contagious disease over the country from the traffic in diseased beasts affords ample evidence of the necessity to put a stop, by most stringent measures, to corrupt practices which tend to degrade and indirectly to impoverish those who lend themselves to them. The agricultural community certainly suffers very severely from such an unlawful trade; and the temporary benefit some derive, by having a ready market for diseased animals, can afford no substantial argument against the many which very justly may be used in condemning the system.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GAMGEE,

New Veterinary College, Dec. 1860.

Professor of Veterinary Medicine.

POISONING BY ARSENICAL PAPER-HANGINGS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The day before I read your leading article on Arsenical Paper-hangings, my attention was called by a patient to a piece of paper similar to that with which her bed-room was papered, and I was asked whether this could have anything to do with her illness. I supposed it might, and advised change of room; but on reading your article, and more closely analyzing the symptoms, I am perfectly convinced that such was the case. The following are the particulars:—

An old lady, much weakened by an unsuccessful operation for cataract last spring, has since come to reside here. About two months ago, for convenience, she occupied an ante-drawing-room, papered with a green flock paper, as a sleeping-room. Since that period she has suffered from frequent and violent spasms of the bowels, dryness of the mouth and a feeling of constriction about the fauces on awaking, nausea, and occasional vomiting; but there has been a constipated state of the bowels, to which I had ascribed most of the symptoms. To corroborate this, two female servants, who have alternately slept in her room, have each of them complained of pains in the stomach and bowels to which they had not been previously subject.

I send you this case in the hope that more general attention may be called to the subject, for doubtless there are many similar to it; and the thanks of the profession, as well as of the public, are due to you for having so forcibly exposed the danger attending these paper-hangings. I enclose a small piece of the one in question; and when I tell you that two-thirds, at least, of the room are covered with the pattern similar to this, and observe how readily it is brushed off, and therefore as readily inhaled, I think your caution was not unneeded, but most valuable.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Seaton, Nov. 28th, 1860.

GEORGE EVANS, M.R.C.S.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Having for years superintended the manufacture of paper-hangings, I can state that the effects of Scheele's green, when in a wet state, are very injurious to the workmen. I have seen them with their faces covered with it (except the eyes), and the lips and nose swollen to double their natural size; also, that, when in a dry state, the workmen who hang it upon the walls suffer much, not being able to continue day after day upon the same work. The imperfect binding, I believe, does not arise from the want of sufficient size or binding matter, for more is used in this than any other colour. I think it has a heating or destroying property like lime, and when exposed upon walls the binding matter leaves it.

I have enclosed (marked No. 1) a piece of paper as it left the makers; and another (No. 2), cut within a few inches of the first, but prepared afterwards, and *washable in water*. If you think fit to test them, and can find any merit in the latter, I can only say that I would enable any paper-stainer to supply the same to the public at an additional charge of *one half-penny per yard*.

This subject has occupied my attention for several years, but the expense hitherto has been more than the public would have gone to. I trust I have discovered a simple remedy, and hope to have the small benefit that may arise from so inexpensive a process. I should add, that it may be applied in many cases to paper now hanging upon the walls (rendering them washable), the expense being a trifle greater.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

Smith-street, Chelsea, Dec. 1860.

W. G. BLOGG.

* * The papers enclosed in Mr. Blogg's letter were forwarded to Dr. Hassall, who reports upon them as follows:—The paper marked No. 1, although sized, is certainly not washable; for

when immersed in water for a minute or two, the arsenical pigment becomes detached on the slightest pressure. Neither can it be said that the prepared paper, No. 2, is really washable, as the colour, although more adherent, is also easily removed. Moreover, the colour of the prepared paper has been so much injured by the process to which it has been subjected, that it would scarcely find favour either with the trade or the public. Size varnish, being soluble in water, is obviously a very indifferent protection; a spirit varnish would probably be much more effectual in preventing the detachment of the pigment, and its consequent dispersion through the atmosphere of the room.

MEDICAL TRIALS.

CROWN COURT, CHESTER.—DECEMBER 7TH.

THE CASE OF EVAN THOMAS.

IN his charge to the grand jury, Mr. Justice Blackburn adverted in the following terms to this case:—There is a case of manslaughter in which a man named Evan Thomas, a bone-setter, is charged with "killing and slaying Francis Timlin, at Birkenhead, on the 9th of October, 1860." It appears that Thomas has not been regularly trained in the medical profession; still he practised as a bone-setter in the regular way. A boy named Timlin, who was suffering from some disease about the knee, was taken to him; the man thought he had a fracture of the limb, and treated it as such by tying splints upon it; but it turned out that there was no fracture, but simply disease, and it appears that this treatment for a fractured limb was bad treatment, and the boy died. Whether his death was accelerated by this treatment or not, it is for you to turn your attention to. I should tell you that though the man was not regularly educated as a practitioner, it is no reason he should be found guilty; and I mention this because there is a notion amongst medical men that if a person has not been regularly educated as a doctor, he is not capable of treating this case or any case. This is not so; and the fact of his not having been educated as a doctor is no element in this case, and ought not to be taken into consideration. You must look to see whether there was such a want of that reasonable care and skill which everyone ought to bring to bear who treats persons in the capacity of surgeon or physician, which would amount to culpable negligence. It is a matter of fact which you must bring your common sense to bear upon; it is for you to say whether there was such a want of care and skill, such an amount of negligence, as would make him criminally liable; and you will require a good deal more evidence than if it were a case for damages. A man ought not to be harassed with charges of this sort unless there are reasonable grounds for them; and you must look carefully at the evidence and see whether it will warrant you in finding a true bill.

The counsel for the prosecution were Mr. Gifford and Mr. Lloyd; for the prisoner, Mr. Serjeant Parry, Mr. Welsby, Mr. J. B. Aspinall, and Mr. McIntyre.

MR. GIFFORD stated the case on behalf of the Crown. The prisoner was indicted for the offence of manslaughter, an offence which, though general in its terms, experience showed varied in its circumstances and degrees of moral culpability more than, perhaps, any other offence known to the law. The complexion of the charge against the prisoner was that he had caused the death of another person by negligence, and the circumstances were these. It appeared that the prisoner practised as a setter of fractured limbs, though not regularly qualified as a surgeon; and on the occasion when it was suggested that he exhibited the want of skill and care and the negligence which proved the groundwork of the present charge, a boy of eight years of age was brought to his place of business, and he treated the boy for a fractured limb, there being in fact no fracture at all. The learned counsel said he had to allege on the part of the prosecution that, in the course of that treatment, the prisoner exhibited such gross want of skill, such carelessness, and want of due attention and a reasonable amount of knowledge, that the result of his treatment was the death of the child; and it was under those circumstances the charge was preferred. He had mentioned that the prisoner was not a regularly qualified practitioner. That circumstance was immaterial in the consideration of this case. It could not be used against the prisoner, because whatever might be his line of life, and the course he pursued, if he used due care and skill in the course of that