employés of the English Vaccine Establishment would report to their superior officers cases *which the latter are peculiarly desirous to have reported,*" and more to the same effect. Now the cases reported upon by Mr. Hutchinson would never have come to the knowledge of that gentleman but for the action taken by the officers in question to bring them to his knowledge, and with the special object of their being subjected to independent and unquestionable testimony. The facts as to this are sufficiently familiar to give occasion for surprise that they should not have been known to Dr. Martin. We would willingly have passed over this portion of Dr. Martin's report in silence, but Dr. Weir will have it otherwise.—ED. L.

"LITHOTRITY COMBINED WITH LITHOTOMY."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—A few words will, I think, suffice to show that the combination performed by me in the case reported at p. 901 of your journal for June 22nd, was widely different in object and execution from that practised by Mr. Macnamara. The crushing operation performed by him would not be considered lithotritry by any lithotritist in Europe or America. The expressive term "fragmentation" has been invented by the Americans to distinguish it from lithotritry. The object aimed at by surgeons like Gouley and Mr. Macnamara is to break up a large stone into several small ones, and so render the operation of lateral lithotomy less dangerous, it being well known that it is not nearly so hazardous to extract four calculi, each weighing half an ounce, as one stone of two ounces. The following statement of Mr. Macnamara that "he was in the habit of first crushing a stone, if of large size, and then performing lithotomy," shows clearly that the crushing operation was not lithotritry, for if it had been there would have been no necessity to perform lithotomy. By lithotritry is meant an operation which reduces a stone to pieces sufficiently small to pass by the urethra; but as Mr. Macnamara only broke up the stone into several calculi, he had, as he says, to perform "the usual operation of lithotomy," which it was the end and aim of my plan to avoid. I, on the contrary, did a perfect lithotritry, each fragment being small enough to pass from the bladder without making any cut into that organ. I simply incised the urethra for the purpose of removing the pieces, as the patient's bladder had no power to expel them. The difference between my combination and that of Mr. Macnamara's will at once be seen when each is correctly formulated. His was "*fragmentation*," and "the usual operation of *lithotomy*." Mine was *lithotritry*, followed by *external urethrotomy*.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Portman-square, July 1st, 1878.

W. F. TEEVAN.

THE DEATH OF THE QUEEN OF SPAIN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It seems but too evident that the Queen of Spain lost her chance of recovery from the over anxiety and assiduity of her friends. The avoidance of excitement of all kinds is of the very greatest importance in that stage of typhoid fever in which the Queen saw her father and other relatives. I have known more than one instance where the pressing anxiety of parents has turned the scale against the sufferer, and led to a fatal issue. It is frequently the most difficult thing to impress upon friends and nurses the absolute need of repose in every case where the powers of life are in danger of failing.

The Queen appears to have lost her consciousness soon after the visit of her father, and to have passed rapidly away after that event. Had she been a poor patient, with the quiet nursing of well-trained attendants, there was apparently every chance of recovery.

I remain, Sir, yours truly,

Marlborough College, July 2nd, 1878.

WALTER FERGUS.

COLONIAL MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have the honour to forward a copy of a letter from the Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands and Public Works at the Cape of Good Hope, referring to an advertise-

ment which appears to have been published in THE LANCET, relative to an alleged vacancy at the Alicedale Infirmary.

As no direct reference is given to the advertisement, it is possible that the Commissioner may have been misinformed, but the Crown Agents think it desirable to call your attention to the matter, in order that you may, if you think it necessary, take steps to contradict the statement that any such vacancy exists.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Downing-street, London, June 29th, 1878. M. F. OMMANNEY.

* * No advertisement relating to Alicedale has appeared in THE LANCET, and no reference has been made to Alicedale in any editorial or other article.—ED. L.

THE CHELMSFORD HYDROPHOBIA CASE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I regret that Dr. Nicholls has taken umbrage at my comments on his case. I merely stated, which I yet maintain, that I do not *think* it will be accepted as a genuine case of hydrophobia.

It was my fortune to see several cases of this disease while serving abroad, and I shall be very happy to furnish Dr. Nicholls with my notes of them, as well as my name, service, and qualifications. May I draw attention to Dr. Buzard's case in your issue of to-day, contrasting it with the Chelmsford one, and leave the profession to judge which is truer to the generally accepted notion of hydrophobia?

Apologising for trespassing on your valuable space,

I remain, Sir, yours truly,

June 29th, 1878.

DUBITANS.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, June 27th.

DENTAL PRACTITIONERS BILL.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, which had come up from the Commons, said that its object was to provide for the examination and registration of dentists. It was proposed that in future no dentist who had not undergone an examination should be entitled to practise. An exception, to work retrospectively, was made in favour of dentists who had been for some time engaged in the active practice of the dental profession. The measure was viewed favourably by the Medical Council, under whose supervision the examinations for dentists were proposed to be held, and, as the promoters of the Bill had the same object in view as the Lord President of the Council had in the portion of his Medical Bill applying to dentists, and as the Bill before their lordships went further in some respects than the Government Bill, so far as the latter referred to dentists, he believed the noble duke would not oppose it in an amended form. With the view of having the amendments printed, he would propose to go into committee *pro formâ* on the following day.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON thought the course proposed by the noble marquis was a convenient one. Though there might be some objection to the Bill as it stood, it was framed with the same object as the Government Bill, and might, perhaps, go a little further. After the amendments to which the noble lord had referred were printed, he had little doubt that he might be able to give the noble marquis any assistance he might require.

The Bill was then read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, July 1st.

IRISH MEDICAL TESTIMONY.

Mr. R. SMYTH asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether his attention had been called to a report of proceedings at Quarter Sessions, Dungannon; if it was true, as stated by the Sessional Crown solicitor, that a circular had been issued from Dublin Castle, signed by the Under-Secretary, directing that medical gentlemen should not be summoned to give evidence in cases of assault, unless where life has been endangered; and if, considering the statement made by the county court judge, Sir Francis Brady, when commenting upon a serious case of assault, that the issue of