closes the Report. Space has precluded us from going beyond the mere outlines of this highly interesting Report, but we shall hope to recur to some of its more striking details at an early date.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

TREATMENT OF EXTERNAL ANEURISM.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you permit me to correct two lines in your report of the meeting of the Medico-Chirurgical Society on the 9th inst.? I am therein stated to have said that "it was not necessary to resort to any means whatever to cure external aneurism: that I cured it in twelve days by low diet."

The impossibility of any surgeon making such a statement must be evident to your readers; but still I think it better to draw attention to the fact, as it might be quoted elsewhere. I have never seen but the one case of external aneurism—viz., that which I then brought forward—cured by position alone, but I believe that in similar instances, where the aneurism is small and entire, and the heart's action feeble, consolidation may take place as readily as in that instance. I never tried the effect in any case before, though I have met with some where I believe cure would have equally ensued.

In reference to the word "starvation," it is quite out of place wherever used. The diet is simply to be suited to each particular case, generally "restricted in quantity, but nutritious in quality."

Before concluding, I may make one observation in reference to the "Dublin method of treating aneurism." We have no such thing. The surgeons of Dublin treat each separate case as it occurs, by ligature, compression, or otherwise, just as the case requires, but, as a general rule, by compression.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOLLIFFE TUFNELL,

Vice-President, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland.

December, 1873.

"A GRATUITOUS MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—My attention has been directed to an article that appeared in your journal last week, in which you do me a great injustice. Your remarks have been copied into a local paper, and, as they are calculated to injure me in the good opinion of my professional brethren, both locally and generally, I must ask you to give as much prominence to my explanation as you have already given to your condemnation of my (supposed) unprofessional conduct.

You state that "Dr. Reid, a member of the Town Council of Pembroke, to save the ratepayers, has actually offered to give his services gratuitously" as medical officer of health for the borough. This I most positively deny. On the contrary, I have, since my election in November, 1872 (not "last November," as you state), repeatedly urged the Town Council to comply with the Act of Parliament, and appoint the necessary officers at sufficient salaries. Where you obtained the information upon which your remarks are based I do not know (nor is it material), but I will give you a brief account of the discussion, so far as I was personally engaged in it, and leave you to judge whether I have acted "unprofessionally" or not.

It happened that I entered the Council-room very late, when the subject of the appointment of a medical officer had been under discussion for a considerable time. As I entered, one of the members of the Council was referring to the circumstance that there were two medical men in the corporation who, he said, had sought to be returned by the ratepayers, and he thought it was the duty of these gentlemen to serve the ratepayers for nothing. I immediately got

up and—I give you my exact words as transcribed from a shorthand writer's notes:—"Dr. Reid said—Mr. Mayor, I have come in rather late, but heard the latter part of what Mr. Dawkins said. I am on the Sanitary Board for Pembroke, and shall be happy to give any assistance, but I am rather at a loss, as I have not heard all the discussion. I may say, however, that you will have to appoint a medical officer sooner or later." At a subsequent period of the meeting the following resolution was put and carried by a large majority:—

"That Mr. Lanning (the clerk) be requested to reply to the Local Government Board's letter of the 24th inst., stating that at their annual meeting on the 9th November last the sanitary committees were appointed for the year, on which committees there are two medical gentlemen acting; and also that at the same annual meeting two inspectors of nuisances were appointed for the year. They therefore hope that these appointments will be allowed to continue for the current year, when the Council will proceed to the election of the necessary sanitary officers."

I again rose and protested against the resolution as an evasion of the Act of Parliament, and stated that I would not act as a substitute for a medical officer of health, but that when any subject connected with the health of the borough came before the Council, I should be happy to give them the benefit of my professional opinion. At the same time, I cautioned the Council that if they did not make the appointment, the Local Government Board would send down a sealed order for them to do so, as had already been done in the case of the port sanitary appointments. I enforced my remarks by telling the Council that they might as well ask a printer, who happened to be a member, to do all the corporation printing for nothing, or a publican, another member, to supply the Council with liquor, as to expect me to undertake the duties they wished to thrust upon me. I could give you a verbatim report of what I said, but I fear it would be encroaching too much upon your space. I trust I have said enough to satisfy you and your readers that I have not deserved the strong reproof that you have thought proper (doubtless through a deficient knowledge of the facts of the case) to inflict upon me. I entertain a very strong feeling that public bodies should set an example to private individuals in obeying the laws of the land, and I would be the last person in the world to support or encourage, much less originate, such a subterfuge as that which you attribute to me. As to "saving the ratepayers," I am sure that the more fully the Public Health Act is put into operation, the less sickness there will be, and consequently the less pauperism, and, as a natural sequence, diminished poor-rates.

Hoping, as an act of simple justice, you will insert this letter in your next issue,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

DOUGLAS A. REID, M.D.

Melville House, Pembroke, Dec. 20th, 1873.

PROFESSIONAL REMUNERATION AT PLYMOUTH.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I brought two charges against the Plymouth physicians: one, that in consultation with the general practitioners they paid two visits for one guinea; the other, that when attending a patient alone, they paid three, four, and even five visits for a guinea. To both charges "guilty" is pleaded, the plea being somewhat oddly accompanied with the most emphatic denial of the truth of my statements. This denial rests upon the fact stated by Dr. Clay and Dr. Prance, that they never pay more than three visits for the guinea. We are thankful for small mercies, and for this one among the rest; but I don't think we shall be convinced that seven shillings a visit is a very dignified charge for a consulting physician. I accept with pleasure the disclaimers as to the fourth and fifth visit made by these gentlemen, but it is curious that Mr. Cutcliffe, who has had a longer experience of this matter than I have, should have so strongly endorsed my statement, "from his own personal experience." It is also curious to find the wonderful unanimity of opinion which exists amongst the general practitioners here as to the numerous visits which physicians pay their patients for a guinea.