaction of the President and Censors, to have wilfully accused any “other fellow or licentiate of professional ignorance, unless it be before the legally-constituted “judges, he shall be fined £4. for the first offence, and £8. for the second; if he offend a “third time, if a fellow, he shall be expelled, and if a licentiate, fined £10.”—“No fellow “or licentiate may consult, in London, or within seven miles thereof, with a physician who “does not belong to the College, under a penalty of £5. fine. All fines are to be paid immediately. The President and Court of the College have the power of committing individuals “contemning their authority to Newgate.” This power has been exercised by the Court, but not of late years.



Will you give a brief recapitulation of the Plan of Medical Reform that you have advocated?

1st. The establishment of a Faculty of Medicine in England, Ireland, and Scotland.

2nd. That all who enter the medical profession should undergo a preliminary examination in Mathematics, Latin, and Greek, and, after a few years, the French and German languages might be added.

3rd. That every candidate for the diploma of the Faculty shall be subjected to an efficient examination *in medicine and surgery*, as well as in the collateral sciences, and that the verbal examination shall be *conducted in public*.

4th. That the examiners, or those composing the Senate, shall receive a fixed stipend; they shall not be teachers; and they shall be elected, as before described, (page 27).

5th. That all hospital appointments shall be made by Concours; and those elected shall be compelled to keep a proper register of their cases, and to publish a summary of them every year.

6th. That an efficient Board of Health shall be established in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and that this Board shall be composed chiefly of medical practitioners.

7th. That a proper protection shall be afforded by Government against illegal practice; and that all qualified practitioners shall be at liberty to exercise their calling in any part of Her Majesty's dominions, not excepting the *sacred circle* of the city of London.

Do you not expect to make a host of enemies by the publication of this pamphlet?—Yes; but I have spoken what I believe to be the truth, and have sought neither the favor nor the affection of any man. I have, moreover, the consolatory assurance that, although the reform I advocate may for a time be retarded by Corporate influence and patchwork legislation, it must ultimately prevail and become the law of the land.



With Plates, 8vo. cloth, 14s.

THE  
STRUCTURE, DISEASES, AND INJURIES  
OF  
THE BLOOD-VESSELS;

BEING THE JACKSONIAN PRIZE ESSAY FOR 1844.

BY EDWARDS CRISP, M.D. M.R.C.S.L., L.A.C.

---

"It abounds in sound practical knowledge, and gives evidence of immense labour and most patient research; and, were it only for the sake of the interesting cases which are embodied in its pages, the book would be well worth the attentive perusal of the practitioner."—*Dublin Journal*.

"The work is a valuable contribution to surgery—one of which the general practitioners have reason to be proud."—*Medico-Chirurgical Review*.

"We have great pleasure in recommending to the notice of the members of the Provincial Association this excellent work of one of our associates."—*Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal*.

"The work does honour to the author as a talented, diligent, and observant surgeon."—*Medical Times*.

"We regard Mr. Crisp's work as a valuable addition to our surgical literature."—*Forbes's British and Foreign Medical Review*.

"The Committee strongly recommend the study of Mr. Crisp's work to those who desire to be prepared for more than the 'ordinary emergencies' of practice."—*S. E. Branch of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association*.

---

JOHN CHURCHILL, PRINCES STREET, SOHO.



THE EXAMINATION  
OF  
A REJECTED CANDIDATE  
AT THE  
ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS  
OF LONDON,

DECEMBER 21ST, 1848.

BY EDWARDS CRISP, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.A.C.

"Such are some of the chief circumstances of this extraordinary case, than which nothing has occurred in recent times so calculated to damage the College of Physicians with the government and with the profession. General practitioners will see the estimation in which their "practical experience" is held by the College, the body to whom the traitorous Institute would give them over bound hand and foot. We do not hesitate to say that the pamphlet now published bears evidence of the most complete competence of Dr. Crisp for the licence to practise, and of the incompetence of more than one of the examiners for their posts. Dr. Crisp may console himself; he, *the last rejected candidate for the licence*, would be acknowledged by the profession to rank as high as any one of the batch of *the last elected fellows of the College*."—*Lancet*, January 20, 1849.

"The examination of Dr. Crisp further proves, that the rejection of a candidate is no proof of his want of professional knowledge. Overrun, as we are, by licensing medical corporations, we are accustomed to look to the statistics of candidates admitted or rejected at these various Institutions, and to judge from them of the value of the several diplomas given. The profession, in consequence, has frequently been led to draw erroneous conclusions. Nothing is easier than for a Court of Examiners to reject or admit a candidate; and the most trivial circumstance will sometimes influence their decision. In Dr. Crisp's case, we are led to believe from his Pamphlet, that a former disagreement with one of the examiners in the treatment of a case of rheumatic fever led to his rejection at the College of Physicians. Certainly, it was not from the want of general knowledge, as the President and Censors stated, if we may judge from the questions and answers published; and it is the height of folly to suppose, the Apothecaries' Society, the College of Surgeons, and the University of St. Andrew's, had each successively been imposed on by an ignorant candidate. The diploma of either of these Corporations is as respectable as that which the London College of Physicians furnishes; and the latter Institution has not *prestige* enough to escape the charge of incompetency or of favouritism in rejecting a candidate who has proved himself fully competent to practise his profession."—*Medical Times*, January, 27, 1849.

"The last year has supplied its victims offered up on this altar of Moloch, the jealous rivalry of existing medical corporations. It is not often these victims are known. They endure quietly the bitter draught which an unjust legislation has compelled them to swallow. Now and then an Armstrong or a Mason Good has reliance enough on his own character, and courage enough to make known his defeat. Such a one has recently presented himself in Dr. Edwards Crisp, a gentleman who is well known as a highly respectable general practitioner, as having contributed largely to the literature of his profession; and, more especially as the successful competitor for the Jacksonian Prize Essay of the College of Surgeons, in 1845. This gentleman is a licentiate of the Apothecaries' Society, a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, and a graduate of a Scotch University; so that he has already undergone three examinations, each of which gave him a license to practise any branch of his profession in various parts of Her Majesty's dominions. But Dr. Crisp, wishing to practise in London as a physician, has no license for this, and presents himself before the president and censors of the Royal College, in Pall-mall. These gentlemen, who readily open their portals for the admission of young men fresh from Oxford and Cambridge, whose only recommendation is their "little Latin and less Greek," agree to reject the man as incapable of practising, who brought with him the experience of a quarter of a century's practice, the esteem of his professional brethren, the confidence of the public, and the testimony of three legally constituted bodies in Great Britain, that he was fit to practise his profession."—*Daily News*, March 17, 1849.

JOHN CHURCHILL, PRINCES STREET, SOHO.



