

Resolved,—That a subscription be entered into to defray expenses.

After a vote of thanks to the Chairman for presiding, the proceedings terminated.

At a general meeting of the students of the London Hospital, held on Monday,—Dr. Andrew Clark in the chair,—resolutions were agreed to in reference to the present condition of the assistant-surgeons of the navy. The first resolution was to the effect that their position was derogatory to the best interests of the service; and the second suggested to the Admiralty, that it should follow the example set by the India Board in the distribution of their medical appointments. The third resolution was, that the meeting viewed with alarm the present policy of the Admiralty in employing unqualified men as dressers in the Baltic fleet—thus following the example already set by the sister service in the case of the Scutari dressers, who are now performing the duties of assistant-surgeons.

On Tuesday a numerously attended meeting was held by the principal medical students of King's College, London,—Mr. Price in the chair,—to take into consideration the present Admiralty regulations regarding assistant-surgeons serving in her Majesty's navy. Mr. A. B. Duffin was appointed secretary.

Correspondence.

“Audi alteram partem.”

MEDICAL ETIQUETTE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I shall be obliged by the insertion of the enclosed correspondence in the columns of THE LANCET. I regret that, owing to my having kept the rough draught only of my first letter to Mr. Hatton, I am unable to supply you with a verbatim copy of the same; any differences, however, that occur will neither affect the accuracy of the facts, nor the spirit in which they are related.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Manchester, Feb. 15th, 1855.

JOHN AIKENHEAD, M.D.

Manchester, Feb. 10th, 1855.

DEAR SIR,—I learn from Dr. — that you have expressed yourself as aggrieved at my having been in attendance on a patient of yours. The circumstances are these:—At about one o'clock A.M. yesterday, I was summoned from my bed to attend an infant of a Mr. B— in Stretford-road. On our way thither in the coach, Mr. B—'s brother informed me that my patient was the child of Mrs. B—, who had unfortunately just died under your care; that Mr. T—* had been sent for, but was not at home; that his brother, the father of the child, was staying at Old Trafford, and that they had been unwilling to awaken him; and that I had then, at the suggestion of the nurse, been called in. On arriving at the house, this account was confirmed by the nurse, with the addition that Mr. G—† had been summoned before Mr. T—, but was not within. I learnt, moreover, that Mr. T— had been engaged for Mrs. B—'s accouchement, but that, being from home at the time, your services had been requested. Connecting this information with the unhappy result of your attendance on Mrs. B—, I was not surprised that you had not been sent for on this occasion, being from experience aware of the fact that patients are too apt to visit on their medical attendants the faults or misfortunes of others. With regard to the second occasion of my seeing the child, I was distinctly requested by both Mr. B—'s brother and the nurse to repeat my visit in the morning. To say that I was called in “on the emergency,” as Mr. B— does in a note I have received from him, and as you yourself are reported to have stated, is a preposterous absurdity. Mr. G— is summoned; when he cannot be found, Mr. T— is sent for; he not being at home, I am then called in—I, who live within two minutes' drive of your own house, (a mile and a half from Mr. B—'s,) and to reach whom they must have passed the residences of at least a dozen medical men. Had you possessed the same opportunities as I,

* Mr. T—, an eminent surgeon in Manchester, whose residence is nearly a mile in an opposite direction to Dr. Aikenhead's.

† Mr. G—, a medical practitioner, living in the neighbourhood of Mr. B—'s house.

from my official connexion with the Medico-Ethical Association, have had, of witnessing the ill-feeling that so commonly arises between medical men from their placing confidence in the statements of their patients, you would have been more cautious in the expression of your dissatisfaction than you have been in the present instance.

I remain, dear Sir, your obedient servant,

J. Hatton, Esq.

JOHN AIKENHEAD.

MR. HATTON presents his compliments to Dr. Aikenhead, and begs to acknowledge the receipt of his letter of yesterday. Mr. Hatton is sorry the Doctor should have given himself the trouble to write so elaborate an epistle, as he had previously been fully informed of the facts of the case.

373, Oxford-street, Feb. 11th, 1855.

Manchester, Feb. 12th, 1855.

SIR,—It is my intention to publish in the medical journals the correspondence which has passed between us. Should I hear nothing further from you on the subject of my former communication within a day or two, I shall regard this present note as closing the series.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. Hatton, Esq.

JOHN AIKENHEAD.

Didsbury, Feb. 27th, 1855.

DEAR AIKENHEAD,—I spent last evening with Mr. Hatton at a friend's house, and in the course of a conversation respecting your dispute with him, Mr. Hatton remarked that he should be quite willing to refer the case to any professional friend. I was not requested to make this communication to you, but considering your official connexion with the Medico-Ethical Association, I should recommend you to make the proposal to arbitrate, and in doing this you are at liberty to use my name.

Believe me, yours truly,

Dr. Aikenhead.

R. ALLEN.

Manchester, March 1st, 1855.

SIR,—Mr. Allen informed me last night that recently you have expressed your willingness to refer the question in dispute between us to arbitration. I also acquiesce in the proposal, and would suggest that each of us select a medical friend, and that the two friends choose a third; their decision to be final.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. Hatton, Esq.

JOHN AIKENHEAD.

Manchester, March 2nd, 1855.

SIR,—I am rather surprised at the receipt of your letter of yesterday, as the “series” was closed in accordance with your own suggestion.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. Aikenhead, M.D.

JOHN HATTON.

THE BROMPTON HOSPITAL AND ITS REGULATIONS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Modern experience shows that a statement of a grievance or injustice through the public press leads to a remedy. Thus encouraged, I would crave permission to mention a case of special hardship, which claims and must receive relief. An advertisement has been issued by the Brompton Hospital committee for two assistant-physicians, and informing candidates that “full particulars, with printed instructions,” may be obtained at the hospital.

Prompted by an earnest desire to become connected with an institution affording special opportunities for pursuing a study to which I have already devoted much attention, I obtained these instructions, and it is to one of them I beg your especial attention. It is to the effect, that “if any candidate shall, directly or indirectly, canvass before he has been declared eligible, he shall be disqualified for the appointment.” It is needless to say that, believing the committee had framed this regulation in all sincerity, and with an intention thus to secure a fair field of competition for all, I resolved on becoming a candidate. I had scarcely, however, arrived at this conclusion, when I found, to my dismay, and shall I add disgust, that a canvass, not only “indirect,” but “direct,” had been already carried on even before the vacancies had occurred—in fact, I found that a large number of the votes of the committee had been asked for and obtained by more than one candidate. It