all present an utter impossibility for the leg to be moved ; but in the course of the night the child had so far recovered his liberty, that, on my going round in the morning, I deemed it necessary to immediately place the fracture on Mr. Amesbury's apparatus, which, from the peculiar circumstances of the case, I did with the greatest care and attention, and again fixed the child, by rollers and other means, with the view of keeping it perfectly quiet. This was successful for about two days, when, in spite of everything, the child got his foot out of the shoe, and consequently once more put the leg out of position. I again set it, this time putting on the under splint, which appeared to keep the limb in its proper place, but after a short time, from continued restlessness and attempts to get out of bed, &c., it was found impossible to keep the leg quiet. I then, after resetting it several times, abandoned the Amesbury, and substituted Desault's long splint, with others, on the leg, the whole being encompassed by several rollers ; but from the constant filth the child was in from every time its bowels were open, dirtying the bed, &c., the bandages were frequently obliged to be removed.

In spite of every unfavourable circumstance, I can prove, by the dressers and others, that the child was dismissed at the expiration of nine weeks, with the leg *straight*, but with a greater quantity of provisional callus thrown out than is usual, in consequence of its having been necessary to remove the rollers so many times.

The child passed the board in the usual way, when the chairman asked his father, among the rest of the patients discharged that day, if they had any complaints to make, when no answer was returned. If the father did not feel satisfied, why did he not complain then, and not twelve months after bring his child to the hospital with his leg much bent, and state it had not been properly set.

In my opinion the case is obvious enough ; the child, since his discharge from the hospital, not being taken sufficient care of. From the constant contraction of the muscles consequent on chorea, the inability of the parent to keep the child quiet, it at the same time being afflicted with rickets, the leg was drawn into the convex position by the action of the muscles.

With regard to the junks being employed, if Mr. Hill (the honour of whose acquaintance I have not) will take the trouble of coming to the hospital he will at once see the utility of them, they being merely two round bolsters made quite hard by being stuffed with bran, and placed on either side of a fractured limb, *after it has been set*, with a cradle over the whole, so as to render it, except in a case like the present, almost impossible to be moved by any effort of the patient.

In conclusion, allow me to say, that during the twelve months I was house-surgeon to the Westminster Hospital, I never had a

case which gave me so much trouble, as I can prove, from sheer necessity, having set and reset that child's leg more than twenty times ; at intervals it made such maniacal screeches, as to entirely prevent the other patients getting any rest. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

B. W. HOLT.

1, Broad Sanctuary, Oct. 13, 1841.

REMARKS BY DR. CLENDINNING
ON THE
MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS
OF THE
ST. MARYLEBONE INFIRMARY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I perceive at p. 64 of the last number of *THE LANCET*, an editorial notice of a letter signed "A FORMER PUPIL," which letter is subjoined to the article, and professes "to correct the inaccuracies put forth in the statements of last week" relative to the St. Marylebone Infirmary.

Now the letter might be passed by unnoticed, for anything of fact it contains, as a harmless growl. It impugns no averment of the statement to which it refers, disputing neither the correctness of the numbers, nor of the individual names, nor official strength or designations, nor, in fact, of any point of information communicated to *THE LANCET* with respect to the infirmary. In fact, it fully confirms (unintentionally, I presume,) the statements of your private informant by reaffirming several, and leaving wholly unquestioned others, of his assertion.

What then are the inaccuracies on account of which the authorities that sanctioned "the statements of last week" are thus editorially summoned to answer, in the favourite court of appeal of the medical student of London, in *THE LANCET*?

To this I can find no appropriate answer, as I think, either in the letter itself or the editorial notice, which gives to that letter whatever of importance it possesses.

Fault, however, is found, to which the editor calls attention generally. The "FORMER PUPIL" is discontented, if not with what has been said, yet at least with what has been omitted of what in his opinion ought to have been said.

Your informant of last week is clearly charged by him with the *suppressio veri* ; and, indirectly, even the *suggestio falsi* is imputed. But by whom are such charges made? There is intrinsic evidence of something untrustworthy about the letter, even in the signature of "A FORMER PUPIL." *Ex gr.* : He speaks of "the two physicians who permit pupils to go round with them." Now the creation and appointment of a third physician is an affair of a few months since. No third physician (exclusively of the physician accou-

cheur) existed in the time of any former "pupil."

The text of the letter also is liable to grave suspicion, being deceptive doubly; viz., in some things that it states, and in others that it omits. *Ex gr.*: It refers with blame to a regulation which limits the attendance of physicians' pupils to certain hours; but it withholds allusion to the fact that restrictions of a similar kind exist in hospitals and infirmaries generally, and are, indeed, essential to good order in such large establishments; and that in the infirmary, as elsewhere, certain hours are named in the rules, only because those medical officers are usually absent before and after those hours, who should assist, superintend, and instruct the pupils of the infirmary. This will appear clearly from this—that the pupils of the resident physician are, though inmates of the house, under no restrictions from the board as to visiting the wards, and evidently because the resident physician may be, and, as a salaried officer, is presumed to be, always on the spot, to control as well as teach them. Again: he says, "there is no time to devote the least attention to morbid anatomy." Now he had said just before, in describing the usual course of things, that the physician "may have half an hour to devote to the dead-house" after the visit to the wards. It might, therefore, be asked, In how many large establishments in London does the physician on duty usually devote half an hour, or any other fraction of an hour, to the dead-house?

Further, it might be asked, Has it ever happened on any of the numerous occasions on which autopsies have extended over two o'clock, that a pupil has been required to retire at that hour, even although a physician were not present? I have never heard of such a thing.

Third example. He complains that the physician's visit is finished in an hour, or thereabout, including thirty or forty cases. Now this statement is true of the milder months, when cases are fewest, and students are least in attendance; but not true of the winter and spring, when the house is full, and disease is severe. In those seasons, an hour and a half is the least, I should say from much observation, that the visit occupies. And two hours are not unfrequently devoted to it. Then he charges upon the statement of last week, errors, of his own imagining, with respect to out-patients, midwifery cases, syphilis, &c., the physician accoucheur, surgeons, and assistant house-surgeons, were all named in the statement, and credit was given to the student for intelligence enough to know without explanation that midwifery cases were not attended by the physicians; nor cases of syphilis; and that neither, therefore, could be included in the physicians' instruction. The out-patients were named merely to show more completely the extent of the operations and comparative importance of

the institution, of which many might be expected to know but little from other sources. They are charged for at no hospital, by whomsoever attended, as everybody knows, and are seldom, if ever, included in the physicians' instruction.

You will now be sufficiently able to judge whether "A FORMER PUPIL" has fairly stated such portion of the case as his ostensible objects required that he should deal with. For the rest, the matter is left, and with full reliance on his sense of justice, in the hands of the editor of *THE LANCET*. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN CLENDINNING,
Senior Physician to the Infirmary.
16, Wimpole-street, Oct. 8, 1841.

ABUSE OF MEDICAL CHARITIES. LONDON HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Satisfied as I am that your pages are ever open to the correction of abuses in public institutions, I shall not make any apology for troubling you with the following instance, which, I am sorry to say, is of very frequent occurrence in the metropolitan hospitals and dispensaries.

Last week I was called to attend Mr. Poulter and his son, of the Virginian Planter, Gibraltar-walk, Bethnal-green-road, when, after two or three days, much to my astonishment, I was told that I might discontinue my visits, as the distiller, Mr. Curtis, of the Mile-end-road, had called in for orders, and having ascertained that the landlord and his son were indisposed, had presented them with an out-patient's ticket for the London Hospital, where they could consult his physician, Dr. Gordon, and procure their medicine gratuitously.

Now, Sir, without attributing any improper motives to this worthy distiller, I do think that more care should be exhibited by him and other governors in selecting proper objects upon whom to bestow the blessings and benefits that such very excellent establishments are capable of affording. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOSEPH HODGSON.
Spitalfields, October 7, 1841.

NEW TEST OF ATTENTION AT ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—A novel mode of determining the prizes in the midwifery class of St. George's Hospital School—not less remarkable for its ingenuity than for its discrimination—is propounded for the admiration of other schools. The prize is to be awarded to the student, who, at the end of the session, shall produce the best notes of the lectures. With this ar-