

*Vaccination—a few remarks on its efficacy.* BY GEORGE A. BAYNES, M.D.

I thought that at this present time, as small-pox is prevalent, a few remarks on the efficacy of vaccination, &c., would not be out of place.

Every one is familiar with the circumstances which led to the discovery of vaccination, which has immortalized Jenner, who, in the pursuit of his investigations, maintained the following points :

1st. That the essential difference between cow-pox and small-pox is the comparative virulence of the two affections, the cow pox being the milder.

2nd. That the person vaccinated with matter from the cow, resists inoculation by variolous matter.

3rd. That the preservative influence of vaccination against small pox is perpetual in the same individual.

Every one coincides with Jenner on his first two points, but some doubt is entertained as to the truth of the third ; it has caused much disputation, and there is still some difference of opinion as to the necessity of re-vaccination. Those who are of opinion that Jenner was in error, base their opinion on the fact that persons who have been vaccinated have contracted small pox, and conclude that the vaccine matter loses its efficacy, and therefore re-vaccination is absolutely necessary. However this may be, one fact is beyond dispute, that small-pox is very mild and extremely rare after vaccination.

It seems to me that the necessity for re-vaccination depends on whether the vaccination was "Genuine or Spurious?"

If it is spurious of course it cannot be called vaccinia, it affords no protection, and therefore nothing is proved.

If the vaccination were genuine, it proves that small pox has occurred after vaccination. But to give due weight to this last result it should be looked at in its proportionate light, and then deductions made. Thus what proportion