

the district branches, all seem to show that the necessity of some improvements in the constitution of the Association is strongly and generally felt. But it yet remains for some one to devise such a re-arrangement of our atoms, as may produce a more normal, efficient, and perfect structure.

Hitherto, members have been left to discover the want of a more frequent intercourse, and a more intimate bond of union, than the Association originally afforded them. Thus they have formed themselves, in some localities, into district branches, the sphere and extent of which are arbitrary, and are controlled neither by appeal to a central authority, nor by reference to any general scheme of division.

Would it not be far preferable, that the General Council should at once proceed to divide the Association, geographically, into a sufficient number of district sections?

Might not each of the existing *branches*, as they are now called, form a *section*,—the large Eastern and Southern Branches being perhaps divided into sections, containing not more than one or two counties in each?

Might not each section be empowered to elect its own Council, and each sectional or district Council appoint a limited few of its members to represent the section in the General Council?

And in order to carry the alteration into effect with due regard to the present governing body of the Association, might not the existing Council be considered merely as the *aggregate* of district Councils, *each portion* of which might proceed to elect its quorum to a new General or Central Council, not exceeding 40 or 50 in number, the head quarters of which would of course be at Worcester, as the residence of the President?

Surely a supreme Council so constituted would be much better fitted for action than the present numerous and unwieldy Council.

Even supposing that the members of the Association, residing in any one of the district sections, should decline to avail themselves of the privileges of local management, representation, and union, offered by such a scheme, might not the General Council be empowered to fill up future vacancies in the Council of that section, the number of such district councillors not being permitted ultimately to exceed a fixed proportion of the members of the section?

The preceding questions I put with deference, though not with hesitation, for I am persuaded that the arrangement which I have indicated would remedy certain defects in our constitution, and provide a more satisfactory method of representation.

Dr. Shapter's motion is, I suppose, intended to accomplish, in some degree, the same object, but it may fairly be questioned whether his plan would confer on district branches more power than they already possess; for I presume that the Council have always been ready to add to their number those gentlemen who may have been recommended by the members of any branch. In fact, our 14th rule expressly provides that all who are "engaged in the executive management of the district branches should be also members of the general Council." But there is another objection to Dr. Shapter's motion, viz., that it recognizes the general Council as a self-elected body,

by proposing that the district branches should "present" to it "*for election*" such of their members, &c.

I believe that our excellent founder would not admit that Dr. Shapter had, in this particular, taken a correct view of the principles on which our Society is constituted.

Dr. Inglis's motion leads me to propound a few more questions. Is it then, or is it not the fact, that the present subscription proves to be insufficient to carry into effect the general purposes of the Association—to defray the expenses of management—to publish a handsome annual volume of Transactions—and to issue a respectable weekly Journal?

If this question be answered in the affirmative—and I entertain little doubt that it must be—we ought to look the difficulty fairly in the face, and either raise the subscription to an adequate amount, or cease to offer so many advantages to members who do not pay for them.

But might not both these courses be adopted? Might not the subscription be raised to one guinea and a half, and be divided into *three* parts—only *one* of which should be compulsory on all the members? Might not the first half-guinea be required simply for membership, (as in the Medical Association of Ireland,) without entitling the members to the publications of the Association? Might not the second half-guinea be applied to the annual volume of Transactions; and the third to the Journal?

Then, in order to insure that all who are entrusted with a share in the management of the Association, should take an interest in its several objects, might not the full subscription of a guinea and a half be required of every member of the Council, whether district or general?

Under such regulations, no serious falling off in the number of subscribers to the Journal and Transactions need be feared; while the option of subscribing would doubtless invite a large accession to the number of members, and thus increase the general influence of the Association.

I will not further occupy your space, on the present occasion, by statements and arguments in support of the foregoing suggestions, which are not put forth hastily, nor without full consideration. But if any objections should be started, I shall beg leave to reply to them in a future number,

And I now remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF THE PROVINCIAL
MEDICAL AND SURGICAL ASSOCIATION.
July 23, 1844.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND.

REGULATIONS FOR THE FELLOWSHIP.

The following official notice has been issued:—

"Notice is hereby given, that the following are the hospitals and schools of surgery and medicine from which certificates of the professional education of candidates for the fellowship will be received by this College for the year commencing the 1st of August next, viz. :—

"HOSPITALS IN ENGLAND.—London—St. Bartholomew's, St. Thomas's, Westminster, Guy's, St.

