

the bottles containing them were labeled with the announcement that a medal had been awarded the firm for the purity of their pickles. On submitting them to analysis, we found in each case copper, and in quantity sufficient to account for the green colour of the pickles.

The mixed pickles exhibited by Barnes, Morgan, and Co., were entirely free from copper, and they contained by no means a large quantity of iron; but some gherkins shown contained a small quantity of that metal.

The pickles of Messrs. Copland and Co. contained a small quantity of copper, as also did those of Mr. Cocks; as regards quality, purity, and flavour of the vinegar, the pickles of both these exhibitors were excellent. Mr. Cocks was awarded honourable mention for the goodness of quality of his pickles.

The whole of the pickles contained in the large and handsome case of Messrs. Crosse and Blackwell were free from even a trace of copper, and they contained only a very small quantity of iron, derived from the soil in which the vegetables of which the pickles were composed were grown; indeed, these pickles were not allowed to come into contact with either a copper or an iron vessel, and consequently they could not contain either of these metals except through the soil. In the Jurors' Report of Class III., the following observation occurs in reference to pickles:—"But the colour was not generally good. This was especially the case with the pickles of Messrs. Crosse and Blackwell, which, though of great purity and excellent flavour, were of a rusty tint, from the presence of a little iron derived from the boilers." Now there are two statements contained in this quotation to which exception should be taken. In the first place, these pickles are of precisely the same colour as all other vegetable substances, whether peas and beans preserved in tin cases, bottled fruits or pickles put up without being greened by the presence of copper; that is, they were of a dull olive or brownish-green colour, and neither more nor less so than other pickles similarly free from copper. Secondly, the pickles exhibited were not prepared in iron vessels, or "boilers," and, therefore, their colour could not be affected by that cause. Messrs. Crosse and Blackwell have been at very great pains to prepare pickles free from copper, and those now made by them are almost equally so from iron. In refusing to supply their customers with the green pickles, and in determining to sell only such as were free from copper, they have met with much opposition from the prejudice of dealers and the public. They are therefore entitled to great credit in this matter, not merely for placing in their case at the Exhibition pickles remarkable for their purity, excellence, and freedom from metallic contamination, but in insisting on supplying the public with similar pickles. Further, the part taken by this firm some time back before the Adulteration Committee, and the pains taken to avoid adulteration in every form,—a warranty being given with everything they sell,—ought not, on this occasion, to pass without notice. On every ground, therefore, Messrs. Crosse and Blackwell ought to have received not merely honourable mention for their pickles, but the highest reward it was in the power of the Jurors to recommend and the Commissioners to award. This was in strict justice simply their due. Messrs. Crosse and Blackwell exhibit by far the largest assortment and the greatest variety of preserved articles contained in the Exhibition, all of great purity and excellence. Several of the articles thus exhibited were novel and peculiar to the firm, and yet for nothing out of all this collection was a medal awarded.

The mixed pickles of Messrs. Marshall and Son, bearing the name of Charles Lazenby, were also entirely free from even a trace of copper, and were in other respects excellent, and therefore likewise merited some distinction.

Lastly, the pickles of Mr. Partridge (late Charles Wix and Sons) were prepared with an obvious desire to ensure excellence and purity, the copper being reduced to an exceedingly small amount, the mixed pickles scarcely containing more than traces. Mr. Partridge has been awarded a medal for the purity and excellence of quality of his pickles.

It should be stated that the cases of most of the exhibitors of pickles contained samples of West Indian pickles; these invariably contain copper as imported, at least that has been our experience.

DESTRUCTION OF HERNIATED OMENTUM BY CHLORIDE OF ZINC PASTE.—This mode of dealing with the omentum which is liable to remain out of the abdomen after herniotomy, was proposed and practised by Bonnet, of Lyons. The surgeons of that city have followed his example with the best results, and M. Desgranges, in September last, thus destroyed a large piece of omentum after an operation for umbilical hernia with complete success.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION. SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the last number of your journal, a leading article was devoted to the consideration of the Report of the Jury of Class XVII.; and in the last part of that article, which deals with the arrangement of the counters and cases, it is said that I have "proved myself essentially devoid of the qualities of systematic arrangement and perceptive power, and" to have "sanctioned a chaotic confusion which has invoked universal censure."

I am not, I assure you, about to discuss the truth of this somewhat violent criticism; I am simply anxious to put yourself and the rest of my professional brethren in the possession of certain facts, an earlier knowledge of which would, perhaps, have led the writer of the article to which I have referred to have modified the tone at least of one or two of his sentences.

On November 12th, 1861, a meeting of the Trade Committee was held at the house of the Society of Arts, at which I read to the nine members present (two only being absent of the whole number) the following communication from the National Committee of Medical Men:—"That in order to facilitate the duties of the jury, and to secure an effective display of the objects in Class XVII., it is desirable that they should be arranged in uniform cases, and as far as possible on a uniform plan of classification." I was much impressed by the great desirability of such a method, and argued the matter at considerable length with the Committee, but to no purpose; for a resolution was proposed and carried (by the instrument-makers themselves, be it noted,) to the effect that "this Committee considers the suggestion of the National Committee to be wholly impracticable, in consequence of the great number and dissimilarity of the articles belonging to the class." In the hope that something might still be done, I then suggested that as an elaborate and exhaustive list of surgical instruments had been issued by the Society of Arts, it was of great importance that the contents of each case should be classified as uniformly as possible in accordance with that list. This subject was then discussed, but a resolution was passed to the effect "That the dissimilarity of the instruments to be exhibited rendered such an arrangement wholly impracticable."

I am very much mistaken if the exhibitors are not by this time fully convinced that in passing the two resolutions which I have just quoted, they committed an error which has proved to be a grave one, which has effectually destroyed every attempt at harmonious arrangement in the class, and has perhaps damaged their interests individually as well as collectively.

Had authority stepped in at this time, and declared that the makers should only exhibit under certain conditions, I believe that the majority of them would have entirely refused to contribute to the Exhibition in any way whatever. Many indeed manifested but little desire to do so with the circumstances as they were.

Such was the state of things immediately after I had commenced my duties; and if the fact be taken into consideration that it was quite impossible to know what shape or sort of case any exhibitor was going to send, a certain amount of chaos might have been predicted. I then proceeded to allot to each exhibitor that which I considered to be a fair amount of area-space, and I venture to affirm that only one or two exhibitors can complain, with any show of justice, of the extent of their allotment. My scheme was submitted to and approved by the National Committee of Medical Men (although they were aware that their recommendation as to uniformity had not been adopted by the Trade Committee), and was then passed on to her Majesty's Commissioners for their acquiescence. This was obtained, and I then prepared a ground plan of the whole class, and submitted it to the gentleman who was appointed by the Commissioners to superintend the whole British space, and he sanctioned it.

The Trade Committee assisted me as much as they possibly could. They sent out circulars to all the exhibitors to know which of them required counters, and these were erected well and cheaply for all who wanted them; but there still remained the annoying fact, that the whole of the exhibitors were free to choose that form of case which pleased them most, and the majority delayed sending them to the building until just before,

or in some instances even after the opening of the Exhibition. For, in spite of constant correspondence (and this was no small matter), I could not induce some of the exhibitors to be prompt and ready for the day of opening.

Under these troublesome circumstances I acted as I think I ought to have acted. I placed in consecutive order, as well as I could, the makers of surgical instruments generally; I kept the exhibitors of dental instruments and materials as much together as possible, as also the manufacturers of orthopædic appliances, artificial limbs, and trusses; and I grouped the dissimilar objects (such as beds, baths, acoustic instruments, &c.) as I was best able, on either side of a screen, which was rendered necessary by the amount of vertical space which had been asked for by several of the exhibitors.

I have now enumerated a few of the difficulties I met with in attempting to carry out an idea, with the importance of which I was then, and am now still more, deeply impressed—viz., an harmonious and methodical exposition of the objects comprised in the class the superintendence of which was confided to me. I regret as much as the gentleman from whose pen the article in THE LANCET of last week proceeded, that there was a failure in this respect; but I have “perceptive power” enough to perceive the source from which the criticism proceeded, and honesty enough to declare that the appearance of my class is quite bad enough to justify animadversion. But, Sir, the history of the affair ought to be known, and I trust that I have enlightened your readers sufficiently on this point to justify me in publishing the letter in your next impression.

Having offered this slight sketch of my connexion with Class XVII., I intend henceforward to be silent on the subject. It was my duty to submit certain facts to the notice of the profession (who in this case are my judges), but it is not my wish to cavil at criticism, whatever be its character.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. REEVES TRAEER, F.R.C.S.E.,
Superintendent of Class XVII.,
International Exhibition of 1862.

Hans-place, Nov. 1862.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Relying on your unvarying liberality and justice, I ask permission to explain some inadvertencies into which the writer of an article on the “Jury Report on Surgical Instruments” has fallen, while commenting upon the relations that exist in this country between surgeons and instrument-makers, in which latter category, from want of a truer nomenclature, inventors of anatomical apparatus for the treatment of deformities are necessarily included.

I am led to do so—first, from the evident involution of myself as an exhibitor in the sweeping denunciation brought to bear against the body under discussion; and secondly, as affording an opportunity for defining the status which should be accorded to those “ingenious men” who, far from seeking to step out of their position, strive their utmost to prove that in those collateral branches of surgical science which depend exclusively upon mechanical aid, they render themselves able coadjutors by the possession of well trained and educated minds.

The question between surgeons and their instrument-maker, has, in one sense, long been anomalous, but not in the manner mentioned by the writer of the article in question, who states that the latter but too often conceals the name of the former, from whom he may have obtained the original idea. In this he is singularly misinformed, for it is the opposite condition which too often exists, and the “struggling or deserving man” consigns to his patron the fame of an instrument justly his own invention.

This state of things, undoubtedly, creates its own equivalent; for the instrument-maker, if a poor man, is content with the increased business given to his hand. But the case differs widely when a person, ambitious of establishing a name for ingenuity, is so dealt with; he feels it then a grievance too great to bear complacently, and yet not sufficient to justify an appeal to professional opinion, lest in making such an attempt he draw down upon his head the anger of the whole profession to whom a mere *ex parte* statement of facts may alone be known.

Medical men, as a body, are too highly distinguished by honourable principles to appropriate willingly the celebrity attached to others, but from the position of instrument-maker being looked upon as subordinate in every sense, a kind of prescriptive right arises on the part of a few, without the least impropriety of intention, to avail themselves of the scientific inventions pertaining to surgery. It is by no means rare that

a medical man, with a well-known taste for mechanics, will devise valuable instruments; but when this is so the mechanist employed dare not, even if he otherwise would, claim for himself its invention without at once producing a wide-spread declaration of his attempted fraud. The names of several of the highest luminaries of the profession have been thus fairly associated with the results of their inventive genius.

The censure is, however, principally addressed to those who have contributed to the Exhibition; but even here many well-known surgical names are affixed to various appliances. There are, however (as in my own case), exceptional circumstances where this could not with justice be done, from the simple fact that every piece of mechanism shown is the exclusive invention of the one who displays the collection.

There is, I would take the liberty of suggesting, but one straightforward remedy for the equivocal position now held, which is an admission that when a professional man seeks the assistance of a scientific mechanician he should not be considered to do so in the same manner as an instrument-maker receives the aid of his workpeople, but be held to consult with him on the best mechanism to adopt in the treatment of the case in question. This has long been done by the highest members of the profession, but it requires to be not a mere tacit acknowledgment yielded by that intuitive sense of right which ever governs distinguished men in all professions, but a received dogma by the medical world at large.

When this generous concession to the advance of intellectual freedom shall be frankly admitted, the writer of the article I have ventured to dissent from may feel assured that his present remarks will have been attended by the wisest and best results, and that surgical instrument makers, as a body, will be found as honest as the greater part of mankind.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY HEATHER BIGG, Assoc. Inst. C.E.

Leicester-square, Nov. 1862.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I am directed to request the favour of your insertion of the following reply to an article which appeared in your journal of the 8th inst., upon the subject of Mr. Seymour Haden's Jury Report:—

The Surgical Instrument-makers' Trade Committee, and other exhibitors in Class XVII., consider the aspersions cast upon them wholly unwarranted, and such as to demand immediate refutation. The allegation that the instrument-makers generally claim for themselves inventions that belong to surgeons, and intentionally suppress the names of those from whom they derived the idea, is totally devoid of truth; and anyone who has attentively observed the class will at once perceive that the claims of every surgeon have been fully allowed; in fact, that the instrument-makers have foregone their own claims in favour of the surgeons, and that the claim of instrument-makers to inventions is the exception, not the rule. The mere statement of the requirements of an instrument given to a maker and left to him to execute, does not entitle the surgeon to the credit of the invention; nothing short of a model, drawing, or lucid and comprehensive description, and that carried out in its entirety, can constitute him the inventor.

With reference to the charge of withholding information from the jurors, they positively deny that such has been the case among themselves, and they are not aware that any such circumstances have occurred with other exhibitors in their class.

The members of the Trade Committee emphatically deny that they resisted the efforts of the National Committee, or that they were in any way responsible for the “want of organization,” and “total absence of order exemplified in their class.” They received but one proposition from the National Committee—viz., that the makers of each class of articles should place their goods together in one case. They objected to this as being absolutely impracticable, as a principle never yet attempted or carried out at any Exhibition, and wholly destructive of the respective interests of the exhibitors. They consider that each one went into the Exhibition as a competitor, striving to excel his contemporaries, and that individuality was one great feature of the Exhibition; beyond this, they evinced every desire to obtain uniformity of arrangement, and forwarded a lithographic sketch of the glass case which they considered of the most suitable form to all the exhibitors. Mr. Traer was appointed superintendent of the class without their knowledge, and that gentleman, acting, they believe, in concert with Mr. Haden, planned and distributed the allot-

ments of space, designed the form of the avenues and counters, enforced the absurd regulation that the cases should not exceed six feet in height; and, in short, arranged everything connected with the class, with the single exception of getting the counters erected and covered—an honour that was conferred upon the Trade Committee in order that it might be made responsible for the cost.

In conclusion, the Committee and the trade can only regret that these remarks should have been elicited by an uncourteous attack from so eminent a journal as THE LANCET, after the sacrifices of one and all to further and promote a patriotic object, which experience has shown to have advanced the welfare of the nation more than that of the exhibitors.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

R. WILLIAMS,

Chairman of the Trade Committee.

Strand, Nov. 1862.

POOR-LAW MEDICAL REFORM.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Some months have elapsed since I last asked permission for space in your journal to address the Poor-law medical officers, but I have only recently been able to procure the "Second Report of the Select Committee on Poor Relief for 1862." In that volume the evidence of several gentlemen is recorded, and amongst them appears the name of Mr. Cane, one of the Inspectors of the Poor-law Board, who boldly stands forward as the champion of the present system of the medical relief for the poor. This gentleman's evidence occupies nine teen pages, nine of which are devoted to observations upon the evidence laid by me before the Select Committee of 1861. He says (after 3892): "That statement (Mr. Griffin's) contains, I believe, many allegations evidently made under most imperfect knowledge of facts. The tables also contain many serious inaccuracies, which lead to conclusions that are fallacious and deceptive, and calculated to produce highly erroneous impressions on the question which they profess to illustrate. Mr. Griffin claims to represent, if not the entire body, yet a very large proportion of the medical officers in England and Wales, and therefore it is of the more importance that the 'statements' and 'tables' should be explained and corrected, if, as I believe, they are open to correction." At page 48, Mr. Cane says, "In several cases in which it is alleged by Mr. Griffin that there has been a reduction of salary, there has been no alteration; but this misapprehension is caused by his having misquoted the returns."

At page 46, Mr. Cane says, "The returns relating to the Retford Union have also been misquoted. Instead of there having been a decrease of £694 in the salaries of the medical officers, as appears by this table, there has been an increase of £65." My answer to this is, that Retford should have been written Thetford, the Th for R. Had I intended naming the Union mentioned by Mr. Cane I should at least have called it by its right name, which is *East* Retford, there being, in fact, no such union as Retford. In the 1843 Return there are only four unions paying upwards of £1000 each to their medical officers, and therefore Mr. Cane could have had no difficulty in discovering the one to which I referred.

There are other cases of a similar kind, but this is sufficient to show the animus of Mr. Cane in his evidence before the Select Committee.

Mr. Cane, after running through many of the propositions laid by me before the Select Committee, concludes his evidence with these most extraordinary expressions:—"The organization of these changes, their supervision and control, can, however, in his (Mr. Griffin's) judgment, be only entrusted to a member of his profession. Accordingly he would compel the Poor-law Board to appoint a 'Medical Secretary,' one of whose qualifications would be that of his having himself been a medical officer, and this functionary would be empowered to adjudicate in all matters having reference to 'Poor-law medical relief,' subject only to the confirmation of the Poor-law Board. It will, I think, be almost unnecessary to offer any detailed comments upon such propositions as these. But if I may be permitted to express my general views, I should say that if Mr. Griffin's suggested alterations of the law, and other regulations relating to medical relief, were carried into effect, they would enormously increase the public expenditure, wholly demoralize the labouring classes, and impoverish the ratepayers of every union to which they were applied. Their effect, too, upon the medical profession would be calamitous. Numbers of persons would enter that profession solely with the view to be elected to one or other of the 3000 or 4000 highly favoured offices which Mr. Griffin would create. A pro-

fession which by some is now thought to be overstocked would become more overstocked still, and medical men would increase and multiply, and competition would be stimulated and carried to such an extent, that but a very limited amount of remunerative practice would eventually fall to any medical practitioner who did not succeed in being elected a medical officer of a union." Mr. Cane's evidence is certainly very amusing. Only fancy "medical men increasing and multiplying" upon the profits arising from an average payment of less than five shillings per patient for attendance, and finding medicines for an illness, the average duration of which is more than five weeks. My evidence was laid before the Committee in 1861, and yet the lucrative appointments it offered, according to Mr. Cane's view, are met this year by a decrease in the number of medical students entering the metropolitan schools by 153 less than in 1860 (THE LANCET, Nov. 1st, 1862). Mr. Cane certainly forms a very low estimate of the medical profession; it is therefore high time that we should have a medical head at the Poor-law Board who can appreciate our requirements. Mr. Cane says my plan would "wholly demoralize the labouring classes;" but surely fixing the rate of wages at 10s. per week as the highest earnings to entitle a poor man to medical relief at the expense of the poor-rate cannot have that effect: in truth I think the rate proposed is too low, but it was fixed at that sum so that the existing clubs might not be endangered. Does Mr. Cane fancy the poor are so fond of physic that they would sham illness for the sake of getting it? The very idea of "demoralizing the labouring classes" by giving them, when ill, medical relief, is preposterous. Mr. Cane says my "propositions would impoverish the ratepayers of every union," a statement so absurd that it scarcely needs refutation; and were it not stated by an officer of the Poor-law Board, it might be passed over without comment; but as there is a table in existence which was sent by me to the Poor-law Board, and to all the subscribing Poor-law medical officers, I will at once say that the calculation then made gave £298,984 for the payments to the officers, with half mileage only, and if the latter £64,608 be doubled, it makes a total of £363,592. The present number of cases, however, will undoubtedly be reduced; but there are other advantages proposed by my plan, all of which, if carried, might bring our receipts up to perhaps £400,000 a year, or £100,000 less than the sum named by Sir John Trollope in the House of Commons—a sum which I think would not "impoverish the ratepayers," but the reverse, as improved sanitary arrangements, and a thoroughly good system of medical relief, would do much to lessen the general pauperism of the kingdom.

This letter gives but a brief sketch of Mr. Cane's evidence, the whole of which requires to be carefully gone through, the statements therein thoroughly sifted, and the truth laid before the Committee, otherwise his very erroneous evidence may be taken for sound doctrine, and, as a consequence, the present system of medical relief perpetuated. I have about £30 of last year's subscription lying in the bank, but I shall need much more if I am to lay bare Mr. Cane's sophistry. I therefore trust my medical friends will not forget that I am open to receive their subscriptions, without which my pen alone will be powerless. Next year there must be a new Poor-law Bill; we must, therefore, not let the present opportunity pass, but do our best to convince the Select Committee there is need of reform, notwithstanding the opposite opinion of a Poor-law official.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

12, Royal-terrace, Weymouth, Nov. 1862.

RICHARD GRIFFIN.

NECROSIS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In your journal of October 25th, Mr. Wormald writes thus:—"In necrosis, by the use of common litmus paper an acid may be detected. Mr. Attfield, demonstrator of practical chemistry at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, found the acid taken from the surface of dead bone to be phosphoric; this dissolves the bone, and the air-bubbles resulting may be seen on the surface of the pus. It may be further observed that in doubtful cases of necrosis the presence of phosphoric acid may prove a valuable diagnosis; and in cases where dead bone cannot be removed by operation, Nature seems to indicate an appropriate remedy."

Mr. Wormald also mentions the name of the late Mr. Bransby Cooper in connexion with necrosed bone. I have to remark that when acting as dresser to the latter gentleman in 1847, I had the opportunity of witnessing, on many occasions, the local