DR. O'SHAUGHNESSY ON THE BLOOD IN
THE CHOLERA.

—
To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have just seen in *THE LANCET* of the 9th February, a paper by Dr. Wright, of Stockton-upon-Tees, in which essay that gentleman includes me in the number of persons who hold that the malignant cholera depends on a *primary* alteration of the blood.

Had Dr. Wright read the "report" in which I published the results of my experiments, he would not have charged me with such absurd and untenable notions. If he will have the goodness to refer to pages 47, 48, 51, and 52, of the report in question, he will see that I have always inferred from my experiments that the alterations in the blood were *secondary effects* of the original and *unknown* cause of the disease. Since the publication of that report I have, as many of my friends are aware, repeated my experiments on the most extensive scale. The results thus obtained fully confirm the conclusions first arrived at, and as fully confute the fancies in which some ingenious writers have recently indulged on this interesting subject. I am, Sir, your obedient servant.

W. B. O'SHAUGHNESSY, M.D.
Paris, 17, Rue du Colombier,
Feb. 17th, 1833.

FINSBURY ELECTION.

LETTER FROM THE RETURNING OFFICER.

—
To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Your article in *THE LANCET* for Saturday, Feb. 9th, headed "Exposures* at the Finsbury Election," has been brought under my notice, and demands an explanation. I therefore call upon you, in justice to me, to insert in your next Number this letter, with which I should not have troubled you, if you had not omitted as "unnecessary" my correspondence with Mr. Rogers, which would have explained and fully justified my conduct.

By the Reform Act, the expense of erecting booths, and the sums paid to deputy returning-officers and poll-clerks, are directed to be paid by the candidates equally—the expense of each booth not exceeding 25*l.*, unless the booths are erected by contract with the candidates.

In order to ascertain the wishes of the candidates, and with a view to consult the convenience of the electors, I convened a meeting of the candidates prior to the election, at which all of them but yourself were present. The tenders of different builders for erecting five booths and a nomination hustings, with suitable accommodation for the candidates and their agents, were produced, and I was authorised to accept that of Mr. Cubit; and, it being considered that one poll-clerk for each compartment

(only one being mentioned in the Reform Act) would not be sufficient, the candidates requested me to appoint two poll-clerks for each compartment. It was also considered that there were many unavoidable expenses, which, though not provided for by the Reform Act, ought to be paid by the candidates.

On the day after this meeting, I explained to you and one of your committee (I believe Mr. Rogers) the arrangements of the previous evening, and proceeded to carry those arrangements into effect, in doing which I incurred the expenses specified in the first bill copied into your Journal, the whole of which have been actually paid.

Having received, in reply to my application to Mr. Rogers for one-fifth of those expenses, a letter intimating that I might expect to receive such a sum only as your committee were *legally* bound to pay, I made out the second bill, in which it will be seen that the booths are charged at 25*l.* each. I also included in it some of the general expenses before alluded to, in consequence of an opinion given by the Solicitor-General in the case of another borough.

After this second account had been sent to Mr. Rogers, that gentleman called on me, and made a formal tender of 37*l.* 12*s.*, in the presence of a witness whom he brought with him. This sum is about one-fifth of the items for booths and deputies, and eighteen poll-clerks. When I perceived what kind of treatment I had to expect from your committee, and that they objected to pay even for the extra number of poll-clerks who had been engaged solely for the accommodation of the electors, I felt anxious to put an end to all further communication with your committee, and accepted the sum tendered, contenting myself with producing to Mr. Rogers the vouchers for several of the items included in my first bill, and offering to produce vouchers for the remainder.

I have only to add, that the office of returning officer is a compulsory one, without fee or emolument attached to it, and that the execution of its duties has required and received from me a great sacrifice of time; but I have the conscious satisfaction of knowing that, to the best of my ability, I have discharged the duties of the office; and I care not for the feeling of exultation which Mr. Rogers appears to entertain, on account of his having obliged me to accept a sum so much less than your proportion of the amount which I have actually expended. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN SATCHELL.

St. Thomas Apostle, Feb. 14, 1833.

To Thomas Wakley, Esq.

P.S. I have omitted to mention, that Mr. Robinson's letter to you was written without my concurrence or knowledge.

. Surely Mr. SATCHELL, as a lawyer, ought to know that Mr. ROGERS, as a treasurer, and the gentlemen of the committee, acting as they were for others, were bound, both by honour and prudence, to restrict all their arrangements to the limits prescribed by the Act. Had they paid more than could be legally demanded, how could those gentlemen have rendered a satisfactory account to the subscribers? Besides, they acted under the opinion of counsel, and we consider that Mr. ROGERS has rendered an immense service to the community by showing at how small a sum more than 200 independent voters may be polled at a contested election—in a district, too, containing 330,000 inhabitants. Moreover, we know that Mr. TEMPLE, one of the candidates, on hearing of the final settlement of the account between Mr. ROGERS and Mr. SATCHELL, stated that he should immediately apply to the returning officer for the refunding of the money which he had paid beyond the sum that could be legally demanded.

* This word was a misprint in the head-line of one of the pages, where, only, it occurred. It was written "EXPENSES," and the blunder was overlooked in the proof.—ED. L.