THE SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HYGIENE AND DEMOGRAPHY, 1891.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The "Transactions" of the International Congress of Hygiene and Demography have been issued by the publishers and the delivery of them to the members of the Congress has been almost completed. Owing to various causes (changes of address, possible errors in the list &c.) some few copies have not found their owners and I ask you to kindly allow me to make use of your valuable columns to request those persons whose names are on the list of members and who have not duly received the "Transactions" to immediately notify the fact to Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, East Harding-street, Fetter-lane, E.C.

I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

G. V. POORE, Hon. Secretary General.

May 6th, 1893.

"SUBJECTIVE SENSATION OF THE MOUTH IN WOMEN."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In THE LANCET of Jan. 25th, 1890, under the above title, Dr. Hadden describes three cases where a peculiar burning sensation occurred in the mouths of women without apparent cause. In your issue of April 15th, 1893, under the heading of "A Case for Diagnosis," "J. D. R." records a case with similar symptoms, but occurring in a man. At the present time I have a gentleman under my care who suffered in much the same way as "J. D. R.'s" patient. About twelve months ago he began to have a burning hot sensation on the right side of the tongue, which was more or less intermittent in character and varied in intensity. Thinking it was due to irritation from an artificial tooth he removed it, but with no benefit. The sensation gradually became worse and he described it as though hot fumes were coming from that side of the tongue and as though it was enlarged. It prevented him sleeping at times and was the source of much worry. About four or five weeks ago the pain became less and since then he has been entirely free from it, the first time for twelve months. There was neither loss of taste, nor touch, nor tenderness over the affected area and nothing abnormal was to be seen or felt. He is about sixty years of age, is a non-smoker and is healthy, but perhaps slightly neurotic. No special treatment was adopted.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

J. HARLEY GOUGH.

Horrabridge, South Devon, May 9th, 1893.

WAS IT SMALL-POX?

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—With this I send you a copy of the *Woodford Times* with report of proceedings of the local board. I may add that the practitioner in question, in answer to my note, reaffirms his diagnosis that the case in question was one of modified small-pox. I never see the patients at the houses at which I call when infectious disease is notified. I hold it is not my duty to do so, as it would soon place me in very awkward positions. I would add that all the members of the board except the chairman agreed with me. Might I ask your opinion as to the matter of the county council and reports? The county council wants me to make all manner of reports to it but declines to pay for them, and I decline to make the reports. If they are worth anything they are worth paying for and I see no reason why I should do work for it without payment. I do not believe members of any other profession would be asked to do it.

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

Woodford Green, May 9th, 1893.

WILLIAM G. GROVES.

GUINEA-WORM IN A DOG.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I write to you regarding a case of guinea-worm in a dog which may interest your readers and elicit from some any similar case. I have had a good deal of experience with guinea-worms in man out here, but I have never known a case in an animal. Cobbold, in his "Entozoa in Man and Animals," 1879, does not give any example of such a case,

and on page 224 he says that dogs are clearly unsuitable hosts. In this book one finds no reference to any other entozoon which could be mistaken for a guinea-worm. The dog, a small fox-terrier, belongs to an officer in my regiment, and I first saw it when we went to a camp of exercise in November, 1892. The dog then went lame in its off foreleg, but no cause for its lameness could be found. It ran about all day and did not seem much put out. It followed the regiment on a march of thirty-nine miles into cantonments in December and seemed to have got over its lameness. About a fortnight ago its owner came to me and said he had extracted a guinea-worm from his dog's leg whole. I must say I thought he was romancing; however, I could not see the worm, as it had been thrown away. I went to see the dog and found it had a swollen leg with a sinus above the elbow, from which was discharging some watery pus. I gave the officer an injection of zinc to use. A few days afterwards the dog was left in my care, as his master went on leave. When I took the dog it was feverish and had its leg much swollen. A long sinus ran down the inside of its leg. I made a counter-opening and washed it out with zinc lotion. In a day or two both openings closed and I let the dog run about and it seemed quite happy. The second day after this I found the abscess had refilled and so I opened it at both ends and from the lower end a piece of a guinea-worm protruded, which I seized and pulled out. I had then a portion of worm about ten inches long, and it was apparently identical with the guinea-worm found so often in man out here. The dog has made a good recovery. It could not have got the worm in these parts as it has not been here long enough and must have swallowed the embryo in its host at Muttra, up country.

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

GEORGE KELLIE,

Surgeon-Major, 4th Lancers H.C.

Bolaram, Deccan, April 20th, 1893.

"MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH AND GENERAL PRACTITIONERS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—There is little doubt but that the action of the medical officer of health of Eastbourne against Mr. Barford will be very properly condemned by a considerable majority of medical men. The question of whether the scarlet fever had ceased—including the stage of desquamation—is not a question of preventive medicine, and therefore the evidence of the medical attendants would very properly be held to be better evidence than that of the medical officer of health. But, setting aside the evidence of opinion, there is the evidence of the fact that three months had elapsed, and this evidence is strongly in favour of Mr. Barford; and, further, setting aside all considerations of preventive medicine, is not a medical attendant bound by law, and by every other consideration, to look after the interests of his patient, whether the disease happens to be contagious or not? When removal becomes a part of the treatment, is considered right and necessary and is prescribed by the medical attendant, is a medical officer of health to have the power to say "You shall not"? No medical man takes these steps without proper precautions, and with proper precautions no one need hesitate to perform his duty to his patient conscientiously. By the views held by "the Bench" Mr. Barford is placed in an extremely awkward position. The friends of the patient could say to him, "If you consider removal necessary and you neglect your duty to our sick child, we shall take proceedings against you"; and, on the other hand, the medical officer of health says, "If you remove that child, I will take proceedings against you." Curiously enough, the case has been made one of interest to the profession generally and should be submitted to the more enlightened atmosphere of our superior courts, where doubtless Mr. Barford will come off with flying colours.

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

A POOR-LAW MEDICAL OFFICER,

London, W., May 10th, 1893.

"DEATH CERTIFICATION."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I live nearly two miles from the registrar of deaths for this district. Until recently I was able to obtain a book of certificate forms by sending for it; but now, it seems,