the effects of vaccination, "thus proving the non-protective power of even a double vaccination. Sixteen sheep which had the small-pox in Wiltshire succeeded in escaping to the sheep-pox, and took it naturally; and out of this number no less than eleven died, thus proving that the severity of the disease was in no way mitigated by the vaccination.

It may be supposed that in preventing or modifying sheep-pox, the reporters determined to give a trial to inoculation with the virus of human small-pox. One hundred eleven died, thus proving that the severity of the disease was the effects of vaccination, " thus proving the non-protective vaccination, which, if rightly carried out, offers considerable advantages for the following reasons:—1. That it gives security immunity from the disease secured by the vaccination of certain flocks, and conclusively show that the statements are altogether unworthy of credence. They further offer some observations on inoculation as a preventive of sheep-pox. "Taking it for granted that the system will not fail into disrepute at the event of the reappearance of sheep-pox in England," they give rules for its performance, and they conclude—

"(a) That the segregation of infected animals, although often of much value in arresting the progress of sheep-pox if immediately had recourse to, and perseveringly carried out day by day, is nevertheless almost impracticable when large flocks have to be dealt with.

"(b) That the slaughtering and burying of the infected animals is but very imperfectly developed, even in the most successful cases.

"That the vaccination of sheep cannot be relied upon as a preventive or mitigant of sheep-pox, as the vaccine disease in these animals is but very imperfectly developed, even in the most successful cases.

"That even if the vaccination of sheep were protective, a serious drawback to its adoption would be that not more than thirty five per cent, will probably be influenced by it on a first vaccination, this under the most advantageous circumstances in the selection and command of lymph.

"That the vaccination of sheep on the principle of retro-vaccination has no value beyond an ordinary vaccination, nor does it plan materially increase the supply of lymph at command.

"That the inoculation of sheep with the virus of human small-pox is equally inefficacious as vaccination.

"That ovine of cows cannot be resorted to as a means to furnish lymph, these animals being insusceptible, as it would seem, to the action of the small-pox virus."

The reporters examine in detail the more important statements made during the prevalence of sheep-pox in 1862, of immediate from the disease secured by the vaccination of certain flocks, and conclusively show that the statements are altogether unworthy of credence. They further offer some observations on inoculation as a preventive of sheep-pox. "Taking it for granted that the system will not fail into disrepute at the event of the reappearance of sheep-pox in England," they give rules for its performance, and they conclude—

"(a) That the segregation of infected animals, although often of much value in arresting the progress of sheep-pox if immediately had recourse to, and perseveringly carried out day by day, is nevertheless almost impracticable when large flocks have to be dealt with.

"(b) That the slaughtering and burying of the infected animals is but very imperfectly developed, even in the most successful cases.

"That the vaccination of sheep cannot be relied upon as a preventive or mitigant of sheep-pox, as the vaccine disease in these animals is but very imperfectly developed, even in the most successful cases.

"That even if the vaccination of sheep were protective, a serious drawback to its adoption would be that not more than thirty five per cent, will probably be influenced by it on a first vaccination, this under the most advantageous circumstances in the selection and command of lymph.

"That the vaccination of sheep on the principle of retro-vaccination has no value beyond an ordinary vaccination, nor does it plan materially increase the supply of lymph at command.

"That the inoculation of sheep with the virus of human small-pox is equally inefficacious as vaccination.

"That ovine of cows cannot be resorted to as a means to furnish lymph, these animals being insusceptible, as it would seem, to the action of the small-pox virus."
The man’s watch being stopped proves he must have been a considerable time in the water. He could swim a very little, but says that the waves were so high and the wind so strong, he was soon overpowered after a few strokes, and he does not recollect any more.

I am, &c.,
C. PAGET BLAKE, M.D. Edin., M.R.C.P. Lond.

The Secretary, Royal National Life-boat Institution.

MARGATE AS A HEALTH RESORT.

To the Editor of The Lancet.

SIR,—I find in the Kentish Observer of the 23rd inst., an extract from the Times, in which it appears that we have fewer sicknesses and deaths than anywhere else in Europe. Now, while I will admit the many natural excellent qualities of Margate in favour of health, it is my opinion that the fearful extent of the common cesspool system and badly arranged privies, with the addition of stinking piggeries, neglected stables and stable-yards, slaughter-houses and their garbage, with miserable dwellings for the poor, and a stinking harbour, with a fearful fume at low water at the end of the jetty, tend to take the shine out of Margate very considerably, and, which, in my opinion, have been cogent causes why I have been brought in professional contact with frequent typhus fever, &c., and sometimes deaths, during my residence of twenty-two years. I would say that often impure waters from the wells have done their work; to some extent that evil is now remedied by waterworks. Yet, Margate, with this impure state of things, is allowed to go on without any scientific inquiry which it seemed to suggest; but was sured and disappointed to find instead that I was charged with having cast an imputation upon the professional character of a member of the Board of Guardians, Isle of Thanet Union.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Margate, June, 1864.
F. CHAMBERS, M.D.

THE CASE OF POISONING BY ARSENIC AT CROWLE.

To the Editor of The Lancet.

SIR,—Observing a letter in your journal of the 25th ult. on this case, I was in hopes of finding some information on the scientific inquiry which it seemed to suggest; but was surprised and disappointed to find instead that I was charged with having cast an imputation on the Board of Guardians. This charge is without foundation. I adhere advisedly to the statement in every particular, and I must say I am exceedingly sorry if any such construction can be put upon what I said. I certainly did not mean it, and, in truth, never heard the gentleman’s name mentioned. It would appear from Mr. Ellis’s letter to you that there had been some misunderstanding between himself and Mr. Holgate, the Coroner, at the inquest; but of that I know nothing. At the adjourned inquest was my first attendance. Whatever I may have stated in my report is from information I have since obtained. The cause of death is stated therein. I also stated that I had seen the deceased on the evening previous to deceased’s death, was called especially at my request, and certainly depose to the facts I mentioned. The whole affair seemed involved in mystery; but what I observed from the analysis pointed to deceased having taken the poison in small doses for some time previous to death. It was stated that she was “a bit of a doctor,” and also, as Mr. Ellis observes, had been heard to say she would make away with herself; so, perhaps, she might have been heroic enough to have carried out her suicidal intention by degrees.

As to the truth of what I have stated—as your correspondents in your columns would have it—there is no foundation. It may acquit me of any intentional imputation on myself,
I am, Sir, yours &c.,
G. W. BINGLY, Ph.D., F.C.S.

Whitley Hall, near Sheffield, July 11, 1864.

THE ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To the Editor of The Lancet.

SIR,—I am very glad to see there is at last a stir being made to obtain justice for the medical department of the army; but I doubt if Government will do anything until they are really obliged. I am happy to know that I have yielded my sites to their present difficulty in obtaining medical officers, by resigning, when, in the Director-General’s acknowledgment of the same, he said he was “sorry to lose so valuable an officer.” My object in now writing is to urge other assistant-surgeons to follow my example. I had contemplated the step for some time, but feared that eight years of army life would have unfitted me for private practice; but after two years’ trial I find it has been rather in my favour than otherwise, and I am now much more happy than more than I then got, having trebled my practice in two years.

I would, therefore, urge all who have an inclination, to cut the service, and leave (what a late Inspector-General of Hospitals once told me the Army Medical Department was alone fit for) the fools and sluggards to enjoy the liberal pay and high position offered by the Government to the hardest-worked and most responsible officers of the army.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
July, 1864.
E. M. WRENCH.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS AND RAILWAY SURGEONS.

To the Editor of The Lancet.

SIR,—Mr. John Adams, the surgeon to the South-Eastern Railway Company, although he asserts in his letter to you that my statement to the President and Council of the College of Surgeons is wholly untrue, nevertheless admits that he did visit and examine the patient of a brother surgeon in the absence of the latter, and without his knowledge or sanction. It is not for me to decide whether such a course was usual or proper, and I abstain from expressing any opinion on the subject. I adhere advisedly to the statement in every particular, and I undertake to prove it, and not only so, but to prove a great deal more. As the case now stands, Mr. Adams has pleaded “guilty” to a portion of the charge, and a denial of the remainder. Mr. Adams can hardly allow matters to remain where they are, and must adopt some steps to set himself right with the profession and the public. If the statements are, as he says, “wholly untrue,” he will have an opportunity of telling a jury so from the witness-box, and I shall be only too happy to meet him before such a tribunal.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Gray’s Inn, June 20th, 1864.
J. JONES.

A CASE OF DISTRESS.

To the Editor of The Lancet.

SIR,—Acting under the advice of several members of the medical profession, I forward the enclosed appeal, earnestly soliciting that you will give it a place in the columns of your journal, and also requesting that you would kindly consent to receive contributions for the bereaved widow.

I have the honour to remain, yours truly and obediently,
HENRY BROMFIELD.


The Rev. H. Bromfield, Vicar of Blockley, begs to call the attention of members of the medical profession to a case of great destitution. For some time past there has been in Blockley a case of great suffering, and their contributions on behalf of the bereaved widow and children.

Mr. Bull has left a widow and four children. The eldest son (nineteen) is an apprentice, but two daughters, a son, and the widow, are utterly destitute. The Editor of The Lancet has kindly consented to receive contributions, which will be applied to establish the widow in a grocery business, in the hope that she may support herself, and keep a home for her children until some provision can be made for them.

Blockley Vicarage, Worcestershire.