

gives only half a representative to Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Glasgow, and St. Andrews respectively; that is to say, one to Edinburgh and Aberdeen, and one to Glasgow and St. Andrews. The graduates of each of these universities are to be numbered in thousands, and yet two of the universities have to combine to elect one representative in the Council. This is a monstrous inequality, and should be rectified in the present Act. The inequality is only less indefensible when the case of the other English universities is compared with that of the Scotch. Either Edinburgh and the other Scotch universities should have separate representatives, or the principle of making one man represent two similar bodies should be applied all through. I am glad this principle found a place, though I think a very wrong place, in the Act of 1858.

Let me urge, secondly, in support of this plan, that it is consistent with the main principle of the Bill of 1870, which is to assert the essential unity of medicine as including every part of the healing art. If it is possible and well that two universities, with all their faculties and their various medical degrees, should be represented by one man—and no one will say that the universities which have been so represented in accordance with the Act of 1858 have been badly represented—then it is possible to combine the representation of corporations, especially if, as this Bill suggests, the great healing art is one and indivisible—one faculty.

Thirdly. I will only assign one other reason in support of what I suggest—namely, that, while enabling a direct representation, it will reduce rather than add to the numbers of the Council, and so reduce the cost, which Mr. Lowe and all who have considered the matter think very great, and which is now seriously exceeding the income.

There can be no doubt, Sir, that the predominant representation of the corporations in the Council is a weakness in that body, and that, but for this, we should never have heard of the humiliating proposal of this Bill to bring the whole Council, and all its highest work, under the check of a Government department. I hope my suggestion may find favour with the profession, and an advocate, if not in the House of Lords, then in the House of Commons.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

INDEX.

THE OPERATION OF EXTIRPATION OF THE COCCYX.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the *American Journal of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children*, Dr. Nott claims to have been the first to extirpate the bones of the coccyx for the cure of coccydynia. The statement has been largely copied in this country and on the Continent. I take the liberty of correcting the misstatement in your widely circulated columns.

It is more than eight years since I assisted Sir James Simpson to extirpate the bones of the coccyx in a case of inveterate coccydynia, for which repeated subcutaneous incisions had been made. It was followed by complete relief, and I had the opportunity, four years after the operation, of examining the parts after the death of the patient. I have since performed the operation myself, but not with complete success.

Dr. Nott's operation in his case is open to serious criticism, as being most unnecessarily severe. There are but few cases of coccydynia which resist the subcutaneous incision, and he confesses that he has never yet tried it.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

May 5th, 1870.

LAWSON TAIT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As a member of the original Graduates' Committee, I cannot but remember at this period, when the new buildings of the University of London are to be inaugurated by Her Majesty Queen Victoria, that it is to an article of THE LANCET we owe the movement which led to the Graduates' Committee, the new Charters, the admission of graduates to the Senate, the existence of Convocation, and, in fact, the University as it now stands. If you turn to

THE LANCET of March 6th, 1847, you will find the article to which I refer. It sounded as a tocsin to the graduates of that day. Indeed, you could not do better than reprint the article at the present time. It will be seen to be almost prophetic as to the destinies of the University, and show how large a debt of gratitude we owe to the leading medical journal.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A MEMBER OF THE GRADUATES' COMMITTEE.

London, May 9th, 1870.

PARIS.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

REOPENING OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.

ON Monday last the doors of the School of Medicine were thrown open to the students after a recess of about three weeks, brought on by the events which I related in preceding letters. Some anxiety was felt lest the violent scenes of the beginning of April might again take place, and this apprehension was entertained not only by the authorities, who would have been much embarrassed, but by such of the students as are verging on the end of their studies, and could not undergo any fresh postponement without much inconvenience.

Happily, these fears turned out to be vain. The attitude of the students was quite calm and decorous, and no manifestations took place even at M. Tardieu's lecture. A very proper measure had been adopted in connexion with this course. The Dean had delivered special cards to such of the students only as had entered their fourth year's studies, which include forensic medicine, and only about three hundred alumni therefore attended M. Tardieu's lecture. Among these there were about half-a-dozen perturbators, who, beholding the decided and sympathetic attitude of the vast majority of the assembly, soon disappeared, after having protested and uttered various cries of disapprobation.

M. Tardieu then warmly thanked the audience for the sympathy which they had manifested in his favour, and having once more justified his professional conduct, resumed his course at the point at which it had been left before the affair of Tours, and concluded his lecture amidst general applause.

ELECTION TO THE CHAIR OF GENERAL PATHOLOGY AT THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.

The election took place a few days ago, the candidates being only two in number—M. Chauffard and M. Potain, both physicians to the Necker Hospital, and men of considerable distinction. M. Chauffard, who has written a treatise on General Pathology, has, so to say, established a claim to the vacant chair, and this probably served in some measure to secure his election, as M. Potain's views and doctrines represent more faithfully the teaching of the Paris faculty, and are more acceptable to its professors. The contest was a close one, M. Chauffard coming in first with fourteen votes, and M. Potain second with thirteen; there was one blank vote.

GENERAL MEETING OF THE FRENCH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

You must not expect, under this heading, to receive any amount of scientific or professional information to be compared with what is presented at the meeting of the British Medical Association. The French Medical Association, though it has a large number of adherents, and enjoys much influence, is comparatively speaking but a friendly society of medical men formed to assist unfortunate members of the profession or their families. It concerns itself with questions of medical ethics, it is true, where some of its members are concerned; but it has nothing to do with scientific debate or research like our own association, and neglects all questions of medical reform, sanitary advancement, &c. &c.

Taking it as it exists, it undoubtedly does much good. At its last general meeting on Sunday, M. Amédée Latour, the spirited and indefatigable secretary of this institution, added the most attractive feature to the *séance* by delivering a long and very eloquent discourse, in which he set forth the value of the Association, and the good work