the effects of vaccination, "thus proving the non-protective power of even a double vaccination. Sixteen sheep which had been vaccinated with success were exposed 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."

Vaccination having completely failed in preventing or modifying sheep-pox, the reporters determined to give a trial to inoculation with the virus of human small-pox. One hundred sheep were inoculated, of which thirty only gave evidence of the introduction of the virus. Of these thirty, two were tested by the counter proof of ovination, and both animals contracted the sheep-pox and died. Two others were exposed to the natural disease and took it, and both of them died. The inoculated sheep also proved as susceptible to the influence of the vaccine virus as others not inoculated.

From these experiments the reporters conclude—

"1. 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.

"2. 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, and this under the most advantageous circumstances in the selection and command of lymph.

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

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

"5. That ovination 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 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 fall into disuse in 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 justifiable only in the very earliest invasion of the flock, and in those cases in which the disease assumes a confluent character.

"(c) That the only remaining conservative measure is inoculation, which, if rightly carried out, offers considerable advantages for the following reasons:—1. That it gives security against a natural attack of sheep pox. 2. That it limits the period of the existence of the disease in the flock. 3. That it mitigates the severity of the malady. 4. That it saves the lives of many animals which otherwise would be sacrificed, and produces comparatively but little loss of condition. 5. That it controls the extension of the disease; as one confluent natural case does more to diffuse the poison than probably fifty ordinary inoculated cases would do. 6. That the mortality from the inoculated disease when compared with the natural, is on the average as three per cent. in the one case is to fifty per cent. in the other."

To this portion of the report considerable exception may be taken. In Mr. Gamgee's report to the Privy Council last year on "Cattle Diseases in relation to the Supply of Meat and Milk," it is asserted, on grounds which cannot lightly be ignored, that in those districts of the Continent where sheep-pox is most persistent the disease is, to a great extent, kept up by the practice of inoculation. It is further asserted that the flocks inoculated in Wiltshire in 1862 were a chief cause of the spread of the epizootic in that county. Now to the ordinary observer it would appear that the very circumstance which in the opinion of the reporters renders segregation of the animals of little or no value in arresting the progress of sheep-pox—namely, largeness of the flock—is the circumstance which of all others would be most fatal to isolation of infected flocks—a prime necessity in the performance of inoculation. The reporters appeal to the experience of the outbreak in Wiltshire to show the value of inoculation. Provided that no

other course were open to the farmer, the appeal would be unanswerable. But Mr. Gamgee also appeals to the experience of the Wiltshire outbreak to show the harmfulness of inoculation when contrasted with segregation and slaughtering of infected animals; and the evidence he adduces certainly seems to outweigh the evidence in favour of inoculation. It is to be regretted that the subject, having been touched upon, was not more fully entered into by the reporters. We would gladly have learned the grounds upon which two observers of so great competence, and whose opinions command our highest respect, rest their objections to the arguments which have been so forcibly urged against inoculation. For the rest, this report satisfactorily settles a vexed question, which would be apt to arise again, to the exclusion of other and more important considerations, in the event of the reappearance of sheep-pox in this kingdom.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE MARSHALL HALL METHOD OF RESUSCITATING THE APPARENTLY DROWNED.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I beg to forward you herewith a copy of a letter which we have just received from Dr. Blake, of Torquay, detailing the result of his successful treatment on a recent occasion, according to Dr. Marshall Hall's method, of a person apparently dead from drowning.

I think that Dr. Blake's case so strongly confirms the course which THE LANCET and this institution have taken in adopting both the plans of Dr. Marshall Hall and Dr. Silvester, that I have thought you would like to make use of it in your next number.—I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,

RICHARD LEWIS,

Secretary to the Royal National Life-boat Institution.

John-street, Adelphi, July 6th, 1864.

Anglesey House, Torquay, July 1st, 1864.

DEAR SIR,—As an old subscriber and warm admirer of your most valuable institution, I beg to address you on the subject of the first article of your "Life-boat," which I received this morning. Being a medical man in practice here, I think I ought to add my mite, however small, to help you in your search after what, by weight of evidence, must eventually influence you in your laudable endeavour to discover what is the best plan of restoring persons apparently drowned.

I was walking leisurely along Victoria Parade here about a week ago, when I saw a crowd collecting on the pier-head round a pleasure-boat which had just come in. Axious to know what was the cause, I proceeded quietly down towards the crowd, and when I got there found the body of a gentleman's servant laid on two planks, apparently quite dead. I simply asked "What is the matter?" "Oh, sir, he has fallen overboard, and was ten minutes in the water before we could pick him up, and then got hold of him with the boat hook, pulled him on board, and brought him here; but we fear he's dead." This was some distance out, near Paignton.

I waited not an instant, but pushing, nay dashing through the crowd, I got to the body, and securing in one instant the help of three powerful men, to do as I bid them, I proceeded, without even taking off my gloves (so urgent was the haste, and they fitting very tightly), to use the Marshall Hall method of restoring respiration. We proceeded vigorously and steadily to work for ten minutes or a quarter of an hour ere there was the least apparent consciousness, he being a very stout heavy man; then there was a heavy gasp. We continued the method, and in half an hour were rejoiced to find natural respiration restored. Then we set to work, got off the remainder of his wet things, and rubbed vigorously, giving also brandy-and-water, which he could now swallow; and as soon as some warmth was felt, we got him into a carriage and sent him home. On looking at his watch, I found it had stopped at the very hour he had fallen into the water. The result has been that in four days he was at his usual work.

Having also had several cases of apparently still born children brought to animation and life by this most admirable and thoroughly physiological plan of proceeding, I think it only due to the memory of the most illustrious member of the profession to add my humble testimony in favour of the Marshall Hall method, which is to my mind unhesitatingly the best ever yet proposed.

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 LANCET, in which it appears that we have fewer sicknesses and deaths than any place in even 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 open privies, with the addition of stinking piggeries, neglected stables and stable-yards, slaughter-houses and their garbage, &c., 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 imperfect state of things, is allowed to go on without a careful and stringent sanitary superintendence. Mr. Gilbert Caught, a member of the Board of Guardians, Isle of Thanet Union, says, in his Statistics of Margate and Ramsgate, that the average number of deaths in one thousand, taking the years 1857, '58, and '59, amounts to 24·953 in Margate yearly, and in Ramsgate 19·6; or deaths in Margate for the three years 756, and in Ramsgate for the same time 696. I account for the fewer deaths in Ramsgate by their having some extent of sewerage. Then at the end of the same extract I find a just and sound suggestion to the Margate municipal authorities, which I consider an urgent duty: "Drain your town," and place Margate in that sanitary condition she is so capable of perfecting.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Margate, June, 1864.

F. CHAMBERS, M.D.

P.S.—Margate population in 1851, 10,099; Ramsgate ditto, 11,838.

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 upon the professional character of your correspondent. 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 then and there received. The witness whom I alluded to as having seen the deceased on the evening previous to deceased's death, was called especially at my request, and certainly deposed 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 doctress," 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 correspondent's letter would appear to impeach my veracity—I must appeal to the Coroner; and hoping that Mr. Ellis may acquit me of any intentional imputation on himself,

I am, Sir, yours &c.,

C. W. BINGLEY, Ph.D., F.C.S.

Whitley Hall, near Sheffield, July, 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 think I have added my mite 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 able to live comfortably and save 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 30th, 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 obliged,

HENRY BROMFIELD.

Blockley Vicarage, Moreton-in-Marsh, July, 1864.

Blockley Vicarage, Worcestershire.

The Rev. H. Bromfield, Vicar of Blockley, begs to call the attention of members of the medical profession to a case of great destitution, and solicits their contributions on behalf of the bereaved widow and children.

Mr. Edgar Bull, surgeon, resided and practised in the village of Blockley for several years. On a foggy night in January, 1863, on his way home from a patient, he fell down a bank and sustained a bad fracture of the leg. A long confinement to his bed, and the consequent loss of income, preyed upon his health and spirits; and although he partially regained the use of his limb, the constitution received so severe a shock that his mind gave way, and in a paroxysm of mental aberration he precipitated himself from a window and was killed.

Mr. Bull has left a widow and four children. The eldest son (nineteen) is in a draper's shop, 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.