proceedings, it would tend, I beg humbly to submit, more to the honour and dignity of the Society than any change of name.

I am, Sir, yours &c.,

March, 1863.

AN OLD FELLOW.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As I find myself in your last number taken to task by “A Fellow” of the Medico-Chirurgical Society for undue adhesiveness to office in that Society, I beg leave to state for the information of the writer, and your readers, that my official position in the Society has been only that of member of the Council in the session 1854-5, and Librarian in 1866-7. I even lost my customary re-election in 1855-6 by non-attendance, in consequence of my frequent absence in Paris in the spring of 1855 in connexion with the Universal Exhibition of that year. I trust, for the credit of the writers, that the exceptions taken to the recent action of the Council, in that and another letter preceding the one to which I have alluded, may have stronger legs to stand on than in the case of

Your obedient servant,

“THE PERENNIAL MR.” C. BROOKE.

Fitzroy-square, March 2nd, 1863.

QUALIFICATION OF A VACCINATOR TO BE A GUARDIAN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Although there is no clause in the Vaccination Act of last year to disqualify a public vaccinator from becoming a member of a board of guardians, the Statute 5 and 6 Vict., c. 57, § 14, enacts that “no person receiving any fixed salary or emolument from the poor-rates in any parish or union shall be capable of serving as a guardian in such parish or union.”

The Poor-law Commissioners have held that a public vaccinator who has contracted with the guardians at fixed rates of payment is disqualified to be elected as a guardian. If he were elected, he might have to decide upon the propriety of his own conduct in his office.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Gwydyr House, March 2nd, 1863.

W. G. LUMLEY.

INFANTILE REMITTENT FEVER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the report of the discussion at the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, “On Infantile Remittent Fever,” No. VIII., p. 258 of your journal, the remarks attributed to me do not read exactly as I wished them to be understood. You will, therefore, much oblige me by the insertion of a short explanation.

I first mentioned that in Germany no single disease responding to the term “infantile remittent fever” was known, and that when I came to London, many years ago, I endeavoured to make myself acquainted with this disease; that I later had the opportunity of seeing a considerable number of cases, designated as suffering from it by some of the most distinguished men; and that of these cases a certain number were clearly “typhoid fever,” others were quite as clearly of “agueish” character—i. e., “intermittent fever,” which in children, especially in the beginning of the attack, is less typical and less easily recognised than in the adult; that in other cases I had to regard broncho-pneumonia of the apex as the real nature of the disease, and again, in others, gastric and intestinal irritation from various causes; that, in short, all the instances I had seen were more or less marked specimens of other generally recognised diseases, as they occur in children.

The cases related by Mr. Curgenvin in his valuable paper I regarded as belonging to intermittent fever.

It certainly cannot be desirable, Sir, that we perpetuate a name which not only leads to endless confusion in the classification of diseases in statistical reports, but is also apt to lead to mistakes in prognosis and treatment; for surely we do not deal in the same way with ague and typhoid fever, or pneumonia, or gastric irritation induced by improper food and other noxious causes, internal or external. It appears to me, on the contrary, a duty to support men like Dr. West in endeavouring to remove the term “infantile remittent fever” from English medical nomenclature.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Finsbury-square, March, 1863.

HERMANN WEBER.

THE CORONERSHIP OF WEST MIDDLESEX.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I suppose that everyone acquainted with the useful and meritorious labours of Dr. Hardwicke in sanitary reforms, knowing his experience in, and peculiar fitness for, medico-judicial inquiries, and his general great accomplishments, will feel a profound regret at the failure of his election to the office of Coroner for West Middlesex.

In addition, I understand that the legality of the votes by which this result was obtained is challenged. Under these circumstances, I hope you will consent to receive subscriptions for a fund to assist that gentleman in defraying some of the heavy expenses into which he has been drawn, and for that purpose you will permit me to enclose to you my cheque for three guineas.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS HAWKSLEY.

Brook-street, Grosvenor-square, Feb. 27th, 1868.

* * We shall be happy to forward subscriptions to the proper quarter.

RETIREMENT OF INSPECTOR-GENERAL MOUAT ON HALF-PAY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Your impression of the 22nd contains a letter signed “One of the Aggrieved,” on which I would wish to say a few words, more particularly as the case referred to appears to me to have been much misrepresented in several communications recently addressed both to the medical and military journals, and in which we have had the views of Mr. Mouat and his friends set forth.

Your readers must be made aware of what your correspondent seems to have entirely ignored, that the case of Mr. Mouat is a common one, and in accordance with the custom of the service.

During the last two or three years I can call to mind among the upper ranks the names of Drs. Jamieson, Annesley, Langley, Fraser, and Sall, all of whom were obliged to retire in consequence of their unfitness for general service; and in the case of Dr. T. Goldie Scot, his promotion was cancelled, and he had to retire on the half pay of a lower rank, on account of his declining to go to India.

It may seem harsh to say so, but the injustice would be to make an exception, even in Mr. Mouat's case; nor can I clearly comprehend (with all his distinguished services) that they are so very transcendent as to justify a deviation from rules in his favour, so stringently carried out in the cases of other old and deserving officers. I am not a little surprised at the misapprehension which appears to exist in your correspondent's mind on the subject of medical boards and half pay.

If an officer gets an order to proceed anywhere, he must obey that order or resign the service. He always however can plead his inability to proceed on the score of ill health; but in this case a medical board is ordered to report on his condition with the view of giving him a title to a higher rate of half pay than he would otherwise be entitled to.

Mr. Mouat does not deny that he was senior on the roster, and consequently the right person to go abroad, particularly as he had not completed, like Dr. Muir, his foreign tour of duty as an inspector.

Without a knowledge of these facts your readers are apt to be misled.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

Feb. 1868.

FAIR PLAY.

ON MEDIO-BILATERAL LITHOTOMY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Sir W. Fergusson's clinical lecture and the instructive remarks of Mr. Erichsen and Sir H. Thompson which have followed it, induce me somewhat earlier than I intended, briefly to allude to a plan which I have adopted for the removal of stone from the bladder of the adult in cases unfitted for crush-ing.

On October 10th, 1867, I performed at Wolverhampton General Hospital lithotomy in two cases: one, a boy, cut laterally; and the other an elderly man, aged sixty-seven years, from whom I removed a large flat stone after the following