

poorest may, at some period of the day, avail themselves of it. I shall watch the results with much interest, and hope to record them on some future occasion.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
Kenilworth, Jan. 1861. G. F. BODINGTON, M.R.C.S.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR.—As a student of hygiene, and a constant subscriber to THE LANCET, I may be allowed to suggest the following query to the patrons of the Turkish bath. Must we not, as students of nature, as physicians, allow, that the best daily sudorific bath may be obtained by vigorous exercise in the fresh air?—the most perfect cleanliness and tone of body by the daily use of the cold sponge bath, with soap, and friction with coarse rough towels, every morning? Is not this English bath far preferable to the Turkish one in every point of view?

Clay next the Sea, Norfolk, Jan. 1861. WALTER SUMPTER, M.D.

SURGICAL OPERATIONS AT ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR.—Some of your readers may feel interested in knowing the number and the nature of the registered operations performed at St. Bartholomew's Hospital by the different members of the surgical staff during the past year, 1860.

I do not attempt to give an account of the relative mortality, because that would take me into matters which, to be useful, would convert the present communication into a lengthened essay. I may say, however, that the results have been generally favourable. The hospital has been remarkably free from any contagious disorder or morbid influence, affecting the recovery of the patients.

The total number of operations amounts to 340, being an excess of 80 over the preceding year of 1859.

There have been 44 operations for strangulated hernia—namely, 22 upon males, 21 upon females, and 1 on a male infant, aged thirteen months. One female suffered from strangulated inguinal hernia. One man, the subject of strangulated femoral hernia, was seventy-nine years of age; he died of bronchitis, after having completely recovered from the effects of the rupture.

Amputations have been as follows:—Of the thigh, 13; of the leg and foot, 10; of the arm, 7; of the forearm, 1; of the hand, wholly or in greater part, 10. The list includes operations both from disease and accident. In one case amputation was performed at the knee-joint; in another at the shoulder-joint. Both cases did well. There have been 4 cases of amputation of the penis for malignant disease.

The removal of tumours of serious nature, of portions of the jaw, tongue, of the breast, &c., amount to 37; the female breast still presenting its unhappy prominence of number—namely, 17.

The following arteries have been tied:—Common carotid, subclavian, radial and ulnar, external iliac, femoral. In one case an incision was made through the pectoral muscle to the axillary artery to let out a quantity of clotted blood; but the hæmorrhage ceased upon the exposure of the parts.

The chest has been punctured for empyema 4 times.

The excision of joints does not find much favour at St. Bartholomew's. It has been practised only once, and that in the elbow.

Lithotrity has been performed 29 times; but this includes the operation repeated in the same patient. Lithotomy has been performed 10 times.

Of minor operations—i. e., cataract, the perineal section, epulis, artificial anus, dislocations, amputations of fingers, excision of fatty tumours, hydrocele, &c., the number amounts to between 150 and 160. The subcutaneous division of tendons for various deformities has been performed 23 times.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
January, 1861. HOLMES COOTE, F.R.C.S.

THE QUEEN'S HOSPITAL, BIRMINGHAM.—The munificent donation of £1000 has been presented by Joseph Guest, Esq., per Mr. Sands Cox, in aid of this hospital, on the condition "that there be given to the incumbent of St. Edmund's Church, Dudley, in his name, six in-patient tickets for ever after his decease." Congregational collections at the churches and chapels to the amount of £3433 6s. 4d. have been paid over to the treasurer of the charity.—It has been determined to appoint a dental and an ophthalmic surgeon to the hospital.

MEDICAL TRIALS.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, WESTMINSTER, JAN. 21ST.

(Sitting in Banco before Mr. Justice WIGHTMAN,
Mr. Justice CROMPTON, and Mr. Justice HILL.)

THE QUEEN v. THE REGISTRAR OF THE MEDICAL COUNCIL.

THIS was a rule calling upon the Registrar of the General Medical Council for England to show cause why a *mandamus* should not issue, commanding them to restore the name of the prosecutor, Mr. Organ, to the Register, from which it had been erased by order of the Council.

It appeared that under the new Medical Act (the 21st and 22nd of Victoria, cap. 90) all persons having certain qualifications were entitled to have their names entered on the Register; and by the 46th section a power was given to the Medical Council of dispensing with those general regulations in favour of gentlemen in the employ of the army and navy, or of the public service. The prosecutor, Organ, had petitioned the Council under this section, and represented himself as having been educated in a foreign university, where he had obtained a diploma; and also as being in the public service, as medical officer and vaccinator to certain parishes in Yorkshire. The Medical Council decided to dispense with the general regulations of the Act in his favour, as being a person employed in the "public service," and his name was accordingly entered on the Register. Objections were subsequently made to his name continuing on the Register, upon the ground, first, that he had obtained the privilege by fraud; and, secondly, that he had also been guilty of infamous conduct in a professional respect, which by the 26th and 29th sections of the Act were made grounds for causing a name to be erased from the Register. The Medical Council, being satisfied that his name ought to be erased, upon these grounds ordered it to be erased; but they did so without giving him notice of their intention, and affording him an opportunity of appearing before them to show cause to the contrary. He accordingly applied to this Court, and obtained a *mandamus* to be restored, and that writ being obeyed by the Council, they gave him a formal notice that it was proposed to erase his name from the Register, and called upon him to appear and show cause to the contrary. The prosecutor accordingly attended with his solicitor, and begged to be heard by counsel, but as the Council refused this application, he declined to take part in the proceedings, though he continued present during the whole of the inquiry. One part of the charge made against him was that he had attempted to procure a medical degree at Edinburgh by sending someone to personate himself and undergo the examination in his stead. This trick, however, it was stated, did not succeed, as the person sent to personate the prosecutor was plucked on the examination. In the result the Council came to the conclusion that the entry was "fraudulently made," and that the prosecutor had been guilty of "infamous conduct in a professional respect," and ordered his name to be erased from the Register. He then again applied to this Court, and obtained a rule for a *mandamus* to be restored, upon the ground that the Medical Council had no power, either under the 26th or 29th sections, to order any name once registered under the 46th section to be erased for anything done prior to the registration. No question was now raised as to the propriety of the erasure, but only as to the jurisdiction of the Council to order it.

Mr. M. SMITH, Q.G., and Mr. SLEIGH showed cause against the rule, on the part of the Medical Council, and contended that the Council had power both under the 26th and 29th sections.

Mr. Serjeant HAYES supported the rule, and contended that neither of the two sections applied to this case, and that it could never have been intended by the 29th section that the Council should have the power of inquiring into the whole of a man's life prior to the registration.

Mr. Justice CROMPTON said he was of opinion that the rule should be discharged. If the facts were in dispute the general rule was for the Court to make the rule absolute, and send the case down to have the facts tried by a jury. But the present was not a case of that sort, for the prosecutor had had an opportunity of disputing the facts, but had not availed himself of it. If the Council had power to adjudicate, this Court would not interfere, unless there was no evidence. Was the case, then, within the 26th section, which enacted that "No qualification shall be entered on the Register, either on the first registration or by way of addition to a registered name, unless the Registrar be satisfied by the proper evidence that the person claim-