

seconded by Mr. Adams, and carried, that Mr. Walton as treasurer, and Sir William Fergusson as chairman, should draw a check for £1215 Os. 0d., payable to Dr. Druitt's account in Messrs. Drummond's bank, and should take the banker's receipt for the amount. It was then agreed that a report of the meeting should be forwarded to every subscriber to the fund, embodying the following extract of a letter from Dr. Druitt to the treasurer.

"Madras, 26th April, 1873.

"Since leaving England I have received accounts of the very flattering testimonial which a large circle of friends propose to present to me. I must trust to you in my absence to convey to them all my grateful sense of their kindness, and my satisfaction at being thought in any way worthy of it.
(Signed) "R. DRUITT."

Very congratulatory remarks were made upon the extremely small expenditure compared with the work which had been accomplished. A vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Haynes Walton the treasurer, and Mr. A. T. Norton the secretary. The meeting terminated with a vote of thanks to Sir William Fergusson the chairman.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

AN EXPLANATION OF THE ALLEGED SCANDALOUS AND LIBELLOUS DOCUMENT RELATIVE TO DR. FORBES WINSLOW.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—After some hesitation I have come to the conclusion that I cannot allow the scandalous and libellous printed documents which have recently been circulated, with the evident intention of injuring and annoying me, to pass wholly unnoticed. The subject is, however, so peculiar and delicate that I find much difficulty in making the matter intelligible, without going into further details of a strictly private character, and this I certainly shall not, at present, be induced to do.

I must consequently content myself with saying that the husband of the lady whose name is most unjustifiably made use of in the document is, and always has been, a perfect stranger to me. I have never even seen him, nor have I ever written to or received any letter from him.

Nearly twelve years ago I was requested to see professionally the lady who had then recently left her husband's house and was residing with her mother. She was suffering from an attack of acute melancholia. She remained under my care for about a year and a half, when she recovered. During the lengthened time she was under my treatment, and for many years after I had ceased to attend her, my mouth was hermetically sealed, except to her own mother, as to the nature of her illness, as well as to the sad domestic circumstances which surrounded the case.

After the lapse of six or seven years I was spoken to by the mother of the lady relative to some proceedings which I was informed were contemplated in the Divorce Court, but I did not see the lady to whom I have before referred on that subject. My communications were solely with her mother and her solicitor. I had nothing to do with these proposed proceedings (which did not originate with me) beyond explaining the evidence I could give if called as a witness.

I heard nothing further on the subject until some years afterwards I was unfortunately asked to meet, at the house of a medical friend, a widow lady, the sister of the husband to whom I have referred. In the drawing-room of the physician at whose house I had been dining, this lady, in the presence of a number of strangers, addressed me in a most vulgar and offensive manner in reference to the cause of her brother and his wife not living together, and by her remarks and manner appeared to imply that I had interfered in the matter, and was the cause of the separation. This I indignantly denied, but the lady, not being satisfied with my emphatic repudiation of the charge, repeated with warmth her insinuations, and asked me why he wife did not return to her husband. Feeling intensely

irritated at being so unjustly attacked in a private room, I said, "If you want to know the reason, don't ask me, ask the wife herself," and I then (what I immediately afterwards regretted) alluded to the nature of the case which the mother of the wife told me was proposed to be set up in the Divorce Court.

I heard nothing more of the matter for nearly a year. I then received an application from a solicitor on behalf of the husband, asking me to apologise for observations I was said to have made in reference to himself. I replied that the charge was false, and that I had nothing to apologise for. I subsequently referred him to my solicitor, and an action for alleged slander was commenced against me.

In that action my solicitor obtained an order upon summons for particulars of the persons to whom it was alleged that I had defamed the plaintiff. Particulars were delivered with the names of two well-known members of the medical profession, who, upon being applied to by myself as well as by the plaintiff's solicitor, denied that I had ever made the slightest reference to the subject to them, thus showing that their names had been very unwarrantably introduced into the case.

The plaintiff in the action, instead of taking the matter before a jury, in which case he would have had to prove his complaints by evidence, thought it right to have the validity of the pleadings first discussed before the judges *in banco*. Upon that discussion judgment was given in my favour upon two of the three counts of the plaintiff's declaration; and, as respects the third count, the judges held that, *if established by evidence*, the plaintiff would be entitled to recover damages.

A few days after this decision, and without any further communication with me or my solicitors, the plaintiff voluntarily and formally discontinued his action, and submitted to pay the costs of it, which costs were subsequently taxed, and the action thus ended. This was in May, 1872. I heard nothing further of the matter until the month of May, 1873, when the scandalous documents to which I have referred were, in disregard of all propriety and decency, circulated not only amongst the medical profession, but to others.

I do not desire to dwell upon this extraordinary proceeding, nor do I, for the reason to which I have referred, think it right to be drawn into further details upon such a delicate and painful subject. I content myself with the undoubted fact that I was fully prepared to defend the action referred to, but was precluded from doing so before a jury by the voluntary discontinuance of the suit on the part of the plaintiff without my consent being asked or obtained.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Cavendish-square, June 11th, 1873. FORBES WINSLOW, M.D.

SKIM-MILK TREATMENT IN DIABETES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The communication of Dr. Barclay, contained in your issue of the 24th ult., confirms the remarks I made at the Clinical Society on the previous evening during the discussion that took place on Dr. Greenhow's paper. I then referred to one of my hospital cases in which I had lately ordered the skimmed milk to be given, and with the following result. The particulars are to be found in full in report the of my clinical clerk, Mr. Paley. I need only mention here the main facts bearing on the point in question.

The patient, T. D.—, aged thirty-nine, had been sent to me from Hampshire by a medical practitioner, and was admitted to Stephen ward on Dec. 7th, 1872. He belonged to a healthy family, and had enjoyed good health until about a year previously, when he became the subject of diabetes. It was an uncomplicated case of the disease, and at one time, according to the account given, as much as twenty-four pints of urine were passed in the twenty-four hours. He was placed upon the ordinary restricted diet, with bran biscuits as a substitute for bread; and on Dec. 13th and 14th the state of the urine was as follows:—

	Quantity of urine per 24 hours.			Sp. gr.	Quantity of sugar per fluid oz.		Quantity of sugar per 24 hours.		
	Pints	oz.			Grains.	Grains.			
Dec. 13th	...	6	10	...	1038	...	24	...	3120
„ 14th	...	4	16	...	1035	...	22·50	...	2160

The restricted diet was continued, and the patient was further placed under a plan of medical treatment which I purposely refrain from mentioning here, as it has no concern with the subject of this communication. The urine underwent a gradual improvement, and between the 7th and the 23rd of January its condition was found to be as follows:—

	Quantity of urine per 24 hours.		Sp. gr.	Quantity of sugar per fluid oz.		Quantity of sugar per 24 hours.	
	Pints oz.			Grains.	Grains.		
Jan. 7th	... 1	18 ...	1029	... 2.40	... 91		
„ 8th	... 2	18 ...	1022	... Trace of sugar.			
„ 9th	... 2	8 ...	1030	... „	... „		
„ 10th	... 4	0 ...	1020	... 2.40	... 192		
„ 11th	... 2	6 ...	1028	... Slight sugar.			
„ 12th	... 2	7 ...	1030	... No sugar.			
„ 13th	... 3	6 ...	1027	... „			
„ 14th	... 2	14 ...	1024	... „			
„ 15th	... 2	8 ...	1023	... „			
„ 16th	... 3	6 ...	1022	... „			
„ 17th	... 2	6 ...	1024	... „			
„ 22nd	... 2	4 ...	1025	... „			
„ 23rd	... 2	6 ...	1029	... „			

The urine was collected from six o'clock one morning till the same time the next, so that the specimen under date of the 23rd was for the day and night of the 22nd. On the morning of the 23rd the medical treatment was discontinued and the diet changed to seven pints of skimmed milk per diem. At the patient's request the quantity was increased on the following day to eight pints, and afterwards continued at this. The following shows the effect produced:—

	Quantity of urine per 24 hours.		Sp. gr.	Quantity of sugar per fluid oz.		Quantity of sugar per 24 hours.	
	Pints oz.			Grains.	Grains.		
Jan. 24th	... 5	0 ...	1014	... No sugar.			
„ 25th	... 5	0 ...	1017	... 4.80	... 480		
„ 26th	... 5	16 ...	1033	... 13.32	... 1545		
„ 27th	... 5	6 ...	1027	... 24	... 2544		
„ 28th	... 6	0 ...	1037	... 17.13	... 2055		

On the 28th the skim-milk treatment was discontinued. I had intended to have persevered with it longer, but the patient simply refused to comply. I am alive to the non-compliance of diabetic patients that sometimes happens in carrying out their dietetic instructions, but I have reason to believe that in this case my orders were implicitly obeyed. During the five days the patient was under the treatment he lost four pounds in weight. Three weeks after admission his weight was 10 st. 5 lb. By the time of commencing the skim-milk it had increased to 10 st. 13 lb., and on leaving it off it was 10 st. 9 lb. The report says that during the last two days of the treatment the patient complained greatly of thirst, although he was taking eight pints of skim-milk per diem. It may be mentioned that the milk supplied to the hospital is daily examined, and is required to come up to a standard of good quality.

The patient was kept in the hospital till March 12th. At first, after discontinuing the skim-milk, he was placed on the restricted diet, and subsequently the former medical treatment was resumed. The weight on Feb. 15th had risen to 11 st. 3 lb., and at the date of his discharge it was 11 st. 7 lb. The urine again fell in quantity to from two and a half to three pints per diem, and the sugar to an average of about 600 grains. It never returned to the satisfactory condition that existed before the skim-milk was commenced, and I am under the conviction that the skim-milk exerted a direct pernicious effect upon my patient.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

Grosvenor-street, June 2nd, 1873.

F. W. PAVY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As a discussion is now going on in THE LANCET on the skim-milk treatment of diabetes, I desire to record briefly the following case now under my care:—In a girl, twenty-one years of age, suffering from the disease in a severe form, of long standing, and extremely emaciated, I have succeeded, by means of the skim-milk treatment, in reducing the daily quantity of urine from 9 and 10 pints, to 4 and 4½ pints, and the specific gravity from 1050 to 1020.

The patient now rests at night, and has no thirst; she used to drink until waterlogged, her stomach being distended visibly. She has never been thoroughly on the skim-milk. I found she would eat crusts of bread, and could not prevent it. I therefore recommended gluten bread, of which she takes two or three pieces in the day. For two days she was without this bread, and had nothing but skim-milk for nearly three days, when the specific gravity of the urine fell as low as 1015. I find the specific gravity is always greatest in the morning, sometimes as high as 1025; and in the evening it varies from 1015 to 1020, and still contains a considerable quantity of sugar. However, the health of the patient is very greatly improved, and she now enjoys a comfort to which she had long been a stranger. The case appears to be too far advanced to permit of the complete arrest of the disease; nevertheless, it is a striking illustration of the great degree of relief obtainable by the treatment in the worst form of the disease.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Villiers-street, Sunderland, June 2nd, 1873.

JAMES WILSON.

MEDICAL BENEFIT CLUBS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have received numerous letters from medical men both in town and country with reference to the above subject, and all seem to agree that such a scheme, if well organised and managed, would be a great boon to the profession, and also be likely to succeed in a pecuniary point of view. They differ, however, very materially in their suggestions as to the best mode of carrying out the undertaking. After careful consideration, I conclude that we have two plans before us. The first, and most simple, is to induce some good Assurance Office now existing to commence this branch of business, and I have no doubt this could easily be done by a little combined influence. The second is to form a central committee for the purpose of establishing a new Medical Provident Society, scale of payments to be calculated by a competent actuary, and a small subscription commenced for preliminary expenses. Before doing this, however, it is necessary to discover how far the profession would be inclined to support such a society; and it has been suggested to me that those medical men wishing to join in the formation of this benefit club should communicate with me so that we might have some idea of the probable number of members in the first instance.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

WM. AKERMAN, L.K.Q.C.P., M.R.C.S., &c.
20, Golborne-road, W., June, 1873.

IRELAND.

(From our own Correspondent.)

NOTHING of importance has occurred in the Irish medical world during the last few weeks until last Monday, when the several medical societies held their annual meetings, as is usual on the occasion of the election of the Council for the Royal College of Surgeons. Four members of the Council lost their seats this year, amongst whom was Mr. Hargrave, the representative of the College in the General Medical Council. The thirtieth annual report of the Council shows that 4 candidates were admitted to the Fellowship during the year, and 125 gentlemen received letters testimonial, 15 candidates being rejected for the final examination. The entire number on the lists of the College now amounts to 371 fellows and 2424 licentiates. The income for the year was somewhat over £4000, the expenditure somewhat under £4000, leaving a balance of £350. The President and Council, in their report, express an earnest desire that the scheme for a conjoint examination agreed upon by the University of Dublin, the King and Queen's College of Physicians, and the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, should receive, at their earliest convenience, the sanction of the General Medical Council. During the year examinations upon the dissected subject had been decided upon. A Professorship of Aural and Ophthalmic Surgery had been decided upon, and Dr. Henry