

Oriental, the Saracen, Turk, and Tartar, down to those of modern times, as the German, Spanish, French, Netherlands, Swiss, Swedish, Austrian, Prussian, Russian, British, English, Scotch-lowland, Scotch-highland, Irish, and North American. The several subjects are treated in a manner at once glorious to the profession of arms and to the author. Well might Sir JOHN MOORE, the best of modern judges, write—

“MY DEAR JACKSON,—I have perused your military book, with which I am much delighted. There are none of us, even the most experienced, who may not derive instruction from it, and I only regret that you, who possess a soldier's mind, had not been a soldier by profession.”

It is sufficiently evident, throughout his entire work, that JACKSON never wrote without the portrait of man in his hand, to use the fine expression of CABANIS. The chapters on Military Training, Intellectual and Moral Motives of Military Action, Economy and Discipline, Military Arrangement for Colonial Possessions, &c., are among the finest things in military literature.

On the whole, we may say with truth, that in this work will be found more knowledge of human nature and of military affairs; more of the science of pure observation; and more of the practical results to be derived from such rare acquirements, and from a varied knowledge of languages, ancient and modern; than has ever been exhibited within the same compass. It may be affirmed, indeed, that history makes no mention of a man so gifted for the purpose he has undertaken.

Finally, we say that JACKSON wrote for all countries and climates—for all ages. Here are principles ready prepared for practical application by princes, statesmen, and commanders, together with a vast fund of information and instruction to all military officers who would be well informed in their profession. By the medical officers of the army, whom the author “considers competent to judge his work, “from their experience of war, and their acquaintance with “the powers of the human constitution,” his legacy should be cherished, and handed down from generation to generation as an heir-loom. Such a man is an honour to the profession at large; he should be the glory of military surgeons.

TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON GRADUATES' COMMITTEE.

GENTLEMEN,—We are induced to adopt this mode of addressing ourselves to you, in reference to our relations with the College of Physicians, notwithstanding the opportunity we had of expressing our opinions on this subject, in the interview which took place between us not long since at the graduates committee room. We disclaim any intention to put ourselves in opposition to you. On the contrary, we feel bound to record, in common with, we believe, all the University of London graduates, our sincere thanks to you for your exertions in our behalf; and more especially to those gentlemen who first originated this movement: feeling assured, that however we may differ in some minor points of detail, too much praise cannot be paid to you for having first put the claims of graduates in a proper light before the profession. We wish it to be clearly understood, moreover, that we do not mean to enter at all into the more extended subject of medical reform. We seek to restrict ourselves entirely to our mutual relations with the College of Physicians, and, with all due deference to you, we are desirous to make public our views, for the consideration of our brother-graduates, in the hope that they may agree with us in urging you at once to enter into direct communication with the college, to the end that all differences in the way may be amicably adjusted as soon as possible.

We are not ignorant that in the first proposed draft for a new charter of the College of Physicians, the existence of our university was studiously kept out of sight, nor are we

surprised that so unfair a policy should have induced the senate and committee of graduates of the University of London, to vindicate their privileges and position in any other way than by a direct communication with the college. We feel, therefore, grateful to the senate, for having responded energetically to this unjust aggression, and for having put in a caveat against this new charter. Now, however, that, in a second draft, these unfavourable clauses have been expunged, and the University of London degrees distinctly recognised, and that, from our own communications with the government, it scarcely admits of doubt that the London graduates will eventually be placed on the same footing precisely as those of Oxford and Cambridge, we think the time has arrived, when the committee may take the first step, by way of deputation, or otherwise, towards opening an immediate communication with that body, without danger of compromising those professional interests you now seek to secure, by carrying on a jealous, watchful, but sadly retarding inquiry into every movement, even when concurrent with your views.

The hitherto partial and vacillating policy pursued by the College of Physicians should not shut our eyes to the importance of that, or a similar institution. Hampered as the college is, by antiquated rights and powers, it is not perhaps surprising that an exclusive and partial charter should have been drawn out in the first instance; and it must be admitted that the council of that college, by consenting to modify their charter, and by making it much more liberal in its enactments, did, as it were, acknowledge their former error.

But now we have, moreover, good reason to believe, that the College of Physicians is become still more liberal in its intentions, and that it is, in particular, very well disposed towards the graduates of the University of London. Of this we feel almost a positive certainty, not only from the wording of the charter, and from much subsequent correspondence published on this subject in the medical periodicals, but also from what we may term semi-official conversations, which have taken place from time to time, between some of the members of the council of the college, and some of our under graduates. We have reason to believe that the college would be most willing to admit our graduates at once into their body, under some peculiar and favourable arrangement, but that the caveat put in by the University prevents the college from obtaining the charter, Sir George Grey having distinctly refused to grant it, till such time as all parties interested in the question have agreed as to its provisions. So far as we know at present, the University of London is the only public body in the United Kingdom which opposes the college. Oxford and Cambridge may have opposed the first proposed draft, but are satisfied with the second, and not one of the English universities has put in and maintained a caveat, except the University of London.

From all we can learn concerning the history of the foundation of the University of London, the Government is bound by a moral obligation to concede to us the same rights as Oxford and Cambridge, and that the College of Physicians will never obtain a charter so long as any of its clauses militate against, or invalidate, any of our rights and privileges; and depending on the existence of a good feeling on the part of the college towards our medical graduates, we think you may fairly put yourselves in communication with the College of Physicians. The following are some of the points for which, we believe, we should contend and to which we would, with all due deference, draw your attention:—

1st. We do not think the college should have the right to confer with its licence the degree of M.D. To give an academic title has always been the peculiar privilege of an university. The college, constituted in no way as an university, cannot thus fairly claim this privilege, the more so as it would be unjust towards those gentlemen, who, having gone through a regular and expensive university education, would yet find themselves no better circumstanced than those who had not.

2ndly. By the present proposed charter, all persons aged twenty-six years, who shall have taken out the degree of M.D. at least three months prior to the obtaining of the charter of the college, shall have the right, for one year, to claim admission in the college on payment of a reduced fee, and without additional examination. We are of opinion that this should be a permanent law, and extend to all future graduates of English universities.

But the college demurs to this amendment, and proposes to stand by the restriction of this privilege to twelve months only subsequently to the date of its charter. We cannot too strongly protest against this year of grace, as it is called. It is a condition discreditable to any who might take advantage of it.

For, first, amongst our own graduates, there are many desirous to practise as physicians, and who, from peculiar circumstances, would not be able, under the restrictions imposed, to do so within the prescribed period. They feel, therefore, that it would be unfair towards themselves.

2ndly. It should be remembered, after all, that those candidates for the licence who availed themselves of this year of grace, would to a certainty be marked men—year-of-grace men, received on an emergency without that test of qualification which their brethren had to undergo before and after them.

3rdly. There are those licentiates of the college (whether members of an university or not) who have already paid a heavy fee, and passed an additional examination; and they also would feel themselves aggrieved, if other graduates were admitted under terms more favourable than they were. Thus, under whatever aspect we look at this year of grace, it suggests to our minds a source of much useless and angry controversy.

To obviate these difficulties, if the fee were reduced, we should feel it to be much more in accordance with our sentiments to submit all to an examination before the college, that examination being restricted to subjects purely practical, and apart from any vexatious and unnecessary reference to minor elementary matter. Here again, however, we find that such a course is very distasteful to many.

First. It is contended, that though the examination to which graduates will have to submit will be nominally practical, it may not be so in reality. The same examiners may not be in office in future years, or a new version may be given to the term practical; and that we have no right to conclude any arrangement by which future graduates may be injuriously affected.

Secondly. It is further contended, that having once passed a fair, practical, and sufficient examination, it is not consistent with the dignity of our university to submit to another examination; the more so as most of our examiners are also fellows of the College of Physicians too, and having been examiners of that College, they are consequently a sufficient guarantee for our qualifications: and even if those were inclined to submit to this examination who purposed to practise in London, our provincial graduates would be unjustly dragged before the College of Physicians. This difficulty can only be got over by adopting some method to prevent the examination from varying.

In spite of all this, we cannot refrain from repudiating all idea of a year or any other period of grace; and supposing the regulation of this examination be found impracticable, let the basis of our negotiations be, that the College of Physicians shall allow our medical graduates, on presenting their degrees, and on payment of a fixed and reduced fee, to be admitted *ipso facto* licentiates of the college.

We are of opinion that this might be done, as we shall presently show, with advantage to the College of Physicians, at once, and that the college might anticipate the introduction of a clause to this effect in their new charter, by passing a by-law in which this right should be acknowledged. The power to do this evidently rests with the college; for if they could, in former times, pass a by-law, by which a body of extra-licentiates was made, under peculiar regulations, it appears to us, that another by-law might now be framed, by which the University of London graduates should be at once admitted licentiates, provided the real provisions on that head, to be hereafter confirmed in the new charter, could be settled by the sort of negotiation we are so anxious to see set on foot.

We are quite aware that we are asking of the college a great concession; but if the line of argument above followed be correct, we can be satisfied with nothing less; and in return, we should show ourselves disposed to make the college a concession of equal importance.

We are all ready to admit that a College of Physicians which should extend its influence over all England is a very desirable institution. We ourselves feel it is one of paramount importance, and for this reason—that the University of London does not pretend to any jurisdiction over, and cannot give any protection whatsoever to, its medical graduates; and hence arises the necessity of some corporate body which should have the power to punish, on the one hand, those of its licentiates who may be guilty of misdemeanors, and encourage and maintain, on the other, the dignity and importance of the physician. Our own graduates, in common with all other physicians, must see the propriety of recognising some ruling power, and we can imagine nothing better than the College of Physicians, so soon as the new measures are properly carried out; we are inclined to presume the council of the college would be willing to admit

us under the restrictions before laid down, if it were made compulsory on all our medical graduates, wishing to practise as physicians in England, to belong to the College of Physicians in London.

The college can scarcely be blind to the advantages that would accrue to it by such an arrangement. Its funds and emoluments, and its influence, would thereby be much augmented; whereas, if the new charter, as it now stands, be obtained, and if, in common with Oxford and Cambridge, we are to retain the power to license our graduates to practise as physicians in England, beyond the sixth milestone, the very reverse would occur. All persons desirous of practising as physicians in the provinces would no longer take their licence at the College of Physicians, but at the University of London. The severity of the examination of the university would ensure them an equally high consideration, and the expense would be less. Thus the number of candidates for the licence of the college would be then, as now, few and far between; its funds might still be found wanting; and its inability to protect its licentiates from unlicensed physicians, from the same cause, would remain, tending still further to diminish the number of candidates for its licence.

By an amicable adjustment, therefore, of the claims of the University of London and the College, are we not right in believing that the best interests of both would be consulted?

Such, then, gentlemen, are the opinions which we are so anxious to make known to you, in order that a deputation may be at once appointed to hold a conference with the College of Physicians; and in the event of our demands being agreed to, we trust you will request the senate of the university to withdraw forthwith the caveat, so that our medical graduates may at once obtain those privileges which their acquirements justly entitle them to hold. We cannot too strongly impress upon you the necessity of activity in your operations, lest so good an opportunity to promote the interests of your medical graduates should be lost. Tardiness in such matters can only be injurious. The parliamentary session is drawing to a close. The government of the university is, doubtless, full of interest to the medical graduates, but, in point of time, comparatively unimportant, when considered in contrast with their social position in the profession. We therefore venture to submit our views for your consideration, in the hope they may meet with your support, and finally lead to some more tangible benefit to the medical graduates in general of the university.

We have the honour to be your obedient servants,
C. H. F. ROUTH, M.D.
HENRY SAVAGE, M.D.
R. D. PYPHER, M.D.

Correspondence.

“Audi alteram partem.”

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE ON THE POOR.—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. RAYNER, OF UXBRIDGE, AND THE ETON BOARD OF GUARDIANS AND POOR-LAW BOARD.

(COPY.)

To the Poor-Law Commissioners of England and Wales.

Uxbridge, Sept. 23, 1848.

GENTLEMEN,—I have the honour to submit to your notice the enclosed bill and letter, received from the relieving officer of the Eton Union, by which it appears the board of guardians utterly repudiate the articles 182 and 183 of the Medical Order, on the ground that the orders were given several days after the confinement of the persons to whom the bill refers, and particularly that, in the case of Betsy Long, the board had paid the midwife for her attendance.

It has hitherto been my practice, on receiving intimation of my services being required, to visit the patient without an order, trusting to obtain the order on the next visit of relieving officer at the village, in which case, the persons requiring my assistance are saved much trouble and toil in sending several miles to the relieving officer for it.

It appears, by the relieving officer's letter, in consequence of this arrangement, the orders not being obtained until after my assistance is given, and after the confinement, (when puerperal diseases commence,) that the cases then become simply cases of “illness,” and under my contract as medical officer of the district, which, to my mind, is a denial of justice, and an evasion of the medical order altogether.

Conceiving that an unfair advantage is thus taken of the