The application of these officers to the East London Union for an increase of salary was met at their board by a return, showing the rate per head, of the sums paid for medical relief on the population of several metropolitan unions and parishes. This was done at the urgent solicitation of the medical committee, and the succeeding paragraph, which is, however, a part only of my illustration of the failure of this computing medical salaries. At page 93 the reader will also detect the absence of a requisite preamble to the last paragraph of the first column, commencing "In every case." In the second column there is also entirely omitted before "2. Pauper Lunatics," No. "2," case in point—viz., only versa the Borough Guardians, as detailed in the February of January last, 1857. The carelessness and the faulty arrangement of some of the paragraphs will at once strike the reader without my occupying further space with the enumeration.

I have been called to a Committee of the Metropolitan Poor-Law Medical Officers to determine whether or not it will be advisable to furnish the parliamentary Poor-Law Committee next session with these details and facts that have been omitted. Owing to the lateness of the session when the medical evidence was received, it was not considered desirable to present to either of the Houses of Parliament the petitions agreed upon at the general meeting of the Metropolitan Poor-Law Medical Officers held at the last sitting of the Senate of the United States (June, 1857). The petition and statement (which appears in the aforesaid Appendix) which was adopted at the meeting at the rooms of the Royal Medical Benevolent College. The petitions are still in circulation for signatures, and will be presented at the next session of Parliament.

I will, in conclusion, take this opportunity of drawing the grave attention of the whole body of the Poor-law medical officers to the important fact, from the remarks of the chairman, made both to Mr. Griffin and myself, it is evident there is, and will be, a very strong endeavour on the part of the guardians to obtain the amending of the permanent powers of the appointment of all the officers of the union will be thrown in by the Poor-law Board as a "sop in the pan," to mitigate and appease the antagonism to the re-organization of the protective powers of the Abdallon House. I send you the following gentle service, ROB'T FOWLER, M.D. EDIN., Hon. Secretary to the Committee of the Metropolitan Poor-Law Medical Officers.

To the Editor of the Lancet.

Sir,—Seeing an account of a case of Umbilical Hemorrhage, by M. Homolle, quoted in your last impression, I am induced to report a very similar one which occurred in my practice a short time ago.

Mrs. S—, about forty-two years of age, the mother of four living children, was confined on September 17th. Her labour was slow from want of uterine power, and the child, though lively and active, was smaller than usual. There was extensive fatty degeneration of the placenta and funis. The child got on very well for three or four days, when oozing of blood took place from the funis (not as yet thrown off) close to the abdon-inal wall, followed by a detachment of the umbilical cord. A pledge of lint, saturated with peroxide of iron, was firmly pressed to the part, and retained by adhesive plaster round the body. The bleeding ceased for some hours; but afterwards re-commenced from the same place, and also from the right upper eyelid and behind the left ear. Several dark stains like those of ecchymosis also appeared on different parts of the body. The child sank from debility, induced by loss of blood, and died at the end of six days. The fatty change in the structure of the placenta was well marked, and I have no doubt was the direct cause of the malnutrition of the child, and the consequent hemorrhogic diathesis. The funis also was extensively atrophied. In my opinion, I should like to ask some of your chemical readers, what is the nature of commerce, and what effects might be expected to arise from its internal administration? The question is suggested by the fact of my having before me, more than a hundred, if not two hundred, the very same appearance taken by mistake about a wineglassful of petroline. Vomiting was speedily induced, but no bad symptoms followed. The small quantity which was absorbed acted on the kidneys, producing an increased quantity of urine, strongly scented with the liquid swallowed.

Petroline and paraffin are to be found in every cottage, and accidents of the kind I relate are very likely to occur, so that it may be well worth while to consider whether it contain any thing more poisonous than their relatives, turpentine and naphtha.

I am, Sir, yours very truly,

Swansea, October 18, 1857.

JAMES SHEPHERD, M.R.C.S.