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 Scotch 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 representation, it will reduce rather than add to the predominance of the Scotch, and will, in the long run, rectify the misstatement in your widely circulated columns.

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 invertebrate coccydynia, for which repeated subcutaneous injections 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 is in open to serious criticism, as being most unnecessarily severe. There are but few cases of coccydynia which resist the subcutaneous injection, and he confuses that he has never yet tried it. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

LAWSON TAUTT.
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SIR,—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,