pauper really in no official capacity? Was he, or was he not, a pauper porter, unpaid, and therefore regarded as an irresponsible person? We know that in some workhouses in London there are pauper nurses, and the way in which they perform their duties was painfully illustrated at the late inquest in St. Giles's. It would have been well, we think, if Mr. Villiers had waited, ere he made his somewhat ungenerous explanations, for the depositions taken before the coroner, and seen how nearly they tallied with the report furnished by the inspector appointed to inquire into the matter. When our brethren are really in fault we have no desire to screen them from the consequences; but it is only justice to the profession and the public that in a case like that of Mary Green a most searching inquiry should be instituted. Dr. Butler's plain and simple statement of the affair, as recorded in *THE LANCET* of last week, remains still uncontradicted, and until it is so we must abide by the opinions we have expressed upon the entire matter.

THE LATE CZAREWITCH.

THE following authentic particulars of the illness of the late Czarewitch possess a melancholy interest. Five years ago he had a fall from his horse. The injury he received attracted very little attention at the time, but he has never been in his usual health since. Three months ago he was confined to his bed from pain in the lower region of the spine, and was then attended by MM. Nélaton and Royer, who pronounced the disease to be lumbago, and that he would soon be restored to health. About a fortnight previous to his death the Czarewitch suffered from a series of symptoms which some of his medical attendants considered to arise from intermittent fever, whilst others were of a different opinion. The treatment consisted mainly in the administration of quinine. He was also treated by electro-galvanism. He died of inflammation of the membranes of the brain and spinal cord. The after-death examination revealed caries of three of the lumbar vertebræ, and a psoas abscess of the size of a pigeon's egg. Tubercles were found in the lungs and brain, one in the substance of the latter being as large as a pea. Dr. Haartman had the immediate charge of the Prince for ten days previous to his death. A detailed account of his illness will, by consent of the Emperor, be shortly published.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

MR. HENRY SMITH'S FATAL CASE OF STRICTURE OF THE URETHRA FOLLOWING THE USE OF HOLT'S DILATOR.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR,—The following extracts are from letters I have already received since you did me the favour to publish my reply to Mr. Henry Smith:—

Mr. Paget: "I have no record of the number of cases, but they are six or more. I have seen no fatal or other untoward result. I operated on one to-day, and propose to do so on another on Wednesday. Mr. Thomas Smith tells me he has employed it twice with good results."

Mr. Birkett: "I know not the number of cases, but I can state that no fatal result has followed the employment of rapid dilatation."

Mr. Campbell de Morgan: "I cannot tell you the number of times I have used forced dilatation of the urethra, but I have done it very many times. I have never had a fatal case."

Mr. Hulke: "I treated several cases with it at King's College, and have continued to use it at the Middlesex, and have

never seen extravasation or fatal result. My cases number more than thirty."

Mr. C. H. Moore: "I have used your dilator perhaps four times, and certainly with no fatal result."

Mr. Holmes: "I have operated five or six times with your instrument. None of my cases were followed by any unpleasant, still less alarming, symptoms."

Dr. Wiblin, of Southampton: "I have adopted your immediate method in twenty-nine cases, and I obtained the most complete success in every instance. I look upon your operation as one of the greatest surgical achievements of the last five-and-twenty years. Mr. Henry Smith's case will not shake my confidence in any degree."

Mr. William Bird, of York: "I have used your dilator about twenty-five times, with the greatest satisfaction both to my patients and myself. In no case have I seen any ill effect follow the forcible dilatation."

Mr. Macnamara, of Dublin: "I have had considerably more than a hundred cases. I never saw a worse symptom than rigor, and that only in exceptional cases. I have operated upon some with valvular disease of the heart; with fistula in perineo; on relapsed cases that have been previously treated by Syme's operation; by caustics; where incontinence of urine existed; in cases of such irritable urethra that the slightest attempt to introduce a gum catheter was attended with intense agony, rigors, and sweats; and yet I have never seen any result save that I have already mentioned (rigors), and that in not five per cent. of the cases."

Mr. Smyly, of Dublin: "I have employed it in sixteen cases, and have never seen even an unpleasant result."

Mr. Robert Macdonnell, Dublin: "I have employed it in six cases without seeing a single untoward symptom."

Mr. Moorhead, Staff-Surgeon at Netley Hospital: "I have performed your operation for stricture of the urethra on thirteen occasions without a fatal result."

Mr. James Lane: "I have only employed it once, and that was on Saturday last. The patient has had no pain greater than that caused by the passage of a bougie; no bleeding, no rigor, or other unpleasant symptom, although his urethra was exceedingly irritable, and rigors had frequently followed the passage of small bougies. I read the case recorded in *THE LANCET* of March 18th before operating on this gentleman. It produced no hesitation or misgiving in my mind, as I regarded it as entirely exceptional, and therefore of no practical value to influence one's proceedings. My uncle has operated eight times with your instrument. Five of the cases were at St. Mary's; three were private. The result has been eminently satisfactory in all. He, like myself, has used it exceptionally, and in cases where he would formerly have resorted to perineal section."

Mr. Newman, of Stamford, has employed it in four cases, published in the *British Medical Journal*.

My own cases number 317 during a period of more than ten years, and in this number I have had two cases where death has occurred, but certainly not in any manner dependent on my operation. One has been already alluded to. The second was in a patient who never suffered in any manner from the operation, but died from serous apoplexy a week after my seeing him, the physician in whose house he was staying being so satisfied of the nature of his illness that I knew nothing of the death until after it had occurred. Thus we have, without Mr. Birkett's or Mr. Campbell de Morgan's, 573 operations, I may say without any bad consequences that can be attributed to the operation.

Faithfully yours,

Saville-row, April, 1865.

BARNARD HOLT, F.R.C.S.

STIMULANTS TO NEW-BORN INFANTS.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR,—If you think the accompanying case worthy of publication, I shall feel obliged by your inserting it in *THE LANCET*. From conversations I have had with different medical friends of experience, I judge that such an early and large administration of stimulants to a new-born infant is uncommon. I have had several somewhat similar cases which proved successful. Two of them were new-born infants; the others were those of feeble infants ranging from one to twelve months old, where I freely administered stimulants. In some instances the little patients were suffering from acute bronchitis and pneumonia, and, with the wine stimulant, stimulating expectorants and emetics were administered, mustard plasters and

turpentine fomentations applied, and, where these latter failed to relieve, small blisters of cantharides.

The risk of giving wine to infants is not so much from its stimulant as from its sedative effect: in large doses it will act almost like an opiate; a combination with ammonia will prevent this. Of course I do not for one moment advise the incautious or indiscriminate use of such a powerful agent as wine to young infants; but I do advocate its being fearlessly employed where the vital powers are sinking, even though inflammatory disease may be present.

I attended in her confinement Mrs. H—, aged forty-two, a woman of feeble frame and imperfect general health. She was delivered on Wednesday morning, Jan. 21st, 1863, at half-past nine A.M., of a male child. The birth was accomplished by slight expulsive pains, and there was some subsequent difficulty in inducing full uterine contraction. The child was one of the most wretched-looking infants I ever saw—literally almost skin and bone; its little wrinkled face was like that of an old man; its cry a feeble wail. I gave the usual directions to the nurse, and not being sent for I did not again see Mrs. H— until the following morning, at nine A.M. The mother was doing well; the infant was rapidly sinking. I learned that the only nourishment it had taken was a little milk and water, which it swallowed with some difficulty, and that the nurse, believing medicine necessary, had forced down its throat a teaspoonful of castor oil, from the violent purgative effects of which he was yet suffering, and the body was but half warm. I ordered the infant to be kept close to the fire, to be wrapped up in hot flannel clothes, which were to be frequently changed so as to ensure the constant application of heat, and to have in repeated doses small quantities of boiled rice-milk, with a few drops of brandy. The child swallowed with considerable difficulty, and slight spasm of the glottis accompanied the act. At one P.M. on Friday morning the purging was still unchecked. The infant had an attack of convulsions, and according to the mother's account there was "a general twitching" of the frame, and "the eyes were turned up." The legs were immediately put for a few seconds into hot water, and the brandy and milk continued. At nine A.M. I saw him. He had then just recovered from a second convulsion; the purging remained unchecked, and he was scarcely alive. Every effort to swallow was followed by spasm in the throat, which nearly threatened suffocation. I should have stated that I had tried astringents, but the difficulty of swallowing them, even in the minutest doses, was such that I gave them up, and trusted to nutriment only. I now ordered the strongest beef-tea to be prepared and carefully cleared, and this, with port-wine, to be given in such quantities as the child was able to swallow. The mother and nurse objected to this as "useless torture to the poor infant;" but I insisted, and waited until I had seen the child swallow about three drops of the mixture in as many doses. The first, though very cautiously and slowly given, brought on such a spasm as to nearly choke him. The two other drops were swallowed more easily, though yet with great difficulty. Plain milk and water caused more spasm than the beef-tea and wine. I desired a continuance of the treatment, and urgently insisted on the body being kept well warmed by the hot flannel cloths.

On the next morning (Saturday) at nine A.M. I again saw the infant; he was then much better; the diarrhoea less. He was able to swallow without difficulty, and he moved about his arms and legs with some energy; his body was thoroughly warm. He had taken since the previous morning—namely, in about twenty-four hours—six teaspoonfuls of beef-tea and three of port-wine, and no other food. The treatment was continued until seven P.M., when it was stopped, and water, arrowroot, and port-wine substituted. The child was altogether better, the diarrhoea less, and upon its being applied to the breast he for the first time attempted to suck. The child continued from this time rapidly to improve, and the diarrhoea soon entirely left. The mother had a large supply of breast-milk, and by the use of a highly nutritious diet and a good quantity of wine the quality of the milk was so improved as to form a sufficient nutriment for the infant, for whom, however, on a few occasions, when there seemed some little failing, I again had recourse to the wine in small quantities, and with the best effects. He is now a remarkably fine child, and it is difficult to believe that the full-grown beautiful boy had been the little shrivelled mannikin of two years before.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. V. M'CORMICK, M.D. Edin.,
Late Assistant-Physician to the
South-Eastern Lying-in Hospital, Dublin.

Shrewsbury Villas, Bayswater, March, 1865.

RECURRING OR RELAPSING FEVER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I think the following case just now will be interesting and instructive to your readers:—

On the 16th of February last I was called to see an infant six months old, who was suddenly seized with a kind of lethargy, hot skin, quick pulse, and stiffness of the muscles of the neck. The head was heavy and drawn on one side, and any movement occasioned pain; tongue clean; pupils natural; no strabismus; bowels regular. Several pimples appeared on the legs and body. The teeth were not the occasion of the disturbance. Ordered a warm bath, salines, stimulants, and diaphoretics. These symptoms ebbed and flowed till the 22nd, when the friends becoming anxious called in a gentleman, who "diagnosed water on the brain." He ordered a cold bath and treated homœopathically until April 1st, when I was called to the child again. The father, who is a good observer, said: "Now, doctor, according to D—, I believe we have a case of remittent fever." I found the child's symptoms somewhat different, though still in a very unsatisfactory state: the pain and soreness of the muscles not so great; the lethargy or stupor occurs every fourth day, lasting some twenty-four hours, with great heat of surface; no sweats. The mother stated that before the symptoms recurred she always noticed a "goose-flesh" appearance of the skin, doubtless indicating an imperfect development of the "cold stage." I prescribed quinine and brandy, but the stomach rejected both. I am now giving two grains of the quinine twice a day in starch as an injection. The symptoms are now abating.

On Thursday, the 6th of April, I saw a very interesting account in *The Times* of the Russian epidemic—this so-called "recurring or relapsing fever." I could not fail to recognise the same type of fever in my little patient who had given me so much anxiety. Surely coming events do sometimes cast their shadows before.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY THOS. BERRY, M.R.C.S.

Amwell-street, Claremont-square, April, 1865.

THE CASE OF MARY GREEN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Your able article in last week's number of THE LANCET is a practical vindication of the character of Dr. Butler under the cruel and causeless attack which has been made on him by a daily paper in the case of Mary Green, for whose sad death he can be held in justice no way responsible. Is it not time that jurymen and journalists, who are so liberal with the professional aid of medical men, for which they take care never to pay, and so free with severe animadversions in case of any mischance, for which they deem themselves irresponsible, should be taught a wholesome lesson?—in order to prove that which never seems to occur to them as a fact, that the reputation of a medical man constitutes his very bread, and is too sacred to be causelessly assailed.

I trust the profession will aid Dr. Butler should he be advised by legal means to vindicate his character; it seems to me precisely a case in which we should stand by the interests of our order. I, for one, will gladly subscribe five guineas for this purpose.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD YOUNG.

SMALL-POX VERSUS INSANITY;

AND

PREVENTION OF PITTING IN THE FORMER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—On the 27th of Jan. last I was called to Northampton, there to superintend a temporary hospital containing lunatics suffering from small-pox. And as there are one or two observations which I should like to make concerning them, you will, doubtless, find room for them in THE LANCET.

The first is, that when the patients became ill from the effects of this disease they became more rational, and, in one case, quite sane; and, again, when the small-pox left them, they returned to their former state of insanity. These changes were well marked; and I believe I am the first to describe them,—if not, let any of your readers say so.