

to the importance of looking beyond the local causes in these affections."

With all courtesy I very strongly protest against Mr. Lennox Browne twisting a sentence (see below) used in reference to an expression in a private letter from him, so as to make it appear to refer to his published communications, and to involve me in a partial recantation from the position I took up originally, a position from which I cannot depart. I impute no motive to Mr. Lennox Browne, but your readers will judge for themselves whether he has been fair to myself, and therefore to the signatories who endorsed my statements. On Feb. 21st Mr. Lennox Browne, seeing my letter in THE LANCET, wrote to me as follows: "I am posting you a copy of my paper to the *Liverpool Medical-Chirurgical Journal*. I don't think I have ever been one not to recognise and even to enforce the importance of looking beyond local causes, and I hope you will find that I am not behind in that respect in the subject now under discussion." On Feb. 22nd I replied in these terms: "Thank you much for your courtesy in sending me a reprint of your recent article just to hand, which I am sorry to say, had escaped my notice. I am certainly in entire accord with the opinion you express in your letter as to the importance of looking beyond local causes in these affections."

Now I did not express any opinion on Mr. Lennox Browne's article in my letter of acknowledgement to him, for I did not feel called upon to do so (and in fact had not read it when I wrote that letter), and I would refrain from any personal criticism whatever had he left me any option in the matter. In my first letter to your journal, I referred to no one in particular in my protest against the caricature of laryngology as a branch of scientific medicine which I considered was in danger of being mistaken by some practitioners for a genuine portrait. But Mr. Lennox Browne will forgive me for feeling that he compels me to conclude that (judging from his publication in the *Liverpool Journal*) he must be the head and forefront of the offenders as regards lingual varix, since he finds that 28.3 per cent. of all the cases seen in his private practice suffered from this affection, and that in 28 per cent. of his "varix" cases the varicose condition "was unassociated with any other objective local evidences." When we are left to infer that all these cases are treated by him by the galvano-cautery point I think Dr. McBride was well warranted in writing, "if we are to cauterise every venous radicle which appears in front of the epiglottis we shall put our patients to much needless inconvenience, and perhaps to some very unnecessary expense." In calling attention to these figures I impute no mercenary motive to those who may, in my opinion, exaggerate the importance of these venous radicles, but the results to the patients for good or evil remain the same, whatever the motive.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Clifton, Bristol, March 8th, 1896.

P. WATSON WILLIAMS.

P.S.—I shall feel grateful if you would kindly forward an early proof of the above to Mr. Lennox Browne, so that he may correct me if I have unintentionally misconstrued his communications at the same time as this appears.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I am obliged to you for adopting the courteous suggestion of Dr. Watson Williams that I should see an early proof of his letter, and I hasten to take advantage of the opportunity thus given me of promptly correcting him. He has certainly misconstrued my allusion to him, for it must be evident by context of the two letters that I quoted him in the belief that he, having read not only my letter but the article which had previously "escaped his notice," acknowledged that I had not failed to recognise "the importance of looking beyond local causes in these affections." Dr. Watson Williams breaks new ground on which, were I disposed, I could further correct him, but I will not trespass on your space.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

LENNOX BROWNE.

Mansfield-street, Portland-place, March 11th, 1896.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In your last number Mr. Lennox Browne refers to my previous letter as if it supported his views and condemned those of Dr. Tilley, Dr. Watson Williams, Dr. Semon, Dr. de Havilland Hall, Dr. Greville Macdonald, and Mr. Batlin and Mr. Charters Symonds. On reference

to the letter in question it will at once be seen that exactly the reverse is the case. Let me, Sirs, once more repeat my belief that dilated veins on the tongue rarely, if ever, cause symptoms or require local treatment. I hope that this will not admit of any misinterpretation.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Edinburgh, March 10th, 1896.

P. McBRIDE.

"THE HUDDERSFIELD POISONING CASE."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I see in the notice *re* the Huddersfield poisoning case in THE LANCET of Feb. 29th that you say it was unfortunate that no urine was taken, but in this you have made a slight mistake. I may say the urine was examined the first of all and in it was found mercury, but I had no proof as to how it had been administered or by whom, and my wish was, if possible, to bring the crime home to the right person.

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

L. DEMETRIADI.

New North-road, Huddersfield, March 2nd, 1896.

"MEDICAL CERTIFICATES AND THE BOARD SCHOOLS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Will you kindly do me the favour to give space in THE LANCET to draw attention to the right of refusing to give certificates to scholars of School Boards? The parents of the children who happen to be my patients bring me a form supplied by some School Board official to be filled and signed. I have refused to sign them, remarking that I am not a paid servant of the School Board, and that in case they are summoned I am quite prepared to give evidence that the child was not fit to go to school. These remarks were communicated to the official, who made a complaint to the Board about my conduct. The chairman called on me about it and said that legally I had a perfect right to refuse to give certificates without a fee, but that I was the only one who refused to do so, adding that if other local practitioners followed my example the Board would seriously consider the question of granting a fee. Now, Sirs, I ask your opinion whether I have adopted a proper course in doing so; if it is so, why should my brother practitioners not follow the same plan to gain our much-abused rights? Lately I have read so much about the insult offered to the profession by some of the School Boards that it is high time we did something to stop it.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

J. F. D'ABREU, L.R.C.P. Edin., &c.

Handsworth, March 10th, 1896.

"THE COMPARATIVE NUTRIENT VALUE OF MEAT PREPARATIONS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I regret that when writing the letter which, under the above heading, you kindly inserted for me in THE LANCET of last week, my memory did not serve me rightly in the reference I made to an account which *Food and Sanitation* published several months past on this subject, and which error I wish, with your kind indulgence, to correct. In the absence of the article referred to, to ensure my recollection, I said that in that paper bovril was stated to be one hundred and fifty-two (152) times superior as a nutrient to Valentine's meat juice, whereas I find on looking over and working out "Professor Chittenden's Percentage Composition of Beef Products, analysed 1891" tables, which you print on page 649 of your journal (March 7th, 1896), and from which presumably *Food and Sanitation's* calculations originated, that Liebig's extract of beef is the preparation whose proportion of "total proteid matter available as nutriment" or of nutrients as I understood *Food and Sanitation* to then imply, is so fractionable when opposed to that of bovril. This difference was, I am inclined to think, a novelty to others as well as to myself at the time, as upsetting previous ideas. With regard to Valentine's meat juice I think I need offer very little apology to *Food and Sanitation* for the mistake I made, considering the esteem in which it is held by that publication. Its value as a nutrient under the same conditions as before, I reckon from the same tables, must have been estimated by your contemporary at sixteen