I know of but two ready ways of correcting the evil, viz., first, by the chairman doing his duty as moderator and regulator of the evening's proceedings; secondly, by interrupting rambling speakers by some one "rising to order," as at the last meeting, when the proper limits of debate are exceeded. Of these the former is much the better. *Damnatur judex cum nocens absolvitur.* The chair is virtually rebuked for neglect of duty by every well-founded call "to order" on the part of an ordinary member. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

AMICUS CURIAE.

April 12, 1843.

FOREIGN BODY IN THE TRACHEA (?)

FOR A

PERIOD OF TWENTY MONTHS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—At a moment like the present when public attention is directed to the unfortunate case of Mr. Brunel, the following statement may not prove uninteresting to your medical readers:—

On the 20th of June, 1841, my brother, Mr. Louis Lewis, of Kingston, Jamaica, while taking some soup for his dinner, in which was a splinter-bone from the beef of which the soup was composed, accidentally passed such piece of bone into the passage corresponding with that into which Mr. Brunel has, as I conceive, passed the half sovereign. After remaining on that island for eleven months, attended by the first medical men there, without relief, and enduring torment indescribable from a constant irritating cough, kept up by the cause before-mentioned, denying him all rest at night, he determined on making a voyage to this country, where he arrived on the 28th of May, 1842, and immediately visited and was attended by gentlemen whose fame assured him of all the relief that medical skill could give. That my brother at times derived benefit from the treatment he received is most true; that his cough was also for a time subdued is likewise true; but yet he got not well; his nights were still unrefreshed by sleep, his appetite failed, and he was continually expectorating. On the 1st of August last he left for Jamaica, and from the hour he arrived again in that country he grew worse, his frame gradually wasting, until, from being a hearty, robust man, he became a comparative skeleton. For many weeks prior to the 12th of February of the present year, he was constantly expectorating pus, in its odour most offensive. His dissolution was at last anticipated, and his friends in this country forewarned of their threatened loss, but on the 12th of February last, whilst cleansing his mouth, on getting up in the morning, being attacked by slight

cough, without the least pain, after a period of twenty months, out flew the bone, of which the following are the dimensions, namely:—In length, three-quarters of an inch; in breadth, one-eighth of an inch; in weight, nine grains. The bone is now in my possession, and has been seen by many members of the medical profession; and I am more than happy to add, that from the 12th of February my brother has lost his cough and regained his strength, and, indeed, is now as well as if he had never suffered from the accidental cause I have stated. Messrs. Rowe and Keal, surgeons, of 24, Woburn-place, saw the above gentleman frequently. I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

G. C. H. LEWIS.

Woburn-place, Russell-square,
May 2, 1843.

THE PREMEDITATION

OF

M'NAUGHTEN.

"Judex damnatur, quàm nosens absolvitur."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Mr. Guthrie has called my attention to the fact that the newspaper report, which represented him as stating that wounds of the diaphragm are "inevitably fatal," was not correct, and that what he said was, that "wounds of the diaphragm never heal." By saying that such wounds never heal, Mr. Guthrie means that reunion never takes place, though, doubtless, the edges of the wound may cicatrise. I do not altogether regret the inaccuracy into which, relying on the report of the daily prints, I was led, since it gives me an occasion of expressing my respect for Mr. Guthrie as a distinguished surgeon and as a gentleman.

If I do not trespass too far on your space, will you permit me to make a few observations supplementary to my paper of April the 22nd? Would it not be proper for such members of the profession as dissent from the medical evidence, on M'Naughten's behalf, in the late trial, to take some public and formal mode of making known that dissent, and thus shifting from themselves the responsibility which might seem fairly to attach to the profession, in the event, almost surely to be looked for ere long, of some fresh horror of a similar kind?

I also beg leave to call attention to a most extraordinary statement in an article in the "British and Foreign Medical Review," a review, however, which, notwithstanding occasional inaccuracies like that which I am about to indicate, is an honour to England, and has secured an immortal name to the honourable, public-spirited, and erudite physician,* who has originated it and so many

* Dr. Forbes.