woman in or immediately after *childbirth*, or shall under circumstances of difficulty or danger, without any order, visit any such woman actually receiving relief, or whom the guardians may subsequently decide to have been in a destitute condition, such medical officer shall be paid for his attendance and medicines by a sum of not less than ten shillings nor more than twenty shillings, according as the guardians may agree with such officer."

Lumley, in his Manual, in reference to this order remarks, "that the term 'childbirth' applies only to cases where the pregnancy is so far advanced that it is possible that the child may be born alive; hence the delivery of a seven months' child is within it, and the fact of the child having died before delivery makes no difference." Now it certainly, we think, should be left to the discretion of the guardians to pay the medical officer for attendance upon cases of abortion or premature labour. These are exceptions to common cases of illness, and often involve great anxiety and labour on the part of the medical attendant. The term "generally," as used by Mr. Fleming in answer to the application made to the Poor-law Board on the subject, would seem to imply that exceptions to the Consolidated Order are allowed. What these exceptions are should be as far as possible clearly defined. If the Poor-law Board decline to afford the definition, surely the guardians should be entrusted with the power of awarding fees in cases in which, according to their judgment, the practitioner is entitled to receive them.—ED. L.

STUDY OF CHOLERA BY MILITARY SURGEONS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—A correspondent of yours, signing himself "Dr. Mac-loughlin, Member of the Legion of Honour," has written a paragraph or more of nonsense in two late numbers of your valuable journal, to show that he possesses a *secret* which he is anxious to impart to the *ignorant* Army Medical Department, but those red-tape, stingy people at the War Office will not reward him for it. He says that the question at issue now is, "Has the Army Medical Department ever attempted to study cholera scientifically?" As an individual member of the Department, I beg to reply that I have.

I think it unnecessary in this place, and at the present time, to enter fully into the views entertained by me of the pathology and treatment of the disease in question. It may, however, be as well to inform Dr. Mac-loughlin that we, the members of the Department, are bound down to no particular views. The Director-General very wisely permits us to think and act as our experience and reading teach us, so long as we practice orthodox medicine. We as a body are well acquainted with the medical literature of the day. Our views are those of the best men in the profession.

If Dr. Mac-loughlin will kindly inform me what his *secret* is, and will tell me in what particular our acts have proved to him that we have not "the medical knowledge to appreciate and profit by the pathological researches relative to this disease which have been placed before us," I shall then be happy to discuss the whole question with him, and thereby relieve the Director-General, who I am quite sure is not inclined to waste valuable time in a useless controversy with such a notorious grievance-monger as Dr. Mac-loughlin. I can afford the necessary time for this purpose, as I am at present taking a holiday in search of health.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES CRERAR,
Surgeon, 60th Rifles.

St. Heliers, Jersey, Aug. 1863.

* * Dr. Mac-loughlin, having made a serious charge against the medical officers in the army with respect to their knowledge of the pathology and treatment of cholera, is bound to make good his assertions. We have admitted his letters on cholera into our pages with the view of elucidating the matter. The subject is one of the deepest importance, and cannot be too largely discussed. Dr. Mac-loughlin is an enthusiast, and no doubt animated by praiseworthy motives; but his wholesale charges of ignorance on the part of the army medical staff are not to be justified by mere declamatory assertion or preconceived theory.—ED. L.

THE CARMICHAEL AND HARLEY PRIZES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Probably you will have no objection to publish the following correspondence, for the purpose of showing (as I think) the entire disregard of law and justice on the part of two of our corporate bodies. It shows, moreover, that the Medical Council, as at present constituted, is useless as a court of appeal in matters relating to education and scientific progress.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

Beaufort-street, Chelsea, Aug. 1863.

EDWARDS CRISP, M.D.

To the President and General Council of Medical Education.

GENTLEMEN,—I have forwarded to each of you a pamphlet respecting the Carmichael and Harley Prizes, believing, as I have stated in my printed letter, that one of your functions is to regulate matters in connexion with education and the progress of medical science.

The particulars relating to these prizes are fully given in the pamphlet. In the one instance, three gentlemen (one of them a colleague) awarded a prize to Dr. Harley, who had not complied with any of the injunctions required by the Council of the College of Surgeons; and in the other, the Council of the Dublin College of Surgeons deputed three of their members to decide a matter that Mr. Carmichael directed by his will should be left to the decision of all the Councillors. The Council of this College, moreover, advertised that prizes of £200 and £100 would be given to the best and second-best essays on Medical Reform (*without reservation*), as directed by Mr. Carmichael; and although there were several candidates, the award of the prizes was illegally withheld.

I shall take the liberty hereafter of placing before you other matters relating to corporate illegalities, which I believe specially come within your province. In the mean time I respectfully beg of you to investigate the grievances of which I complain, trusting you will believe that my motive in making this appeal is neither a vindictive nor a pecuniary one.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

EDWARDS CRISP.

June 15th, 1863.

SIR,—I beg to inform you that your memorial and the pamphlet which accompanied it have been submitted to the General Medical Council during their recent session. But the Council found themselves obliged to pass the following resolution:—"That the Council is of opinion that the matters referred to in a memorial presented by Dr. Edwards Crisp, respecting the Carmichael Prizes, is not within the powers of the Council as limited by the Medical Acts, and the Council therefore decline to enter on its consideration."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Dr. Crisp.

FRAS. HAWKINS, Registrar.

IS AMAUROSIS PRODUCED BY TOBACCO?

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—You did me the honour to insert a paper of mine on amaurosis in your impression for the 25th ult. May I now ask space for a few additional observations on the same subject? I am induced to make this request that I may notice a communication of M. Sichel to the Société Médico-Pratique de Paris at its *séance* of Feb. 23rd in the current year, and reported in *L'Union Médicale* of May 5th. I think it is just to M. Sichel and myself that I should state that my paper was communicated to THE LANCET in March last, and that consequently I had not had an opportunity of making myself acquainted with his very important observations "De l'Influence du Tabac Fumer sur la Production d'Amaurose."

I now avail myself of the valuable opinions of that great ophthalmologist in confirmation of the views that I then ventured to publish on the relation between amaurosis and the influence of tobacco. It is true that he does not describe the pathological condition as an atrophy of the optic nerves, as I was induced to consider it in the three cases recorded; but more recent observation has satisfied me that this is the last stage only of a progressing condition.

I was anxious to cite cases in which the abnormality was as positive and as evident as possible, and the attendant subjective symptoms correspondent. I had no doubt that I was enabled to pronounce certain conditions of the fundus of the eye to have been produced by the influence of tobacco, but as they were comprised in differences of vascularity and coloration of the optic nerve, I felt that I should have some difficulty in