the use of an exclusively animal regimen—he has even maintained its use for three months' duration; the benefit derived from it is attended with much uncertainty, but in some cases the relief is both speedy and continuous; such a release from the monotony of sheer animal food seems to the author highly desirable.

Both the author of the treatise and Professor Capezzuoli have employed themselves in the view of the doctrines of Bouchardat, and they find that the amount of sugar secreted does not depend with any exactness on the quality of the food, any more than it does on the indulgence of thirst; animal diet only seldom produces a slight diminution in the relative amount of sugar to a given quantity of urine, and even the saccharine diet (as above defined) may have the same effect. They do not deny that by modifying the amount of urine, diet is often very influential in increasing or diminishing the absolute amount of sugar secreted. In such cases they regard the operation of diet, with regard to the sugar, as indirect. We confine ourselves to a bare indication of the scope of this work, the impossibility which presents itself to us of entering into the nice details of which it consists, compels us to rest satisfied with the little information we now tender to our readers. Though founded on the observation of but six cases, it is a good example of minute and philosophical inquiry, no consideration being neglected which can be brought to bear on the disease.

ART. XV.—*Inconsistencies of the English Census of 1861 with the Registrar-General's Reports, and Deficiencies in the Local Registry of Births.* By WILLIAM LUCAS SARGANT, 1865. Pp. 51.

THE following conclusions, the results of the author's calculations, are so important, if any wise correct, that we are induced to quote them; not indeed with the intention of engaging in any critical examination of them, but solely for the purpose of calling the attention to them of those of our readers who take an interest in vital statistics. We have only to add, that the paper containing them, with the author's explanatory remarks and suggestions, is published in the 'Journal of the Statistical Society of London,' for March, 1865.

The conclusions in question, which he calls the principal ones he has arrived at, are the following:—

"1. That the census of 1861 is not to be implicitly trusted, but requires further investigation.

"2. That the male infants below 1 year old are underrated by 36,546, or 12 per cent.; and the female infants by 30,831, or 10½ per

cent. That in the second year of life the deficiencies are $11\frac{1}{2}$ and 11 per cent.; in the third year 2 and 1 per cent; and in the first five years taken together, $6\frac{1}{2}$ and 6 per cent.

"3. That this difference of error between male and female infants is probably owing to the better registration of male births, and not to a worse enumeration of males in the census.

"4. That the males and females together, of all ages *under* 20, are apparently underrated by 510,446; but that some considerable deductions have to be made from this number.

"5. That the males and females together of *all* ages are probably underrated by more than half-a-million.

"6. That the deficiency in the census is far greater in some districts than in others.

"7. That the registration of births is very imperfect in some places, Liverpool and Hull appearing to be the worst, with London, Cheltenham, Plymouth, and Portsmouth, following in order of demerit.

"8. That we have but few materials for comparing the census of Scotland with calculations made from the registers of births; but that as far as we can judge, the Scottish census is as inaccurate as the English one."

ART. XVI.—*On the Probable Surgical Effects in Battle, in case of the employment of Projectiles of a more elongated form, such as the Whitworth Projectiles.* By Deputy Inspector-General THOMAS LONGMORE, Professor of Military Surgery, Army Medical School. Reprinted from 'Army Medical Report for 1863.' Pp. 7.

THIS short tract will well repay perusal, as containing some interesting and curious facts, as well as speculations, on the effect of bullets of different kinds employed in war. It is not, perhaps, always present to the mind of a civil surgeon, though obvious when once stated, that the effects of different kinds of arms have to be studied for military purposes under two points of view, viz., how they act on the individual who is first struck, and what effect they have on the body of troops of which that individual forms a part. The object of firing on a body of troops is, as Mr. Longmore justly observes, not to kill as many as possible, nor even chiefly to stop their instant power of motion (as when wild animals are hunted); but to inflict, upon as many of them as possible, such injuries as shall render them useless as soldiers, at least during the campaign. Consequently, projectiles are sought for, such as (1) have a high velocity and great range; (2) are not easily deflected from their course; (3) produce severe injuries in their course; and (4) can pass through