

briefly as follows:—Lady Flora was maid of honor to H. R. H. the Duchess of Kent (not to Her Majesty), and after being absent on a visit to her friends returned to court, certainly evincing some signs of pregnancy, which, though not very manifest at the time, were observed by Sir James Clark, merely as an observer, without examination, on which he advised Her Majesty to dispense with Lady Flora's attendance at court.

She accordingly received an intimation to this effect, together with the cause of it. The lady knowing of course the injustice of the dismissal, at once put herself under the protection of her brother, the Marquis of Hastings, who insisted on seeing Her Majesty, and demanding an examination by eminent medical men. This was immediately accorded and an unanimous opinion at once expressed that the case was one of ovarian dropsy, from which disease she eventually died, though not till long after her character had been fully vindicated, as I myself saw her repeatedly afterwards riding and walking in public with Her Majesty, who, with her accustomed justice and kindness, appeared to take every means of publicly vindicating the character of the aspersed lady. As I said before I know nothing of the other cases referred to, but this one of Lady Flora's would certainly tend to confirm my remarks rather than Dr. Peltier's treatment, as had the case been allowed to proceed without an examination, very much more unpleasant results would inevitably have followed.

I am, Gentlemen, &c.,

Hatley, E. T.

F. D. GILBERT, M.R.C.S.L.

[The above arrived too late for insertion in the first form, we nevertheless publish it here, and in doing so feel that it is but justice to our friend Dr. Peltier to observe that it is not at all uncommon for the circumstantial part of a case to be variously rumored, as seems to have been so with Lady Flora Hastings, while the substance is retailed unchanged; and that, with regard to the treatment of the case, we have sufficient confidence in his skill and judgment to believe that when he discovered the time for interference he would not let it pass without putting into practice the means indicated. In reply to the few remarks of Dr. G. that have been omitted, as being of a private nature, we have only to say, that Editors are too courteous and consistent to asperse such productions of their contributors as they deem worthy of publication. Nor do they hold themselves accountable for the practices and views of any other individuals than themselves. In answer to Dr. G.'s last inquiry they assure him that the facts published are credible, and that the parties concerned are or have been of the School of Medicine of this city, as the daily papers have openly stated.—EDS. MED. CHR.]