

sums of money, on the representation of some of the College authorities, were willing to make a grant of land for the erection of the required buildings. Unfortunately, the convenience of this site for the purposes in view had not been sufficiently considered before the Town Trustees were approached. It was too distant from the centre of the city, from the railway stations (2½ miles), and of still more importance, both from the Royal Infirmary and the Royal Hospital, interfering thus seriously with the attendance of students at these institutions. On these grounds objections were raised to the suggested site when the matter came before the medical department. The great distance from both the Royal Infirmary and the Royal Hospital, and the consequent interference with clinical teaching, was an objection mainly, of course, affecting the medical department; but the other reasons named affected the College in each of its departments, and therefore the line taken by the medical was as much in the interests of the College as a whole as of its own particular department. The selection of this site not un-naturally called forth opposition on the part of those who had recently given up their vested interests in the Botanical Gardens—in which was the suggested site—and handed them over to the Town Trustees, so that the people could enjoy the garden as a public park. It is to be hoped that the difficulties in obtaining a suitable site will be overcome, and that the money necessary for the building and equipment of a University College will be forthcoming before long.

The Town Trustees have recently made a grant of £2,000 towards the building schemes of the Royal Infirmary and of the Royal Hospital, but have attached conditions as to the raising of other moneys during the next year.

At the annual dinner of past and present students, Professor Addison, President of the Students' Club, occupied the chair, and as usual, the dinner was well attended.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE SOCIETY OF APOTHECARIES OF LONDON.

SIR,—In a previous issue of the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, Dr. Stocker comments upon some remarks of Mr. Horsley at Newcastle, in reference to the representation of the Apothecaries' Society upon the General Medical Council. Mr. Horsley has already explained to the General Medical Council how he came to make the mistake in saying that the election of the representative was by those "who had not a particle of medical education about them," and therefore that part of his address need no longer be a matter of dispute.

Dr. Stocker objects apparently, however, to the further remark of Mr. Horsley, in that he described the electorate as a "handful of City grocers." Now, surely a grocer is one who sells groceries, and I would venture to ask Dr. Stocker whether groceries such as mixed soices and other common kitchen goods such as curry powder, cayenne pepper, etc., are not sold across the counter at the Apothecaries' Hall to any customer requiring them? If this be the case, the term "grocers" is surely not inapplicable.

Dr. Stocker is a Member of the Royal College of Physicians, and I was under the impression that those holding that valuable distinction were precluded by the by-laws of the College from selling drugs, dispensing medicines, or trading. It seems rather an anomaly that individual Members of the College should be debarred from doing these things, and at the same time the Master of the Apothecaries' Society should be exempt from the regulations. These by-laws press very hardly sometimes upon professional men practising in the Colonies who are compelled to dispense medicines, and have therefore to return their diplomas of Membership. As a student of ethics I am interested to find that whereas dispensing by an individual Member for his own patients is not permitted, yet if that individual Member becomes the Master of the Apothecaries' Society in London, he may dispense wholesale for any customers, and sell them packets of mixed spices at the same time, and whilst doing these things retain his Membership of the Royal College of Physicians. Verily it is an amusing world.—I am, etc.,

Devonshire Street, W., Dec. 11th.

A. G. BATEMAN.

THE INCOME OF THE GENERAL MEDICAL COUNCIL.

SIR,—As an old member of the British Medical Association, I would emphatically protest against the suggestion made in Dr. Rentoul's letter on the above subject: that the income of the General Medical Council should be augmented some £26,000 a year by the imposition of an annual tax on the hard-earned incomes of medical practitioners.

The case of solicitors, auctioneers, bankers, brewers, etc., appears to me to rest upon an entirely different foundation, inasmuch as these are licensed to follow their respective vocations, and any unlicensed person conducting such business or profession would be liable to summary prosecution. Medical practitioners have, as the law is now administered, no such privilege or protection.

Expediency may suggest that as medical practice is supposed to exist not merely for the profit of the practitioner, but also for the public good, it should be exempt from direct taxation, but justice demands that where there is no privilege or protection there should be no special taxation.—I am, etc.,

West Worthing, Nov. 13th.

FRANCIS H. PARSONS, M.D.

SIR,—Dr. Rentoul has broken a discreet silence by reproducing his impractical hobby in your columns. I am surprised at Dr. Rentoul's proposition to raise the General Medical Council's spending powers under present circumstances, and with a Council hostile to the principle of direct representation. It will be time enough to think of a poll tax when the direct representatives are in a majority, and if they all behave as Dr. Rentoul did soon after his recent election, that time will be relegated to the Greek Kalends. I think good taste would prompt a prolonged period of reticence to your correspondent.—I am, etc.,

East Sheen, Dec. 9th.

ALEX. MCCOOK WEIR.

MEDICAL ORGANISATION.

SIR,—Dr. J. Harold Bailey's letter in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of November 25th illustrates the difficulty of creating efficient medical organisation. Some men will not join a society because of other men connected with it, and there are men who will leave a society because of something done or left undone with which they do not agree in every particular. I once heard a practitioner tell the reason he was not a member of the British Medical Association: He would not belong to a Society of which a certain eminent practitioner was a member! This is individualism run riot. Those who have the the real welfare of the profession at heart will not allow personal considerations to debar them from joining associations which exist for the common good.

Dr. Bailey's "remedy" for the imaginary shortcomings he attributes to the Medical Guild could not have the effect he predicts, because instead of the needful union there would be further dissension, and the charge of "whitewashing" the provident dispensaries can only be made through ignorance, or from a wish to be offensive because it is contrary to the truth, as anyone can learn who wishes to know the facts. The chief object of forming the Guild was to remedy the evils of the provident dispensaries, and that object has been kept in view throughout and acted up to on every possible occasion, not without results. The "lack of support" which the Guild receives, as Dr. Bailey alleges, is a matter of opinion—there are already over 200 members and new ones are continually joining, and the most vivid imagination cannot picture better society outside the Guild than exists inside it.

The Medical Guild exists not to sow dissension or to advantage one class of practitioner to the detriment of another class; far from it. The Guild aims at promoting union, loyalty, and the co-operation of all for the common good—the carrying out of the golden rule in the relationship of practitioners to one another. This cannot be done by wrapping oneself up in one's mantle of self-righteousness and thanking God how much better one is than other men: but by goodwill, by sinking personal differences for the attainment of high ideals, and by a little self-sacrifice much may be done.

The Guild would invite Dr. Bailey and all who think with him and are anxious for the common weal to become members, when they would find a willingness (of which they seem at present to be honestly in doubt) to remedy the evils of the