Mr. Kanthack next makes the extraordinary assertion that "in actinomyces, whether in man or in cattle, the central mycelial zone, the true and typical fungus elements always stain with Gram's method, but the club-shaped bodies may be important structures, and play a part in the development or reproduction of the organism. With regard to Mr. Kanthack's statement that "the extraordinary differences in the staining reactions of the human form from those of the bovine are certainly new and require confirmation," I may say that attention was drawn to them by Dr. Acubell and Professor Crookshank five years ago, and I regret that, as is evidently the case, Mr. Kanthack should have written on actinomyces without having studied Professor Crookshank's exhaustive reports on this subject. Mr. Kanthack next quotes me unfairly. I quite agree with him in that in madura disease the clubs are "gigantic," and they were so in my specimen. What I said, or certainly implied, in my paper was that the clubs did not stain with Gram's method, and hence were apparently absent. A line or two farther on I distinctly stated that the clubs were present.

I take this opportunity of correcting an error which appears in my paper. The reference to Baumgarten (ref. 4) should be Baumgarten's Jahresber. ii. Path. Mikroorg. iv., 1888, p. 300. In my paper. The reference to Baumgarten (ref. 4) should be Baumgarten's Jahresber. ii. Path. Mikroorg. iv., 1888, p. 300, note. I fear I have already occupied much space, and I will therefore conclude by referring Mr. Kanthack to the historical and pathological researches on actinomyces by Professor Crookshank published in the report to the Agricultural Department for 1888. This report is now about four years old; in it many of the points alluded to here are dealt with most fully. I am, Sirs, yours faithfully.

R. T. HEWLETT.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The brief account in THE LANCET of August 20th of the "false" death certificate given by me omits an important fact: and as the press has prominently reported the case with extraordinary distortion and scandalous imputations, I would like to request you to correct the injustice to the justice and integrity of the medical profession in this affair. Thus,—I learnt in the daily papers that I kept a dispensary and swindled the poor of their money and lives, though I conduct a middle-class practice at a private residence; that the patient had been visited twice by an unqualified man was given great importance to; that I had sent a registered practitioner to see the case and that he was quite willing to give the certificate was not mentioned. These are the facts: On July 25th a patient sent a message to my surgery requesting a visit. My unqualified assistant went. There were then no serious symptoms. He went again next day and found her much worse. He sent for me. I was engaged with a bad midwifery case and knew I could not leave for hours. I have a grave constitutional defect. I cannot be in two places at once; but I did the best I could under the circumstances. I sent a message to my colleague Mr. Herring of Sussex-road, N., to see the patient for me. He has been paid by me for going and was therefore my agent. He agreed with the diagnosis and treatment and has since written to the Registrar General to say he would have been quite willing to give a certificate. I arrived on the scene a few minutes after death and never saw the patient alive. I have been much blamed for not giving Mr. Herring's certificate to the friends. But I did not take the trouble, for the following reason. It is an actual fact that if language is taken in its ordinary sense, it is possible to truthfully fill up a death certificate as at present worded without having seen the patient at all. I could in this case truthfully give the cause of death "to the best of my knowledge and belief." I could truthfully state when I had "last seen" him or her. But could I logically and truthfully say I had treated the deceased? A little reflection showed me I could. It is first necessary to understand the meaning of the word "attended," as used on a death certificate. Like many other words in the English language it has two meanings as different as night from day. The phrases "attending an auction," "attending court," "attending a funeral" means simply "going to" and nothing more. But there is overwhelming evidence that on a death certificate when the words "attended" or "attends" means "attending to" patients, it means treating them. I can attend patients at my own house. But I could I truthfully and logically say I had treated a patient

2 We colored plates in Professor Crookshank's Report to the Board of Agriculture on Actinomyces.

O. S.—being still ill. The latter was admitted ten days later into the Liverpool Fever Hospital, South, his case having been notified as one of enteric fever. Death occurred three days subsequently. The post-mortem examination was referred to them by the almost locally known familiarly as "Danube fever." The crew were paid off at Rotterdam, several of them, including
whom I had never seen? A thousand parallel examples that he had built a bridge, though he had done it entirely showed me I could. Would not an engineer naturally say made them himself. Finding he had neither seen nor touched so insane as to accuse him of lying? 'T | met him in the street and asked him (the registrar) for some therefore if the statements just quoted can be truthfully language in its ordinary sense I have had to pay nearly the certificate for which I was fined. For the crime of using thus: "I certify that I personally attended to during ambiguity about this. It was unfortunate for me that my position.—Ed. L.

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SANITARY COMMISSIONER WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA FOR 1890.**

To the Editors of the Lancet.

Sir,—In reviewing the above report in your issue of Aug. 20th, you dwell at some length on the mortality and sickness caused by enteric fever among the British troops in India. That it is a subject of great importance to the army nobody can deny. Not only many lives are lost both among the men and officers, but the State also suffers a great pecuniary loss by the sickness and invaliding caused by it. With your permission I shall attempt to say a few words on the subject from the little experience I have had both among the British and native troops in India. You ask the question whether enteric fever is or is not prevalent among the native population in India? I have no hesitation in saying that natives of India do not suffer from it to the extent the Europeans do in India. There is no doubt that the enteric fever is essentially the same in pathology in India both among the European and native Indians, as the typhoid fever in Europe. If that is the case the question arises, How is it that it is not so prevalent among the latter as among the former? It is more puzzling when one thinks of the sanitary surroundings of both the classes. He must be a bold man who can put his fingers in the noses of Asiatic native soldiers and their companions in the barracks of the British soldiers in India. As you rightly observe, there are no imperfect drains and sewer air to account for the cause of the disease. It cannot be put down to the water-supply, as not only is it good, but account for the cause of the disease. It cannot be...