

much at some of the "facts" mentioned by Dr. Sanderson, more at some of the conclusions he has deduced, and most of all at the coolness displayed by him and a few other scientific authorities, in ignoring, or in authoritatively disposing of the scientific work and conclusions of other Englishmen whose scientific position is not inferior to their own.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
London, April 11th, 1875. LIONEL S. BEALE.

## HEALTH OF FOLKESTONE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In *The Times* report of the proceedings of the House of Commons on Thursday last, it appears Lord Robert Montagu stated that the death-rate of Folkestone in the month of August last amounted to 23 per 1000. The report of the Registrar-General being quarterly, I referred to the quarter ending Sept. 30th, 1874, which includes the month mentioned by his lordship, and found the number of deaths to have been 83, and the death-rate under 17 per 1000. In the preceding quarter, ending June 30th, the death-rate was one of the highest on record, notwithstanding the absence of any epidemic or prevalent disease. This was owing in a great measure to the large number of troops at Shorncliffe camp, and the sickly state of the 23rd Fusiliers just returned from the Ashantee war, for Sandgate and Shorncliffe camps are included in the Folkestone district of the Registrar-General. The number of deaths was 98, and this, in a population of 19,584, gives a death-rate of 20.016 per 1000, just enough to put Folkestone for that quarter in the category of towns in which the death-rate was over 20 and below 23. It may have been in this way that Lord Robert Montagu arrived at the figure 23. I need not point out that selecting one quarter from a series of years, and that the one in which the death-rate is amongst the highest recorded, is scarcely so safe a way to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the sanitary condition of a place as taking the average of a series of years would be. The Registrar-General takes this latter course, and in his last decennial report—from 1861 to 1870—of the health of the watering-places, Folkestone has the lowest death-rate, with one exception, that of Hove, which now is, I think, joined to Brighton, and reckoned with that town; the death-rate of Folkestone being, on an average of ten years, 16.4, that of Hove 16.2. The average death-rate of the last four years, from 1871 to 1874, is still under 17, for it amounts to 16.7.

I am, Sir, yours &c.,

WILLIAM BATEMAN,  
April 8th, 1875. Medical Officer for the Borough of Folkestone.

P.S.—I have received the following note from the registrar:—

Cambridge House, Folkestone, April 10th, 1875.

DEAR SIR,—On turning to the register-book of deaths now in my possession, I find that from Oct. 1873 to the present time only two deaths have been registered as having occurred in that part of Folkestone town called the "Narrows": one, a young woman aged twenty-nine, from phthisis; the other, a child four months old, from marasmus.

I remain yours faithfully,

W. H. BIRCH,  
Wm. Bateman, Esq., Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages.  
Medical Officer of Health for Folkestone.

## ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—A short time ago, Mr. Hardy, in reply to Dr. Lyon Playfair, announced in Parliament that not only were there no vacancies in the Army Medical Department to be filled up, but that there are now (including the candidates at Netley) seven officers in excess of the establishment, though THE LANCET, and indeed several other professional and military papers, have pointed out that, while the army estimates show no reduction in the number of medical officers, the department has been reduced by no fewer than twenty-six during the past twelve months; so that either Mr. Hardy was instructed wrongly when he gave his reply, or the army

estimates are incorrect and more money is demanded from Parliament than is required.

That the medical department of the army is being steadily reduced (while the strength of the army has been increased) a reference to the following table will demonstrate:—

*Strength of the Army Medical Department, taken from the Official Army Lists of 1868 and 1875.*

|   | 1868. | 1875. | Increase. | Decrease. |
|---|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| Surgeons-General...                                     | 8     | 9     | 1         | —         |
| Deputy Surgeons-General...                              | 36    | 33    | —         | 3         |
| Surgeons-Major of 20 }<br>years and upwards ... }       | 96    | 191   | 95        | —         |
| Surgeons (now Surgeons-<br>Major) ...                   | 257   | 125   | —         | 132       |
| (Assistant) Surgeons of }<br>over 6 years' service... } | 360   | 389   | 29        | —         |
| (Assistant) Surgeons of }<br>under 6 years' service }   | 311   | 83    | —         | 228       |
| Total of all ranks...                                   | 1068  | 937   | —         | 131       |

It will be seen from the above that during the past seven years the department has lost two of the inspectorial grade and 129 executive officers.

The following table is also appended, which shows the number of graduates of the University of Dublin who took their degrees and entered the army during the past ten years:—

*Number of M.B. Degrees conferred in Trinity College, Dublin, during the past ten years.*

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1865—18, of whom there are now in the Arm. Med. Dep. | 5  |
| 1866—32  | 10 |
| 1867—34  | 12 |
| 1868—36  | 1  |
| 1869—41  | 2  |
| 1870—37  | 5  |
| 1871—35  | 3  |
| 1872—42  | 2  |
| 1873—37  | 2  |
| 1874—42  | 0  |

It will be seen from the above that, while during the years 1866 and 1867 twenty-two out of sixty-six, or one-third, entered the medical service of the army, during 1873 and 1874 only two out of seventy-nine did so.

It would be hard to find a better instance of what injustice and broken faith can accomplish in deterring the best men from entering what ought to be a most popular service.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

April, 1875. ARMY SURGEON.

## DISGRACEFUL CONDUCT AND ITS PENALTY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—On Friday and Saturday, the 29th and 30th of January last, the usual examination in Arts was held at the Apothecaries' Hall.

In the first class of the pass list was placed \* \* \* \* \*, and his certificate was shortly afterwards sent him in the ordinary course.

The Society of Apothecaries afterwards received information which led them to believe that \* \* \* \* \* was not present himself on either of the days of the examination in question, and that he was, in fact, personated by someone else, who answered the examination papers for him.

I communicated the suspicions of the Society to \* \* \* \* \* accordingly, and required him at once to deliver up the certificate which had been, as the Society believed, improperly obtained, so that the same might be cancelled.

The certificate was returned to me the next day.

The suspicions entertained by the Society having been thereby confirmed, it seems to be their imperative duty towards the members of the medical profession in general and the students in particular, that these facts should be most generally known and widely circulated.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

R. H. ROBERTSON,  
Secretary to the Court of Examiners in Arts.  
Apothecaries' Hall, London, E.C.,  
April 13th, 1875.

\* \* \* We have not printed the name of the delinquent. Why have not legal proceedings been instituted?—Ed. L.