

thing is already prejudged; the phenomena are *mock marvels*; the thing itself is an *hallucinating fraud*," remains *indisputable*.

I am, Sir,
Yours truly,
W. NEWNHAM.

Farnham, Feb. 15, 1845.

SIR JAMES GRAHAM'S MEDICAL BILL.
THE REGISTRATION CLAUSES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND
SURGICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,

I fully agree with your correspondent of the 28th of December last, that it is very desirable that the question of the new registration should be mooted; and as he invites a discussion upon the subject in the pages of your Journal, I hope you will not refuse admission to the following remarks, although they will be found to contain a view different from your own, and that of your correspondent upon the matter in question. The point in dispute is, whether existing members of the College of Surgeons will be entitled to register as "surgeons" under the new bill, without possessing the honorary degree of Fellows of that body, on payment of two pounds, or whether they must register as "licentiates in medicine and surgery," and pay five shillings only. The late statement of the Apothecaries' Company adopts the latter hypothesis, and has made it the most powerful engine for arraying the general practitioners against the physicians and surgeons, while the writer of the article in the last number of the *Quarterly Review* declares that qualified surgeons, of course, cannot be deprived of the privilege of registering as such, and that the "licentiate in medicine and surgery," under the 28th clause of the new bill, is the apothecary, who has no diploma from the College. This also seems to be your notion, and that of your correspondent, "A Member of the College of Surgeons;" and it is because I think it is a mistaken one, that I now trouble you.

Nothing to my mind can be clearer than the recognition by the new bill of the three existing divisions of the profession, namely, physicians, surgeons, and general practitioners, under the respective titles of physicians, surgeons, and licentiates in medicine and surgery; and hereafter, supposing the bill to become law, no person can register under either of the two first heads without arriving at a more advanced age, and undergoing a competent examination, after which he becomes, by the mere act of registration, *ipso facto*, an associate of the College of Physicians, or Fellow of the College of Surgeons, as the case may be. The licentiate may register at an earlier age after an examination, by which he shall be proved "duly qualified to practice as a licentiate," but which gives him no power to register under any other title. On such registration the physician, (or *associate* of the College of Physicians, as he is always denominated throughout the bill,) and the surgeon or *fellow* of the College of Surgeons, (as he is termed,) will have to pay a fee of five pounds each, while the licentiate will have to pay two. I beg to draw particular attention to the foregoing titles, by which the different grades are distinguished, and which a glance at clause 18 will render clear, because I think that you and your correspondent

have been led into error by not attending to this division, as I shall now proceed to point out.

The 28th clause of the bill provides for the registration of existing practitioners under the three divisions specified, and the analogy of the case in respect to the fees demanded, makes it certain to my mind that the person who pays two pounds will register as a physician or surgeon, and the person who pays five shillings will register as a licentiate.

The question is, whether the mere possession of the diploma of the College of Surgeons will entitle the holder to call himself a "surgeon" in the sense of the act, and claim to be registered as such, on payment of the higher fee. The writer in the *Quarterly* says it will; but one moment's thought is sufficient to refute this absurdity. The fees are declared to go towards the expense of the act, and the members of the English college are about 12,000. What must the expense of the act be, if the Members of the College of Surgeons alone are expected to pay £24,000 towards it! and this without reckoning one farthing for double registrations. The thing is ridiculous. Your correspondent has evidently been led into error, by misquoting the 28th clause, or rather by not quoting enough of it. In his note he says, that "in the 28th clause there is a provision that the registration fee shall be two pounds in the case of Fellows or Associates of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons;" and you observe in your remarks, that "as the Associates of the College of Physicians will be entitled to register as Physicians equally with the Fellows, it cannot be doubted but that the *members or associates* of the College of Surgeons would, by implication, be entitled equally with the newly-created Fellows of that College to register as surgeons."

Now, the remarks I have made above, will, I think, show that this is not true. The cases are not analogous, for the future associateship of the College of Physicians will be the registering titular grade of *that* body, whether the possessors of it are *Fellows* or not; while the Fellowship of the College of Surgeons will be the registering titular grade of *that* body, whether the possessors of it are members or not. The mistake has arisen from supposing that the word "associate," in the 28th clause, applies to the members of the College of Surgeons, which it clearly does not, as the addition of the one word omitted by your correspondent, taken in connection with the preceding observations, will make evident.

The sentence stands thus, "two pounds in the case of Fellows or Associates of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons *RESPECTIVELY*,"—that is, Associates of the College of Physicians, and Fellows of the College of Surgeons, and not Fellows or Associates of either or both of these bodies, as you and your correspondent seem to suppose.

I have treated this subject in a manner which may perhaps appear tedious and tautological, but its extreme importance at the present juncture, and the misapprehension which so widely prevails with regard to it, must be my excuse. Amidst all the confusion worse confounded, with which the question is beset, one great difficulty will be found to arise from the position of that large and daily increasing portion of members of the College of Surgeons who do not practice as apothecaries, and yet are not Fellows of that body. These

gentlemen, as matters now stand, are entirely disqualified from registering at all, and their case must sooner or later form the topic of serious discussion during the progress of the bill through Parliament.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.
E. G.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

PROTEST AGAINST THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL, FROM HAMPSHIRE.

To the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons.

We, the undersigned, members of the Royal College of Surgeons, practising in Hampshire, desire to convey to the Council the expression of our great dissatisfaction, and of the deep sense of the injustice with which we have been treated by the mode in which the Council have exercised their powers under the new charter.

We will not stop to remark on the preamble of the charter, which asserts that it was granted at the humble petition of the College of Surgeons, whereas it was the production of the Council alone; nor do we wish here to argue the question whether or not it may be of essential benefit to the science of Surgery; that in future the whole body of Surgeons should be divided into two classes; and that those alone should form the higher class who have undergone a better classical education, a more extended professional one, and who have passed a stricter examination; but we protest against the injustice by which six hundred of our body have been arbitrarily selected to form this higher class, who have neither had a better classical education, nor a more extended professional one, nor have submitted to a stricter examination than ourselves; whilst we, their professional equals, are required to submit to a second examination, in order to attain that rank which has been bestowed, without examination, on the others. The arbitrary and invidious manner in which the Council have appointed this higher class, and the strange requirement that we should undergo a second examination (embracing, as your examination papers show, the rudiments of anatomy and physiology) to attain our previous equality, after having received diplomas, pronouncing our fitness to practise surgery, and having been for many years in the actual practice of surgery, we cannot but regard as a fundamental violation of the constitution of the College from which we obtained our diplomas, and as a breach by the council of the compact into which at that time we entered; while, indeed, the whole proceeding of the council has been at variance with the just and constitutional principle, that, in all changes, existing rights are to be respected: a principle which Sir James Graham, in the new Charter, gave the council the full power of carrying out.

By this *injustice* we feel that our diplomas as members have become valueless as an honorary distinction, while the entire disregard of our feelings and interests as a body, which has been thus indicated, and the contemptuous neglect with which the remonstrances of a large number of our members have been treated, have shaken the confidence we were before disposed to place in the council; who have created a distinction at once odious to the excluded, and without real honour to those who have been pro-

moted by a partiality, that neither the profession at large can respect, nor the public appreciate.

	Date of Diploma.
Gay Shute, Gosport,	1801
J. R. Keele, Southampton,	1805
J. Stace, Southampton,	1808
James Ainge, Fareham,	1809
J. R. Beddome, Romsey,	1811
W. P. Vaile, Southampton,	1812
J. Smith, Weyhill, Andover	1812
Thomas Dyer, Ringwood,	1813
R. Budd, Fawley,	1813
W. Gutch, Broughton,	1815
W. Peskett, Petersfield,	1815
John Jenkins, Gosport,	1816
H. Slight, Portsmouth,	1818
John Blatherwick, Fareham,	1819
G. Swann, Wickham,	1819
J. Davids, Cowes,	1820
H. Shebbeare, Odiham,	1820
George Pedder, Ryde,	1821
A. Maxfield, Southampton,	1821
C. S. Westcott, Ringwood,	1822
H. Sainsbury, Romsey,	1823
John Covey, Alresford,	1823
H. C. Westlake, Andover,	1824
E. J. Warrey, Lyndhurst,	1825
W. Curtis, Jun., Alton,	1825
R. Ware, Southampton,	1826
R. S. Fowler, Southampton,	1827
J. Slight, Portsmouth,	1827
R. Warwick, Redbridge,	1827
Edward Covey, Basingstoke,	1827
H. Ryder, Clanville, Andover,	1827
C. Jones, Alton,	1827
G. B. Corfe, Southampton	1828
H. Phene, Ryde,	1828
C. M. Burnett, Alton,	1828
G. Nunn, Lyndhurst,	1828
J. Pursell, Winchester,	1828
Edward Andrews, Titchfield,	1829
J. Bullar, Southampton,	1830
R. W. Bloxam, Ryde,	1830
F. R. Smith, Hythe,	1830
J. Bayley, Odiham,	1830
G. B. Hellard, Portsmouth,	1831
W. Kerr Loveless, Stockbridge,	1831
Henry Dayman, Millbrook,	1832
W. Cass, Cowes,	1833
L. O. Fox, Broughton, Stockbridge,	1833
W. Bullar, Southampton,	1833
George Miller, Emsworth,	1833
H. Waterworth, Newport,	1833
H. Wooldridge, Southampton,	1834
F. J. Burgess, Bishop's Waltham,	1834
R. W. Smith, Winchester,	1834
Wm. Barnard, Farnham,	1835
G. T. George, Southampton,	1835
E. P. Davies, Christchurch,	1836
T. B. Salter, Ryde,	1836
G. B. List, Southampton,	1836
C. H. Scott, Southsea,	1837
Augustus Slight, R.N., Portsmouth,	1837
John Wiblin, Southampton,	1837
John Baker, Shirley,	1838
Edward Chinery, Lymington,	1838