To the Editor. Sir,—In a recent letter in your columns a correspondent, who signs his letter J. H., but who, I fancy, may be identified as a frequent contributor to newspaper discussions on the subject, states that “the Gloucester citizens renounce vaccination.” This is one of those statements that is more easily made than proved. If the recent election for Guardians is any evidence on the subject, it does not go very far. Of fourteen candidates avowedly run as anti-vaccinators, seven were elected, and four out of the seven were at the bottom of the poll in their respective wards. This does not look much like renunciation. But suppose they had been at the top of the poll, what would this prove? Possibly, that the feeling against the present vaccination law is strong in Gloucester. That might be an argument for modifying the law, but it is none for talking of vaccination as a “delusion.” If your readers want a specimen of wild and inconsequential rhetoric and utterly fallacious statistics on this subject, they will certainly do well to procure the recent work on vaccination of Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace. It shows conclusively how incapable a really clever man in one department of knowledge be to appreciate evidence in another. As to your correspondent T. C. T., again very well-known initials in the anti-vaccination field of controversy, his statements about the Gloucester epidemic are about as reliable as those of J. H. about the “renunciation” of the city—“repudiation,” it is, according to T. C. T. If any of your readers would care to read the article in the “Lancet” to which he refers, I shall be glad to send them a copy, and they can then in reading it be on their guard against being “misled.”—Yours truly,

Francis T. Bond, M.D., Lond.,
Hon. Secretary, Jenner Society.
Gloucester, April 7, 1898.