

court and the physician's affidavit as to what his evidence would be with more exact information placed before him, the judge *quashed* the finding of the coroner's jury and directed them to sit again. The following verdict was then returned: "That the deceased E. M. C. died of tetanus. The disease was not caused by the method of vaccination nor was due to the vaccine used." That the last part of the verdict which stands in this case was justified, is abundantly apparent. The best authorities are agreed that the symptoms of tetanus develop within from four to fifteen days after inoculation. Meningitis has been spoken of in connection with the case, with how much reason we do not know; in any event, to settle the question of diagnosis beyond dispute, a bacteriological examination of the wound discharges ought to have been made, and this was apparently not done. It may fairly be held that the diagnosis of tetanus has not been established beyond dispute. Moreover, the evidence goes to prove that the vaccination was not performed as it ought to have been. The operator was not a physician, and whilst he testifies to the cleanliness of the child, damages his own standing as a judge of what is properly called clean by also testifying that he did not wash the arm before vaccinating.

Admitting, however, for the sake of argument, that the diagnosis of tetanus in this case was correct, and that the incubation of the disease might extend over more than three weeks, and also taking as proven that the operation was done with all proper precautions, it is still impossible to believe that the tetanus germ was conveyed through the vaccine used. Before it was put upon the market, bacteriological and physiological tests failed to discover any pathogenic organisms in it. Many vaccinations must have been done from the same batch, and yet in one instance only does this rarest of complications follow. That such should be the case is inconceivable if the infection came through the lymph. A much more probable explanation of the accident is not far to seek. There is on the vaccinated arm a wound which, we have every reason to suppose, was not kept clean as it should be, from the fact that it appeared as a running sore at the time when the physician was called in twenty-four days after vaccination. Infection of this wound with tetanus germs is not surprising. The opportunities for entrance of the tetanus bacilli or spores into wounds must be very great, since, in the earth of many localities, and consequently in the dust, the organism is abundant. Why people who are not overly clean do not more frequently fall victims to the disease is the wonder.

Much has also been made by opponents of vaccination, of an outbreak of tetanus in Camden, New Jersey, in which nine out