

practice, and in a region which, as I showed statistically from the returns of the Board of Health, gave in that year a larger mortality from the disease in proportion to population than any ward in the city.

With the above I reported still better results obtained by this method of treatment in private practice, which I will not recapitulate here.

That results so favorable should excite incredulity was to be expected. One zealous dispute asserted publicly in opposition to my explicit statements and the probabilities, that my cases must have been "exceptionally mild" ones. The precise opposite was the fact. I cannot, however, deny that my cases may have been, *after a few days of treatment*, exceptionally mild as compared with some others.

From this *résumé* of results already published, I now proceed to those of the following year, 1876. In that year I treated from the Dispensary 37 cases, of which 29 occurred in the first four months. Then the epidemic quite suddenly abated, and only eight were seen in the remainder of the year.

Of these 37 cases, three passed, after a single visit, under other medical care—with what results I do not know; five others died, and 29 recovered.

Of the five that died, one, aged two and a half years, was moribund with laryngeal croup when first seen, dying in less than ten hours afterward. The only possible remedy, tracheotomy, was refused.

In another case which was bad, but not hopeless, when first seen, I returned on the second day to find the patient moribund. The parents, who were extraordinary specimens of perverse stupidity, acknowledged that they had not used the remedies furnished them, an old woman having told them that the spray would injure the child's eyes! I may here mention that I have in many instances, scarcely more favorable than this in respect to nursing, made up for the deficiency by very frequent visits on the part of myself or my assistants; otherwise I never could have obtained the results I have. In this instance, other engagements made this impossible.

Deducting from the five deaths these two cases in which the treatment was not employed, leaves three deaths out of 32 cases in which it was tested; or, again, a little less than ten per cent.

Among the twenty-nine cases that recovered were a full quota of severe ones, and four were among the very worst that were ever known to recover, as can be attested by competent medical witnesses. I condense a brief account of one of these from notes taken at the time:

Ann McFall, aged three years, 606 Second avenue, March 21, 1876. When first seen, great inflammation and swelling of the fauces; membrane on both tonsils and over soft palate; much enlargement of cervical glands. Extrême nasal

affection with profuse sanious muco-purulent discharge; excoriated nostrils and upper lip, and obstructed breathing. A great degree of blood-poisoning was evident from the characteristic hue and expression.

Expecting her death before the next day, treatment was nevertheless begun. The nose was thoroughly cleansed out two or three times every day by syringing with warm salt water, in which I was kindly assisted by Dr. D. C. Comstock. This proceeding was always followed by freer respiration and improved hue of complexion. The one favorable symptom was that the child could be induced to take milk quite freely.

The condition of the patient continued about the same for six days, the membrane having disappeared from the tonsils, but continuing on the faucial arch and uvula, and a large patch having formed on the tongue.

On the 27th the case was seen by Dr. W. T. White, who predicted its fatal termination. For the next five days the patient's condition continued critical, but gradually improved under the use of the same means, which were employed altogether for two weeks before the patient was considered out of danger. This case was repeatedly seen by Dr. W. E. Bullard.

Few cases, giving so much evidence of constitutional poisoning as this did, recover. It is to be noted that it was treated without stimulants or quinine.

Over-zealous advocacy may be of great injury to a good cause. I therefore say explicitly that I do not claim that such extremely bad cases as the above can, as a rule, be cured. Constitutional vigor is an important factor and sometimes of itself produces remarkable recoveries under all kinds of treatment. I do, however, believe, from not a few similar experiences, that this method, when effectively applied, gives, in all such cases, the best, and in some, the only chance of recovery.

It would be unpardonable forgetfulness should I fail to record my great obligations for most valuable assistance in the above-mentioned labors to Dr. D. C. Comstock, and to Dr. W. E. Bullard, who is now visiting physician to the south district of this Dispensary.

Aware that the endless repetition of statistics of cures resting mainly on my own unsupported assertions, could add little to the weight of the original ones, I adopted at the beginning of the past year (1877) the plan of having the cases occurring in my Dispensary service seen and the diagnosis verified by competent, disinterested, and well-known witnesses. Seventeen cases thus occurred during the year. I reserve the details of these cases and their results, with interesting and instructive facts connected with them, for publication when the number of such attested cases shall have become sufficiently large to be authoritative. I will only state at present that most of these cases have been kindly seen