Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

"DIFFICULTIES UNDER THE NEW VACCINATION ACT."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—With your permission I should like to reply to the letters of "P. P." and "General Practitioner" in your issue of March 11th and then I have done with the matter. Both these gentlemen seem to consider it "offensive," "undignified and unprofessional," and "irksome" to arrange *with their own patients* a suitable time for "vaccinating those babies they have brought into the world." Surely the family practitioner can settle so small a matter soon after the mother's confinement without loss of dignity, be he never so self-important. To say that such arranging for the child's vaccination at a later stage is either "unprofessional" or "offensive" is simply an abuse of language.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
THOS. FREDK. I. BLAKER,

Preston Park, Sussex, March 20th, 1899. Public Vaccinator.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Your correspondent "Fairplay" now attempts to justify the new "duties" of the public vaccinator by declaring that it is also the duty of the private practitioner to visit and offer to vaccinate. I am certain that it is not his duty, and that such offers of professional services are most objectionable. The space for vaccinations in the ordinary visiting lists is for the names of those whom the practitioner has been asked to vaccinate, and for no others. "Fairplay" might just as well suggest that the space for obstetric engagements is for the names of those whom the practitioner has heard are *enceinte* and are to be called on with offers of professional services. Such visits are most offensive to many people who look upon them as an attempt to establish a medical tyranny; they are contrary to the ethical laws that govern our profession and must be irksome to most medical men. I hope, Sirs, when you give your ruling in this matter, you will not lend your countenance to this system of "calling for orders" which has been advocated by more than one of your correspondents.

I am, Sirs, your faithfully,
P. P.

March 20th, 1899.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The list, supplied to me this month by the vaccination officer contains the names of many children who were over four months old prior to August 31st, 1898, for me to notify and visit according to the new Vaccination Act.

The clerk to the board of guardians for this district has since informed me that the vaccination officer had no right to have given the names "of what I call defaulters and wholesale law breakers of the Vaccination Act" to me; he also told the vaccination officer that he should refuse to pay the account when sent in by me. By this I suppose he means the minimum fee of 1s. and the vaccination fee for these older children. As this may happen to other public vaccinators, may I ask you through the columns of THE LANCET if I cannot recover both minimum and vaccination fees in all cases of older children that I have notified, visited, and successfully vaccinated, also if I can claim the minimum fee for these older cases I have notified and visited but have not vaccinated? Will you also inform me how, when, and by whom the new Act provides for dealing with these older cases, as I have been asked time after time the following question: "Why are So-and-so and So-and-so who have children much older than mine allowed to escape and nothing done to compel them, whilst I am pounced upon, which is most unfair?" I think you will agree with me that these women made a very just complaint, and to my thinking the sooner these wholesale law-defiers are dealt with, the more general will vaccination become than it is at the present time.—I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

March 20th, 1899.

ANOTHER PUBLIC VACCINATOR.

"THE REMOVAL OF ADENOIDS IN INFANCY."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—With reference to an annotation in THE LANCET of March 11th under the above heading an account of the following case may interest you. A female child, aged 14 weeks, was lately brought to the Birmingham and Midland Ear and Throat Hospital suffering from very marked obstruction to respiration and a diagnosis of post-nasal growths was made. Mr. F. Marsh, honorary surgeon to the hospital, decided to remove them at once. The child was placed under chloroform and the growths were removed with the aid of a small StClair Thomson forceps, after an attempt to use the finger had shown that thereby injury to the velum would ensue. The operation was entirely successful and in three days the patient left the hospital completely relieved. The child had been largely reared on starchy food.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
R. FELIX RYLAND, M.R.C.S. Eng., L.R.C.P. Lond.,
House Surgeon to the Birmingham and Midland Ear
and Throat Hospital.
March 14th, 1899.

UNRESTRAINED LUNATICS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The difficulty in certifying mentioned in a leading article in THE LANCET of March 11th is met by medical men joining the Medical Defence Union which supplies a form of indemnity against actions to its members. During recent years I have declined to certify in cases of insanity unless such a form is signed by the petitioner; in no case in my experience has that indemnity been refused, although it has sometimes been signed reluctantly. The production of that document to a lawyer or a court would be proof that "reasonable care" had been taken. None conversant with this subject can dispute your observation that the state of the law concerning it is unsatisfactory; but when we obtain the indemnity we are no longer liable to "vexatious, harassing, and costly litigation."

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
March 20th, 1899. STANLEY HAYNES, M.D. Edin.

HUNTER v. CLARE: AN APPEAL.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Permit me through your columns to appeal to the profession for subscriptions to a fund for the assistance of the widow of the late Mr. Kingsley Hunter, L.S.A., of Gamlingay. Her pathetic letter published in your issue of March 11th caused me to enter into communication with her in order to get her sanction for this letter. She informs me that the whole of their capital was expended in the purchase of the practice at Gamlingay, which was utterly ruined by the prosecution of her husband, and she is left penniless and will soon be homeless. I sincerely hope that a practical expression of the sympathy which I am sure most of my professional brethren must have for her will be the outcome of this appeal.

Cheques should be made payable to "The Hunter Fund" and may be sent to Gillett's Bank, Oxford, or to
Yours truly,

RIVERS WILLSON.
42, Wellington-square, Oxford, March 20th, 1899.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Referring to Dr. Major Greenwood's letter in your last issue I earnestly hope that some effort will be made to assist the unfortunate Mrs. Hunter. I should be quite willing to give a small subscription and I think there must be many others throughout the country who would be glad to contribute their "mite" if only to show their disapprobation of the prosecution of the late Mr. Hunter.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
M. L. DHINGRA, M.D. Edin., D.P.H. Camb.
Finsbury-park-road, N., March 20th, 1899.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I shall be happy to give a small contribution towards any fund that may be raised for Mrs. Hunter.

Personally, I strongly disapprove of the action of the General Medical Council in instituting this prosecution and I think Mrs. Hunter is deserving of much sympathy.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

ROBERT A. FRYER, M.B. Edin.

New North-road, N., March 22nd, 1899.

"SALIPYRIN IN INFLUENZA."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In THE LANCET of March 18th appears a letter from Dr. Butler Harris drawing attention to the excellent results obtained by the use of salipyrin in influenza. As I have been using a similar compound for two or three years with most rapid relief of the headache, backache, fever, and malaise of influenza, and without any untoward symptoms following its use, I beg to submit it to the readers of THE LANCET. The formula I generally use is as follows: acetanilide, 30 grains; spirit of chloroform, two drachms; spirit of camphor, one drachm; salicylate of soda, one and a half drachms; water to six ounces; one ounce to be taken every four hours until relieved. In dispensing this, owing to the slight solubility of acetanilide, the spirit should be added first and the water added by degrees. The mixture contains always light flocculent crystalline masses floating near the surface and directions have to be given that the mixture must be well shaken each time of taking. Even in cases where the pulse is most feeble I have seen rapid improvement without the slightest bad symptom, evidently owing in some measure to the stimulating effect of the camphor and alcohol. In most cases the sense of relief is attended by copious perspiration. The cost of the above combination is so much less than salipyrin that I recommend it especially to those practitioners who like myself have a great number of poorer-class patients who cannot afford to pay for very expensive prescriptions. I have three times had occasion to use it myself when attacked by influenza and each time with rapid convalescence, and in over 100 cases among my patients the compound has been invariably successful.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

H. LYON SMITH, M.R.C.S. Eng., L.R.C.P. Edin.

March 12th, 1899.

SURGERY OF PANCREATIC TUMOURS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In the discussion on Mr. Barker's paper at the Clinical Society of London¹ I said that Krönlein had removed a *tumour*, not a "cyst," as reported. It was an angio-sarcoma "as big as a fist." His original communication, with a fine coloured drawing of the post-mortem appearances, will be found in the *Beiträge zur Klinischen Chirurgie*, vol. xiv., 1895, p. 663. A solid tumour of the pancreas, if not left alone altogether, must be taken away, as there can be no question of drainage.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

ALBAN DORAN.

Granville-place, Portman-square, W., March 21st, 1899.

"THE INFECTIOUSNESS OF PHTHISIS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I see that in an annotation in THE LANCET of March 18th dealing with the action brought by the Leas Hotel Company against the executors of the late Radclyffe Hall it is stated that a witness for the defence said that my father, the late Dr. C. E. Fitz-Gerald, had certified the cause of death wrongly. I think it is a thousand pities that I was not called as a witness in the case, as I also saw the deceased once during life, my father having seen him twice, and having ample opportunity to ascertain the nature of the disease I could have positively asserted that in my opinion my father's certificate was right and that acute pulmonary phthisis was the cause of death. I have already certified the same for an insurance company and have also carried on a correspondence concerning the disinfection necessary with both the manager of the hotel and also the solicitor to the deceased. It is extremely unpleasant to us to have my late father's certificate impugned.

With regard to a matter appearing in THE LANCET of

March 11th, 1899, concerning my late father's paper entitled "The Just Position of Bacteriology," may I be allowed to state that I have no acquaintance whatever with Mr. Maurice L. Johnson and that his letter quoting my father's late paper was entirely outside my knowledge? The paper was my father's last and the view taken was a favourite one with him and I published it out of respect for his memory.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

E. D. FITZ-GERALD, M.R.C.S. Eng., L.R.C.P. Lond.

Folkestone, March 20th, 1899.

MONOPOLIES IN THERAPEUTICAL MEASURES.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The letter of Mr. Tallerman which appeared in THE LANCET of March 18th supports only too strongly the grave objection which I have long felt in common with many balneologists in this country to the altogether unnecessary interference on the part of lay inventors in the domain of therapeutics. No department of medical practice is perhaps more open to exploitation of this objectionable character than that presented by balneological therapeutics, but it is only within the past four or five years that we have been confronted by a new and more grave aspect of this evil. Hitherto we have been accustomed to the competition of that large army of unqualified practitioners (male and female) which derives such wide support at the hands of a credulous public, but now we are met by claims on the part of outsiders the character of which will be better realised when the profession has had time to grasp their full significance.

The medical profession, in this country at least, is made up very largely of men who devote a great part of their lives and much money to investigating disease and devising methods for the alleviation and cure of human suffering, and "cursed" in the eyes of his professional brethren would be the medical man who refused to make known any useful discovery or who by patent law or otherwise should limit to his own selfish ends the therapeutic value of any method of treatment whatsoever. Is it tolerable, then, that we should be asked not only to sanction but to support outside the profession practices which we justly condemn within our own ranks? In expressing these views I hold no brief for any particular hot-air apparatus. In truth, although I recognise certain advantages pertaining to each I consider them all to be more or less mere adaptations of principles and methods long known in balneological practice.

In conclusion, and briefly, I would put the case thus. If the medical profession does not possess men sufficiently scientific and inventive to devise suitable and efficient apparatus to carry out its own methods of treatment let us at least demand from the outside inventor, as a condition precedent to our recommending or using his apparatus, that he shall apply to it the same principle of free and unrestricted use which we are ourselves in the habit of applying under similar circumstances.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Buxton, March 18th, 1899.

SAMUEL HYDE.

"THE TALLERMAN TREATMENT AND ITS COUNTERFEITS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I have read with surprise Mr. Tallerman's letter in your issue of the 18th inst. In reply to the letter I may safely leave the press and the profession to take care of themselves. With regard to myself I totally deny the suggestion that I was aware of any apparatus at Mr. Tallerman's or elsewhere of a similar character to my own being in existence at the time my patent was granted and in this opinion I am supported by a leading firm of patent agents, who, at my request, made a most exhaustive search at the Patent Office.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

ARTHUR E. GREVILLE.

Upper Berkeley-street, Portman-square, W.

* * This controversy must now cease in our columns. We omit certain personalities from Mr. Greville's letter.—ED. L.

¹ THE LANCET, March 18th, 1899, p. 768.