there were any cases of suppression of urine, excepting in cholera, without disorganisation of the structure of the kidneys. Experience in these cases did not lead him to believe in the assertion of Sir Henry Hallford, which he had made in his paper in the "Transactions of the College of Physicians," that they depend upon paralysis of the kidney. He thought that was never the case, but that the cause of suppression of urine was always either a calculus or some change of organisation in the kidney, or in some portion of the urinary apparatus. In one case of suppression of urine there was carcinoma of the glands. This was amputated; the urethra remained much contracted, and there was a very small secretion of urine, which at length amounted again to suppression, when death terminated the scene; and, on examination of the body, the kidney was found as much decomposed as if it had been exposed several weeks, although only a short time after death, and no other decomposition was present. In another case of suppression of urine, stones were found in the prostate gland. In another fatal case Mr. Hodgson found disease of the ureter and bladder; and in another that he remembered, disease of the kidney. Mr. Hodgson terminated his remarks relative to suppression of urine by saying that of course he would not affirm that these cases were necessarily fatal, for he knew many that had recovered; but he firmly believed that they were all dependant upon some organic change in some portion of the urinary apparatus.

REGISTRATION OF STILL-BORN INFANTS.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—Feeling the great importance of having all statistical returns as perfect and uniform as possible, I have taken the liberty of sending you the following particulars:—

On the 6th of October, 1842, I attended a woman with her fifth child, which was still-born, and from the peeling off of the cuticle must have been dead for some days.

On the 2nd of October, 1843, the same person was delivered of twins, both male children. The first was born alive (and is still living), the second *never breathed*, although the heart continued to pulsate for nearly an hour, artificial respiration having been kept up during that time.

On calling the next day, I was somewhat surprised that *both* of the children had been registered—and that the registrar had given a certificate for the still-born child's burial—and still more so when the mother told me that she had had a similar certificate last year for her child then also still-born.

I shall feel obliged if you will favor me with a reply to the following questions:—

1. Does the law recognise an infant as being born alive *which never breathed*?
2. Is it customary or lawful to register a *still-born child*?

I am, Gentlemen,

Yours truly,

FRANCIS BUCKELL.

Romsey, October 7, 1843.

* * * We sent a copy of Mr. Buckell's communica-

tion to the Registrar-General, who favored us with the following reply:—

TO THE EDITORS OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your note of the 21st instant, respecting the registration of still-born children, I have to state for your information, by direction of the Registrar-General, that the instructions issued to registrars on that subject are as follows, namely:—

"Still-born children must not be registered; but if a child is born alive, and dies how soon soever after birth, both the birth and the death must be registered separately in the proper form."

The question whether the law recognises an infant as being born alive which never breathed, is one which the Registrar-General does not feel himself authorised to decide.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

THOMAS MANN, Chief Clerk.

General Register-office, Oct. 23, 1843.

* * * It may be interesting to notice, that the law in France on the subject of the registration of still-born children is exceedingly uncertain at present. We learn from the "Gazette des Hopitaux," (23rd of September, 1843,) that a maid servant who had been delivered of a still-born child, together with her master, and the *officier de santé*, who had assisted at the accouchement, were condemned to fine and imprisonment by the Tribunal of Montélimart for violating the 346th article of the penal code, which provides penalties for every person who has been present at an accouchement, and neglects to make a declaration of the birth to the proper officer. The parties condemned appealed, however, to the Correctional Tribunal of Valence, which acquitted them on the ground that the child was still-born. But their condemnation was subsequently confirmed by the Court of Cassation; although it had been decided by a Court of Cassation, in 1836, that no penalty attached to the neglect of registering a still-born infant.—EDS.

ST. GEORGE'S SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, LONDON.

The introductory address at this school was delivered this year by Dr. Lankester, the lecturer in the school on *materia medica* and therapeutics. The principal objects of the address were, in the first place, to present to the mind of the student the nature of the facts upon which medical science is based; and, in the second place, to point out the principles which ought to direct the student in the reception of the statements of others, and in the investigation of facts for himself. We subjoin the following extracts from the lecture:—

"From the study of the laws of inorganic nature, the student passes on to those of the organic kingdoms. He will not now have less to do with the laws of inorganic matter, but the subjects of his study assume a much more complicated character under the influence of what is called vitality; I will not say the principle of vitality, for organisation is only another form under which matter is submitted to our senses.