

supposed to have given the plaintiff to shut himself up in a room for so many weeks. Now, do you believe, Sir, that the agent—the assistant as the agent—is entitled to give any such evidence at all? If given—and I must assume it to be,—is it not part of the fraudulent statement made by the assistant to procure money, and not part of the treatment? If Dr. Kahn's assistant made a representation, it was a fraud practised with a view to obtain money. There is no other evidence in the case which bears upon it. I must say that I think Mr. Bowen May, in this case—and I give him credit for it—has acted very consistently altogether. I give him credit for believing that Dr. Kahn has extorted in this case, but at the same time I think he has himself slightly imitated Dr. Kahn without meaning it. The matter was fairly met, and an offer was made to leave it to any barrister to determine what should be done; but Mr. May thinks that because Dr. Kahn is not a member and fellow of the colleges in England—although he is a duly-qualified man in one of the continental schools—that he is unfit to practise; and Mr. May may think that by threatening an exposure Dr. Kahn will repay him over the money. Now, Dr. Kahn is not disposed to be intimidated in such a way. And I must say I think the two gentlemen have gone a little too far in sending a letter to THE LANCET: here is a correspondence between the 11th and 17th of June (letter read). On the 17th of June Mr. May writes again, presenting his compliments, and promising to call upon Dr. Kahn on the following day, on his way to the Botanical Gardens, at half-past three P.M. Then there is another interview between Dr. Kahn and Mr. May, and Mr. May threatens some sort of criminal proceedings. Then comes the letter from Mr. Phillips; and Mr. Phillips writes the letter that you have already had. In answer to that, Mr. May writes a letter of the 22nd of June. (This and the other letters were put in and read, after which the learned Counsel proceeded—) And I submit that there is no evidence at all to affect Dr. Kahn, except the two small points that I have urged; at all events the treatment was never followed, and therefore no injury could arise from it. I shall, therefore, leave the case in your hands, Sir, with great confidence, as I really do not see that a case is made out against my client. He might observe that the person who had obtained the money from the plaintiff would have been called, but he had long since left the defendant's service, and could not be found.

Mr. MAY said the judge could form his opinion of the value of the last remark, from the fact that the person alluded to had been in the court during the trial.

The DEPUTY-JUDGE then delivered judgment as follows:—I have not the slightest doubt upon this case; that it is a case for damages, and that the plaintiff is entitled to recover the whole of the sum claimed. I think it is highly creditable to the plaintiff that he had the moral courage to come into court and expose this transaction; and as to the agency, the assistant, whoever he may be, has certainly committed a gross fraud, and one cannot help feeling warmly that this fraud was practised. At the same time one cannot help seeing that as to Dr. Kahn not having been present at the interviews, that this is a mere stratagem to secure himself against the consequences of being brought into a court of justice. The whole of the case, I think, is very discreditable to the defendant, and the plaintiff is entitled to the judgment of the court for the whole of the amount sued for. One cannot help saying that the whole case is most discreditable and disgusting, and I shall allow the highest expenses to the witnesses.

Verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed, with all costs.*

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE ECONOMIC LIFE ASSURANCE OFFICE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I beg to enclose a correspondence in which I have lately been engaged with Mr. Downs, actuary of the Economic Life Assurance Office, and which I consider my duty to lay before the profession through the medium of THE LANCET. The following are the facts of the case:—

My patient, Mr. W——, applied at the Economic to effect

* We have received a letter from Mr. Bowen May, in which he states that the defendant, Kahn, immediately after the trial, returned him the other £30.
—ED. L.

an insurance upon his life, and referred the directors to me as his medical attendant. On receiving a list of questions respecting "his health and constitution," I wrote to Mr. Downs, to ask whether the directors expected the information gratuitously. To this inquiry I received no answer, but in the course of a few days I was informed by Mr. W—— that the directors had requested him to name another referee, stating in their letter to him that "I was unwilling to answer without a fee." I immediately applied to Mr. Downs, to know by what authority this statement had been made, and received his reply, stating that the questions were sent to me as the "private friend." This is a paltry evasion, as Mr. W—— informed the directors that I had attended him and his family for many years. The inference that I was unwilling to give information without payment of a fee is incorrect. When this question was first agitated with the insurance offices, I resolutely declined to answer inquiries without a fee, but I have so frequently been placed in a disagreeable position with my patients by so doing, that latterly I have consulted my own interest, and if my services have not been considered worthy of remuneration, I have given a brief certificate, and have not answered the several queries. In the present case, the directors of the Economic not only endeavoured to obtain my certificate unfairly, but by an unwarrantable statement would have led my patient to believe that I was unwilling to assist him in carrying out his wishes "to make a provision for his family."—I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Lambeth-terrace, July, 1857.

CHAS. COLLAMBELL, M.R.C.S.

THE MARSHALL HALL METHOD

SUCCESSFUL IN A CASE OF DROWNING OF TEN MINUTES' DURATION, AND AN INTERVAL OF HALF AN HOUR BEFORE ITS APPLICATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Allow me a short space in your valuable columns, to lay before your readers another case showing the incontestable value of the Marshall Hall Method, as compared with the old system.

As the vessel *The Sisters*, of Bude, was coming to anchor in the Bay of Clovelly, North Devon, R. W——, a seaman, aged twenty, was cast overboard by a flap of the jib-sail whilst in the act of stowing away the same during a storm. He remained in the sea ten minutes, and disappeared twice: just as he was about to descend the third time, the captain of the vessel succeeded in throwing a rope round him, and hauling him on board; after which half an hour elapsed in launching a boat and bringing him to me, on the sea-shore, half a mile from the vessel. *Instantly, and on the spot*, I adopted, in the presence of a large crowd of persons, the invaluable method of restoring suspended respiration in the manner laid down by Dr. Marshall Hall. The condition of the patient, cold surface, purple lips, dilated pupils, turgid and congested countenance; the wrist and other pulses of the body imperceptible; heart's action not audible; extremities quite cold and of a livid hue—all of which symptoms are expressed in one word, apnoea (or asphyxia)—prove that we should, on all occasions, have recourse to the Marshall Hall Method, even after the lapse of so long a period. In ten minutes my patient breathed feebly; in half an hour, on being asked if he were better, (although he could not articulate,) he raised his hand in token of the fact. I worked on, and in two hours and a half I had the immense satisfaction, after placing him in a warm bed, of conversing with him on the nature of his feelings &c. during the process.

I am, Sir, very faithfully, &c.,

Hartland, North Devon,
July 31st, 1857.

R. R. G. THOMAS, M.R.C.S. E.

POOR-LAW MEDICAL RELIEF.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Your readers will remember that a short time since I forwarded to you the copy of a letter I addressed to the Poor-law Board. In it was a passage from a leading article of *The Justice of the Peace*, and the following question: "As one of your medical officers, I shall feel obliged by your informing me if the lame, impotent, old, blind, and such other amongst them being poor and not able to work, are the only persons I am, by virtue of my office, bound to attend, and what course I am to pursue when the relieving officer sends me orders to attend persons not coming under the class above-named?" To this I received the annexed unsatisfactory reply. Pending further inquiries on the subject, which are being made, it may