consistent with that judgment, and to substitute it for your letters.

Be so good as to give me a few lines in reply, stating whether the foregoing is not a correct representation of the facts of the case, which, if you would do at your earliest convenience, I shall be obliged, so that I may be enabled to give your reply publicity in the journals of Saturday next.

In conclusion I repeat my unfeigned regret for the course Dr. O'Beirne has compelled me to pursue, and I beg to assure you of the sincere respect and esteem of yours, very faithfully,

FREDERICK SALMON.

No. 10.—*Mr. B. Cooper to Mr. Salmon.*

My dear Sir,—If you think it necessary, you are perfectly welcome to publish the correspondence between us, relative to the controversy between yourself and Dr. Beirne. Yours, very truly,

BRANSBY B. COOPER.

2, New Street, Feb. 5th, 1834.

RICE AND CHOLERA.

REMARKS, BY DR. TYTLER, ON THE LETTER OF MR. DUNN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The letter of Mr. Dunn, published in the last number of *THE LANCET*, contains two facts of great importance. The first is contained in the following assertion of Mr. Dunn. "In November, in consequence of the circumstances mentioned in my former letter, an alteration in the dietary was made, by which the animal food was reduced; milk, which before was allowed to be purchased, was forbidden, and two ounces of rice were, *twice* a week, substituted for potatoes." This is followed by the remark, that "the quantity of rice allowed (two ounces twice a week) is too small to have produced any effect." But, Sir, with submission to Mr. Dunn, these are neither the words of his former letter, nor do they convey the inferences which are deducible from that letter, as corroborated by the facts that are disclosed in the communication under date 4th instant. The words of his former letter are these: "We have substituted an allowance of rice, the result of which I will communicate after we have made a longer trial of it." Now, Sir, what is the result? And this information in his last letter is not *directly* afforded by Mr. Dunn, for he there states, "the quantity of rice is too small to have produced any effect," and yet in his preceding communication, we were promised to have the "RESULT" of the quantity of rice, *small or great*, which was given as diet to the prisoners at Wakefield!

Nevertheless this information is amply supplied, although *indirectly* supplied, in Mr. Dunn's recent epistle, because in it he

unequivocally mentions that on the 9th of December, "a case of Asiatic cholera occurred in a vagrant," and that "the disease continued to spread among the vagrants until the morning of the 24th of January, when it made its appearance in a most alarming form, *without any premonitory symptoms*, in a different part of the prison." This, Sir, is a most accurate description of *rice disease*, as it often makes its appearance in those who are using rice, without any warning symptom, and this identical effect is thus alluded to in my letter of Nov. 4th, 1833. "The rice may therefore produce, should it be bad, a deleterious effect on those who partake of it, although the disease thus produced may appear to the medical gentlemen in attendance to originate in some other cause." In the Wakefield prison rice was given as food, and continued to be given, and in that prison, while the rice was so given, dreadful bowel complaints, *cholera*, and other diseases, made their appearance, and this is "THE RESULT" of "THE TRIAL" which has been "made with rice" at Wakefield, as is gathered from Mr. Dunn's own statements, although he says the rice was given only at the rate of two ounces per week.

The second fact alluded to in the letter of Mr. Dunn, which requires notice, is this. Mr. Dunn says, "In many of the samples furnished in Wakefield I detected the varieties of bad rice Dr. Tytler has described." Here, then, in Wakefield, an inland town of Yorkshire in England, the deleterious rice is *admitted to be present*, and that town has been conspicuous, at least since the discussions on the rice question, for the prevalence of *cholera*. Those facts speak volumes, and it is, therefore, unnecessary for me to pursue the subject further. I beg to remain, Sir, yours very obediently,

R. TYTLER, M.D.

London, February 16th, 1834.

APPLICATION OF

WHITE PAINT TO BURNS AND SCALDS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have been induced by the success of the practice, to lay before you a brief account of a mode of treating burns and scalds which I have followed for some time with great and immediate relief to the patient. The application may not be new, but I have not seen it mentioned in any work that I have read upon the subject,