gratuitous trouble of redressing public evils; but recently on a Sunday a street case of wholesale poisoning by lemonade syphonage, of such glaring prominence, came before my notice, that I cannot, without a guilty cynicism, forbear to intervene. Outside an Italian ice and lemonade shop I, whilst some twenty paces distant, was struck by the grass-green tint of the lemonade contained in a glass reservoir. Walking up close to it, I was horrified to see a copper syphon tube steeping in the reservoir; and this is not all. The constructor had evidently reflected on the hydraulic conditions of syphonage. He had adapted a spring stopper to the free mouth of the copper syphon in such a way that finger-pressure would at once cause the syphon to flow. The practical result of this arrangement, as will be seen, is that each successive glass of lemonade drawn not only holds the percentage of copper contained in the reservoir bulk of lemonade (dangerously strong already), but an additional portion of higher concentration, locked up in the syphon before it is caused to act. The lemonade was extensively patronised. Standing aside at a distance, I saw more than a dozen customers, each one booked, as I think you will admit, for an inevitable colicky pain at the least—in some cases for actual colic, which probably might be hereafter attributed to the eating of fruit, to atmospheric agencies—in short, to one of many causes not the right one.

Having put you in possession of the facts, it may be deemed worth while to throw down the copper held by a glass of this lemonade, and publish its amount. Either sulphuretted hydrogen or hydrosulphate of ammonia would of course effect precipitation at once, previous neutralisation being in the case of acid copper solutions unnecessary.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
J. SCOFFERN, M.B. Lond.

June 28th, 1880.

BLISTER TREATMENT OF ACUTE RHEUMATISM.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I was pleased to observe in the last number of your journal the remarks made by Mr. Hott of Bromley, Kent, respecting the value of the blister treatment of acute rheumatism. This plan I had extensively worked out at the London Hospital, and published the results obtained in the reports for 1864.

Treatment is unfortunately very much the subject of fashion, and tried and approved modes of practice are often laid aside and forgotten in the search for novelties. I am glad to find that the notice of the profession is again drawn to a safe and sound plan of treatment which rapidly relieves the pain and fever, and when carried out *boldly and decisively* shields the heart from inflammatory action and permanent structural change.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
HERBERT DAVIES, M.D.,
Consulting Physician to the London Hospital.

Finsbury-square, July 3rd, 1880.

ON THE EXCISION OF OBSTRUCTION AT THE NECK OF THE BLADDER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Mr. Browne commenced by objecting to Mercier's operation on the broad principle that such operations as "excision of obstruction at the neck of the bladder" were "useless" and "injurious." Finding, however, from the evidence I brought forward that the removal of prostatic obstruction was practised by some surgeons and recommended by others, he shifted his position, objecting now to the operation on the ground of the particular means employed to effect the object, "by passing instruments down the urethra." The *principle* of the desirability of removing prostatic obstruction, in certain exceptional cases, may now be regarded as established, and whether a surgeon prefer to effect the object by cystotomy, or by perineal puncture and ligature, or by excision per urethram, is altogether a secondary question to be decided by each operator as he may think best. For Mr. Browne to object to an operation because it had in many instances to be repeated, is about as reasonable as if a surgeon were to object to lithotripsy on the

ground that Sir H. Thompson had in so many of his cases been obliged to repeat it. Before commencing my lectures I applied to M. Mercier for recent information regarding his operation. Unfortunately he was absent from Paris and very ill, but promised that he would give it on his return. Within the past few days I have received a letter from M. Reliquet, stating that he had recently performed Mercier's operation in two instances and that the results were "heureux." So much for the operation which Mr. Browne says was abandoned because it was useless and injurious.

On the one side we have positive evidence of the value of the operation afforded; firstly, by a series of cases published by Mercier, *with the names and addresses of the patients*; secondly, by the report of the Académie de Médecine; thirdly, by that of the Académie des Sciences; and, fourthly, by Reliquet's practice. What have we on the other side? The allegations of Mr. Browne, who has failed to produce any facts to support them.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
W. F. TEEVAN.
Portman-square, July 5th, 1880.

THE DISPUTE AT GUY'S HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I beg to forward a copy of a letter sent by the students to Mr. Brudenell Carter, and to ask you to kindly insert it in the next number of THE LANCET.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,
W. HALE WHITE, M.B. Lond.
House Physician.

The Reading Room, Guy's Hospital, June 6th, 1880.

To R. BRUDENELL CARTER, Esq.

SIR,—We, the undersigned students of Guy's Hospital beg leave to offer you our thanks for your letter to THE LANCET of the 25th ult. We desire to assure you that our demonstration against the Treasurer was undertaken with the greatest reluctance, and only under the conscientious conviction that our justification was in this case perfect. We feel deeply grateful for the sympathy shown towards the staff of our hospital, engaged as they are in a difficult and delicate controversy, to preserve intact the tradition of a school which numbers in its roll the names of Bright, Addison, and Astley Cooper, and to keep their patients from the grasp of a nursing system which in its vaunting self-sufficiency shrinks not from endangering their safety, and utterly destroys the old home comforts of the ward.

We have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servants,

A. ERNEST MAYLARD, M.B., B.S. Lond.,
Senior House Surgeon,
G. H. RUSSELL, M.B. Lond.,
Senior House Physician,
R. WATTS WHITE, M.R.C.S.,
House Surgeon,
W. HALE WHITE, M.B. Lond.,
House Physician,
J. H. MORSE, M.R.C.S.,
Junior House Surgeon,
J. A. J. HOWELL, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.,
Junior House Physician,
T. S. CROOK, M.R.C.S.,
Senior Obstetric Resident,
H. H. STURGE, M.R.C.S.,
Junior Obstetric Resident.

June 29th, 1880.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In answer to Mr. Larkin's appeal, I would suggest a committee of old Guyites, to demand from the Governors the immediate resignation of both Matron and Treasurer, to restore order; and that the nursing arrangements be placed under the supervision of the Medical Superintendent. If this is refused, try the question in our law courts—"That the nursing arrangements being prejudicial to the care and comfort of the sick in the hospital, are not the Governors acting contrary to the Trust Deed of the founder in allowing such a thing to exist?"

The present state of things has gone too far, and it is the duty of all Guy's men to rally round the staff. A mass meeting would be useless; it must be done by a committee in London, who should act for those in the country.

I am, Sir, yours truly,
C. F. HARDING, M.D.,
Whittlesea, July 5th, 1880. Formerly Birkett & Bryant's Dresser.