

which has long been felt. It is obvious that the needles generally used, whether right-angled or self-feeding, are clumsy to a degree, occupy too much space, are difficult to use or to guide in a confined area, and frequently tear the flaps in the hands of the most skilful; whilst in the case of a child of six months they cannot be used at all. I have myself generally used a small straight or full-curved needle, mounted on an ordinary needle-holder, on account of the comparatively small damage to the flaps caused by its introduction compared with that of a mounted rigid needle; but the difficulty has been that the needle-holder was cumbersome and its handles when in use too near the mouth. With Mr. Lane's needle it is obvious this difficulty is entirely removed, and we shall no longer see a child of three years with its mouth full of irritating wire sutures, vainly trying to talk, or even endeavouring to remove the sutures with its fingers. Operation in the first year, when a child is more under control, and long before it begins to talk, removes many difficulties, is more likely to lead to good results, and renders unlikely the closure of a hare-lip previously to that of a cleft-palate, the one operation only rendering the other the more difficult. How many of our so-called surgical instruments might not be relegated with advantage to a museum for antiquities?

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

Albion-street, Hull, Oct. 11th, 1896.

ALFRED PARKIN.

"A CASE OF VOMITING LARGE MASSES OF CANCEROUS MATTER."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In accordance with your suggestion, I proceed to give a few brief additional details of the case of Vomiting Large Masses of Cancerous Matter, which was reported in THE LANCET of Oct. 3rd. The patient paid me a visit last evening in order to show himself to me, and his healthy florid looks and robust appearance quite astonished me, for I had not seen him for some months. He told me he felt quite well and weighed more than he had done for the last thirty years. He has no pain in the stomach and can digest his food with comfort. I examined him carefully and found nothing abnormal either in the abdomen or elsewhere. The patient's progress towards recovery from his emaciated and exhausted state was necessarily slow, still he advanced in health and strength till the first week in July, when he considered himself able to resume his usual occupation, that of a sawyer, and from that time to the present he has not been off work a single day. He is a very abstemious and temperate man, and is wise enough to avoid taking any kind of food or drink which might prove difficult of digestion. He has never vomited since he threw up the "cancerous matter," and he hopes he will never throw up the same kind of matter again, and so do I; and I also trust that on that occasion he expelled from his stomach the morbid growth both root and branch, and that there has not been left a single germ to strike root and spring up again. I confided to the patient's wife that her husband had made a wonderful recovery and that his case was so interesting that I took a note of it and had sent it to THE LANCET, but that I had not mentioned her husband's name. Not having mentioned her husband's name rather ruffled the lady's temper, for she remarked that "her husband never did anything that could make him ashamed of his name." This reminds me of a circumstance which occurred some years ago. I published in THE LANCET a case of actinomycosis. A medical friend informed some of the relatives of the patient of the fact. On hearing this piece of news a copy of THE LANCET was ordered for each member of the family to be preserved as a memento. But the disappointment was great when it was discovered that the name of their dear relative was omitted from the paper. "We would willingly," said a brother to me, "have given a £5 note a piece for each copy of THE LANCET if our brother's name had only been mentioned in the account of his illness."

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Lincoln, Oct. 6th, 1896. WILLIAM O'NEILL, M.D. Aberd.

"ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCHOOL."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—A correspondent writing to you from St. Andrews University criticises in THE LANCET a notice of motion given

by me at the last meeting of the University Court. That motion, I rather think, your correspondent knows aims simply at securing that our own best students may have some inducement to hope that they may have a chance of getting appointed to an assistantship which may enable them for at least three years to devote themselves almost wholly to the subject in which they have specially excelled. When a man has taken a degree with honours in any department of study surely it is no insignificant appointment which enables him at the expense of one hour per week for four months, at the remuneration of £100, to carry on his special studies; and just as surely any man who knows what an assistant's work in St. Andrews University is will say that the man who has taken his degree with honours is a most suitable man for such work. Certainly the best of our assistants have been such men. But, good as such men have been, there have been year by year as good men among our graduates, and many of these men have complained to myself that the chance of an assistantship has never come their way. There are very few professorships going, but there are many excellent school appointments, and surely a candidate for a mastership in a high-class school could not have a higher recommendation than that he has been three years, after graduation with honours, an assistant in a university in the subject to be specially taught in that school. Our main aim here must be to create first-class teachers with the hope that out of these, as in past days, we may draw first-class professors.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

St. Andrews, Oct. 9th, 1896.

MARK ANDERSON.

"LINCOLN MEDICAL PROTECTION FUND."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Will you kindly publish the following additional subscriptions received for the above fund? The total amount received is £371 19s 6d., of which sum £44 19s 6d. was collected by Dr. Barnes.—I am, Sirs, yours truly,

Oct. 12th, 1896.

W. A. CARLINE, Hon. Treasurer.

	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Wm. Easby, Peterborough...	0 5 0	W. H. Griffiths Williams, Mottishall ...	0 10 6
O. Giles, Sleaford ...	0 10 0	Sir Peter Eade, Norwich	0 10 6
Manchester Medical Guild, per A. Stewart	1 1 0	C. Muriel, Norwich ...	0 10 6
S. C. Griffiths, Society of Apothecaries, London ...	0 5 0	W. H. Day, Norwich ...	0 10 6
Walter Edmunds, Lambeth Palace road...	1 1 0	F. Preston, Norwich ...	0 10 6
George Elam, Manor-road, Stoke Newington	1 1 0	S. H. Burton, Norwich...	0 10 6
A. B. Stevens, Springfield, Tulse-hill, S.W.	5 5 0	F. W. Burton-Fanning, Norwich...	0 10 6
A. M. French, H.M.S. Phaeton ...	1 1 0	H. C. Nance, Norwich...	0 10 6
M. E. Ling, Saxmundham, Suffolk ...	1 1 0	D. D. Day, Norwich ...	0 10 6
W. G. Walford, Finchley-road, N.W. ...	2 0 0	J. S. Hinnel, Bury St. Edmunds ...	0 5 0
Victor Horsley, Cavendish-square ...	1 1 0	W. Maine, Clacton-on-Sea ...	1 1 0
From the East Anglian and the Cambridge and Huntingdon Branches of the British Medical Association, per Dr. Edgar G. Barnes:—		C. E. Addison, Colchester	0 10 0
T. C. Allbutt, Cambridge	1 1 0	Haynes Robinson, Norwich...	0 10 6
H. Gervis, Bishop's Stortford ...	0 10 6	S. Barton, Norwich ...	0 10 0
R. H. Lucas, Bury St. Edmunds ...	0 10 6	A. C. Turner, St. Neots	0 10 6
W. A. Elliston, Ipswich	0 10 6	Mrs. E. Garret-Anderson, Upper Berkeley-street, W. ...	0 10 6
		W. Bodkin, Chelmsford	0 10 6
		W. H. Bansall, Aylsham	0 5 0
		H. Stear, Saffron Walden	0 10 0
		W. A. Smith, Newport, Essex ...	0 10 0
		F. A. Rookes, Felixstowe	0 10 6
		E. Stanley Wood, Cambridge ...	0 10 6
		Leslie Fletcher, Diss ...	0 5 0
		G. C. Giles, Attleborough	0 10 6
		R. McKelvie, Blofield ...	0 5 0
		C. F. Wright, Eye ...	0 5 0

ABORTIONS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—There must be very many among your readers who, in the course of their professional duties, would be in a position to assist an embryologist to the possession of valuable material for research. So slight are at present the additions made to a knowledge of human embryology in Great Britain and Ireland that one wonders if Allan Thomson ever really worked among us. Unfortunately, most of those who could make good use of such material rarely or never find it placed in their way. If they would only realise it physicians and general practitioners could help forwards our knowledge of the normal and abnormal development of man enormously. As