of, the enormous amount of work done by others on immunity and of the work which probably lies at the root of these experiments—I mean that done on cytolytic processes. Mr. Walker in his reply confessed, in fact, to ignorance in regard to this.

I hardly think it necessary to pick to pieces his criticism of my remarks, for he has so placed these, which were only published in brief abstract, out of the context, that I should have to write out what I said in full to make the position intelligible. To give an instance, surely “work on immunisation” is different from “immunisation,” as quoted by Mr. Walker as a positive fact! I must therefore be general. In the first place, I never said that the results of the work of others coincided in every particular with the results of Mr. Walker's experiments—that would be too much to expect of any work—and I pointed out differences. In the second place I have a good imagination but I cannot recognise the ultimate difference between experiments on immunity and experiments on curative processes based on induced immunity. For Mr. Walker to say that experiments which “deal with the immunisation of mice beforehand to tumours which were subsequently introduced have no bearing upon the treatment of already existing and well-established tumours” is—even if it were true, which it is not—to emphasise his ignorance of the nature of the process and the work done. Direct contradiction is given, if any were needed, by the experiments of Clowes and others on this very subject.

Then in regard to priority. In the historical portion of a paper by Bashford, Murray, and Cramer² they state that Jensen (in 1901) “observed the complete disappearance of tumours from mice that had been successfully inoculated. He added, however, that the ‘results of attempts to cure mice of tumours have hitherto been uncertain.’”

Again: “Borrel recorded suggestive experiments directed to obtaining a polyvalent immune serum against human cancer.” Also: “Clowes the animals in which spontaneous absorption had occurred were stated to possess a specific antibody in their serum which on injection into animals with transplanted tumours *exerted a curative effect*” (italics mine). And so on. There are several very important and interesting papers in the Third Scientific Report of the Imperial Cancer Research Fund dealing with the immunity established in rats to mouse tumours and the immunising effects of other tissues, including the work done with testis. Regarding Mr. Walker's claim to “cure” mouse cancer with “testis serum” I have already spoken—and the less said about it the better!

In conclusion, I only wish there were a hopeful outlook for the experiments, but I think if Mr. Walker will make himself familiar with work on cytolsins generally (of which he confessed ignorance) he will, when he fully understands all they imply, be as doubtful as other workers have been who have considered the question of making a cytolytic serum for human cancer on these lines. All my criticism would have been avoided if Mr. Walker had acknowledged the work of others—whether he conscientiously considered that he was first in the field or not. I make no attack on Mr. Walker and unwillingly allow myself to say this much in answer to his attempt to clear himself. I shall not, therefore, discuss the matter further.—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

Liverpool, Nov. 14th, 1908.

W. BLAIR BELL.

THE NEUROTONE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—May I state in your able journal that I am not the inventor of “The Neurotone or Neurostone,” as it is termed; but during many years of research work in electricity I have found it a perfect appliance to accomplish the object I had in view.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

Ottawa, Nov. 4th, 1908.

J. A. GRANT.

COW'S MILK: A SUGGESTION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I should feel very much obliged if some of your readers who have patients unable to take ordinary cow's milk would be so good as to try those patients with milk from cows which are not in calf. The milk that is supplied daily in this country is in 99 per cent. of cases obtained from cows

in calf. My experience so far has been that patients, especially children, who were unable to digest the ordinary market commodity were when given milk obtained from cows not in calf able to take the latter and thrive on it. The difference between the two milks is considerable, as the drain of the embryonic calf must seriously interfere with the quality of the pregnant cow's milk.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

G. ARBOUR STEPHENS.

Swansea, Nov. 9th, 1908.

BELFAST HEALTH COMMISSION.

(FROM A CORRESPONDENT.)

(Concluded from p. 1483.)

WITH reference to the deplorable state of affairs in Belfast pointed out by the recent Health Commission, that the corporation is without information as to the details of deaths occurring in its district beyond the mere numerical particulars obtained from the Registrar-General's official publication—information without which no sanitary authority can adequately search for, or cope with, causes of disease and death—it is clear the excuse of the committee of the corporation, that it is the duty of the Local Government Board to promote the legislation suggested by the Health Commission in this direction, is mere fencing with the question. The corporation of Belfast should itself promote a Bill and “the most effective and natural way of dealing with it (the question of vital statistics) is to follow the precedent of the English and Scottish Registration Acts, even if such a method involves fresh legislation; and we recommend that this should be done,” says the Health Commission, and it further adds: “In view of the importance of the information as to the details of deaths occurring within the city, we regret that the corporation did not fall in with the suggestion made to them in October, 1907, by the Local Government Board for Ireland, which, pending legislation, would have enabled them to get the information desired.” There can never be any proper public health administration in a city until the medical officer of health has trustworthy vital statistics, and, as the Health Commission reports, any health reforms attempted without such information must be in the nature of leaps in the dark. Imagine a city where, as the Health Commission says, the corporation does not know the causes of death among the children, where “the corporation are completely in the dark as to the places where deaths in the city are occurring, even from such important diseases as phthisis, tuberculosis, pneumonia, cancer, diarrhoea, or from diseases which may be due to industrial causes, to poverty, or to any of the other conditions which may be thought of as associated with modern town influences.” Dr. H. Whitaker, the former medical superintendent officer of health, often drew attention to the defects in his sources of information; nay, more, Mr. H. W. Bailie, in his report just issued for 1907, says in reference to this matter, “We are where we were a year ago.”

In the face of these facts, why does the corporation not promote a Bill itself and get this matter made right, which is the very foundation of public health, and put into its Health Bill all other matters—the control of the milk-supply, certain powers for sanitary administration (as advised by the Health Commission), the getting rid of the abomination of double tenement houses, the reorganisation of the antiquated system by which there is a medical superintendent officer of health and 14 district medical officers of health, so as to make the medical superintendent officer of health the real head of his department, with personal control of everything pertaining to the public health, &c., so as to place Belfast on the level, in public health administration, with any city in England or Scotland? When anyone suggests to the corporation of Belfast the trial of public health measures which have proved efficacious in other cities they always get the same answer, “We have no powers,” and the bogey of the Local Government Board is trotted out. In reply, it may be said if you have not powers your duty is to get them. Sheffield and Bolton got special Acts passed to enable them to make pulmonary tuberculosis compulsorily notifiable, Manchester and Bristol went for special legislation on the milk question, and Huddersfield was compelled by a Committee of the House of Commons for leading

² The Natural and Induced Resistance of Mice to the Growth of Cancer, Proceedings of the Royal Society, B., vol. lxxvi., 1907.