

backs are bandied about for appointments in the public service.

A small dispensary or sick bay is *not* be-
wailed by Dr. Tweeddale as our only retire-
ment: see his letter in *THE LANCET* of 19th
June. Had we these in all ships we would
have little cause to complain; but as Dr.
Tweeddale simply and truly observes, even
they are luxuries we enjoy only occasion-
ally. There are no habitable dispensaries or
sick berths in any class of vessels under line-
of-battle ships. On this station we have at
present some thirty ships and vessels of war:
two of these have roomy sick berths, because
“receiving ships,” always in harbour; they
are the *Magnificent* at Port Royal and the
Romney at Havannah: I believe the *Win-
chester*, a first-class frigate, has a small sick
berth also, being a flag-ship; the other ves-
sels have none, but all have dispensaries of
some sort or other, quite uninhabitable how-
ever, even so long as to roll out a dozen pills.
They are of various dimensions, the largest
being some six feet long by three or four feet
wide, and four, five, and six feet high. The
two first mentioned vessels have comfortable
gun-rooms, being two-deckers; the others,
even the *Winchester*, have little ovens of
berths on their lower decks, which are almost
inaccessible to the light and air of the hea-
vens, and where, during their temporary
occupation, at feeding time, by the young
gentlemen, (mates, midshipmen, clerks, and
assistant-surgeons,) the light of half a dozen
purser’s dips is actually required to find
their mouths.

These, Sir, are facts, and, being facts, are
stubborn things, which I defy any one to
gain say or resist. I have the honour to be,
Sir, your obedient servant,

A LICENTATE OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE
OF SURGEONS OF EDINBURGH.

West India Station,
October, 1841.

P.S.—Since writing the above, her Majesty
having been graciously pleased to recom-
mend that assistant-surgeons of the royal
navy shall rank with the subaltern officers
of the army, the general commanding-in-
chief has ordered that the former may be
recognised and saluted by the troops accord-
ing to that rank—we trust the *privileges* will
shortly follow.

*** For the present we shall not be able
to admit any further communications on this
subject. Correspondents who have written
under anonymous signatures, especially, will
not object to this determination.

HUSBANDS AT ACCOUCHEMENTS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Your correspondent signing himself
“W. K.,” Bury St. Edmunds, need not be so

sensibly apprehensive that the intrusive visits
of husbands in the lying-in room will become
general, as few can be found possessing suf-
ficient moral courage to be present, even
when solicited; and as this is rarely done,
excepting in cases of difficulty and danger
(when it seems that “W. K.,” with all his
delicacy, would admit them), why should
he, or any other sensible and judicious ac-
coucheur, heed what idle gossips, or the
“Grundies,” might say? As for the offices
which the accoucheur has to perform in the
execution of his professional duty, does he
now, as formerly, practise slovenly acts, or
equip himself in a manner to disgust the
patient? Certainly not. A better state of
things has long prevailed in the metropolis,
and, I believe, throughout the kingdom; and
he must, in truth, be a sorry tactician who,
in the management and dispositions of the
lying-in room, would allow anything to as-
sume an appearance that was either inde-
cent, indelicate, or unbecoming. “W. K.”
may not be aware of the reserve which is
sometimes felt towards medical men in their
future visits to the family, and he might have
been kindly and handsomely treated by hus-
bands whose wives he has on such occasions
attended; but why should he be so discour-
teous as to doubt the assertions of his profes-
sional brethren of long standing, and, conse-
quently, much greater experience? All
other points in “W. K.’s” letter have been
so very ably met and refuted by the commu-
nications of Mr. Chatto and “B. H. W. H.,”
in *THE LANCET* of Dec. 18th, as to render
farther comment supererogatory. I am, Sir,
your obedient servant,

JOHN BRYANT, M.D.

Edgeware-road,
Jan. 18, 1842.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL INFIRMARY.

HERNIA, TWICE, IN OLD AGE.

JOHN WHITE, ætat. 73, an in-pensioner of
Greenwich Hospital, was brought to the
infirmary, at half-past one, on the morning of
the 9th of October, with incarcerated ingui-
nal hernia of the left side. The taxis, vene-
section, warm bath, and tobacco enema, were
had recourse to, but without effect, when it
was deemed advisable to submit him to the
operation for inguinal hernia, which was
accordingly performed by Sir Richard Dob-
son, M.D., inspector of hospitals and fleets;
when on opening the sac a large quantity of
intestine was found protruding, which re-
quired much dexterity and nice manipula-
tion in returning, even after the stricture had
been divided. The lips of the wound were
then brought together by ligature, and the
case went on well until the 3rd of November,
when he was discharged cured.

On Saturday, Nov. 20th, (just six weeks from the former operation,) he was again brought in with incarcerated inguinal hernia of the *right* side, when all the usual remedies were tried, but with no effect, and he was again subjected to the operation, and the intestine returned, and he is now quite recovered from both operations; the recovery from the latter being rather more tedious than the former, from the debilitated state of his system.

This case is uncommon and interesting from the great age of the patient, as well as from his recovery, after having undergone so serious an operation on both sides. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

KEATS R. RISK,
Assistant-Surgeon R. N.

ANOTHER PHENOMENON.

THE following statement, which appears in the *Hampshire Telegraph* of Jan. 17, shows that *all* the clever girls in England did not disappear with Elizabeth Okey:—

“We were much gratified last evening by witnessing some extraordinary experiments connected with mesmerism, at Dr. Engle-due’s residence. We are in the same position with all others who have seen the phenomena, and are incapable of offering any explanation; but we are satisfied as to the reality of what we saw. A young female was introduced to the company. Dr. Engle-due put her in five minutes into a perfect mesmeric sleep. Dr. E. requested the company to give him in any order they pleased some articles arranged on the table. A biscuit was given to him, which he eat—immediately the mouth of the young female moved as if she was eating. When asked by Dr. E., she replied she was tasting ‘bread;’ an apple, an orange, a glass of water, some bread and butter, were followed by the same results. The bread and butter was eaten by Dr. E. at the further end of the room, while the numerous persons present surrounded the girl; immediately she moved her mouth, and when she was asked what she was eating, she said she was eating bread and butter: a pinch of snuff which the doctor took she disliked, and a cigar she said was something nasty. The de-mesmerising motions soon relieved her from her trance. ‘Seeing is believing,’ and what we have related above we *saw*.”

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It having been reported that I am a candidate for the vacant chair of midwifery at the London University College, I beg to state that there neither is, nor ever has been, the slightest foundation for such a report, and I shall feel much obliged if you will

permit me publicly to contradict it through the medium of your Journal. Your obedient servant,

EDWARD RIGBY, M.D.
23, New-street, Spring Gardens,
Jan. 24, 1842.

EXTEMPORANEOUS PRODUCTION OF MILK.

A Russian chemist, Dr. Dichost, suggests the following mode of keeping milk, and of preparing it extemporaneously. Evaporate freshly-drawn milk, by a gentle heat, until it becomes perfectly dry; then put it in air-tight bottles, and it may be kept for any length of time. If milk be required for immediate use, take a small quantity of the powder, and add water to it. The flavour of the milk will be found preserved.—*Graefe and Walther’s Journal*, 1841.

A COUNTER-PRACTITIONER.

ONE of these *quasi* doctors, who set up a drug-store some time since, was called on by an old lady to give her something for nettle-rash (urticaria). The doctor examined the eruption very carefully, and concluded that cream of tartar was the remedy, and forthwith prepared the dose. The old lady was loath to take anything internally, and preferred some external application; the *druggist* persisted, however, that he had hit on the proper remedy, and in order to overcome her objections took half the dose himself, declaring that it was not unpleasant to the taste; so his patient swallowed the other half, and then took a seat, perhaps to ascertain before she left the shop that she had not taken poison, or from an indisposition to move. Meanwhile, the druggist delighted at his prowess, related other instances of his success. He was interrupted, however, by violent sickness, which his patient began also to experience. Great consternation arose, and a medical gentleman was sent for, who found that the man had given tartar-emetic instead of cream of tartar. This performance is attested by the respectable medical witness who was sent for at the time.—*Dr. Buckler, of Baltimore*.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Philadelphus cannot place much value on the authentication of facts, since he offers a contradiction of the letter of Mr. H. without even sending his name and address in confidence to the Editor. There ought, however, on such an occasion, to be no objection to answer an avowed correspondent under a real name. Moreover, both Mr. H. and the public have a right to demand a real signature to the statements. Otherwise they might fairly pass them by as waste matter.

J. E. (Amwell-street.)—We never comply with such requests. Advantage would be taken of the practice by some anonymous correspondents, who would soon render it a new variety of quack advertisement.