HÆMATOZOA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It may interest some of your readers to know that I have received from Dr. T. Lewis, of Calcutta, some slides containing specimens of hæmatozoa in blood and urine, and that Sir William Jenner will show these slides at the meeting of the Pathological Society on Tuesday next. Unfortunately the slides have been damaged *in transitu*, but two or three good specimens of the *Filaria sanguinis hominis* can still be seen. Sir William Jenner will also show some ova and immature worms from the blood of a dog, which were sent from China by Dr. Lamprey to Dr. Aitken, and on which Dr. Welch has written a paper, which is to appear in your columns. In *Nature* of the 13th of February there is a note on Lewis's remarkable discovery which seems to make it desirable to put on record the dates of the discovery. The *Filaria* was discovered in the urine of patients with chyluria by Lewis in 1869, and a report on the discharges of cholera, in which this discovery was noted, was sent in to Government in that year, and was published in 1870 in the Sixth Report of the Sanitary Commissioner with the Government of India for 1869 (Calcutta, p. 143). In 1870 or 1871 a specimen was sent to Netley. The *Filaria* was discovered in the blood either in 1871 or early in 1872. I cannot discover the exact date from Lewis's paper, but will ascertain it. As questions of priority sometimes arise at a time when it is difficult to settle them, I think it well to put these dates on record.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Royal Victoria Hospital, Netley,
February 24th, 1873.

E. A. PARKES.

CASE OF MUSSEL-POISONING.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Having seen mussel poisoning recently commented upon in THE LANCET, I thought the following notes of a case might be of some interest:—

On the 19th inst., J. F——, a strong, healthy man, took the greater portion of two quarts of mussels to his tea. Immediately afterwards he went out to transact some business. About half an hour after, while walking along the street, he was suddenly seized with dizziness, and at the same time felt a prickling of the skin, commencing at the lips and extending over the whole face and neck. His eyes throbbled and grew dim, and seemed to swell in his head, and he was griped and sickened by a severe pain in the stomach. With difficulty he managed to get home, and at once sent for me.

I found the patient in great distress. He complained chiefly of cramp in the stomach, intense throbbing of the temples and eyeballs, and a sensation of giddiness as if everything was swimming round him. He still complained of the prickling sensation in the face; and by this time he felt the prickling also in his hands and along the fingers; the face and neck were congested almost to lividity, and were considerably swollen; the eyelids were swelled, the conjunctivæ injected, and pupils contracted. The hands and wrists were also very red, and felt hot; very similar, indeed, to what is perceived by sight and touch on the appearance of the rash in scarlatina. The rest of the skin presented nothing abnormal. The pulse was full and quick; but the case was too urgent for me to take time to count it. The patient was very sick, and several times attempted to vomit, but his efforts were abortive.

The case was treated by a mustard emetic, with copious draughts of warm water, followed, after an interval, by a smart aperient. The patient experienced immediate relief, and soon afterwards went to sleep, and next morning he was perfectly well.

The patient's wife had also taken some of the mussels, but she fortunately vomited them soon after they were swallowed.

The mussels were purchased from one of those itinerant dealers who are so common in Liverpool. I have several times seen these poor people gathering mussels from the dock walls, where, from contiguity to the filth and scrapings

of the ships, the mussels cannot be of the healthiest. As two persons were fatally poisoned in Liverpool only a few days ago by eating mussels, it would be well if the authorities kept a better watch upon the vendors of these shell-fish.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

THORBURN PATERSON,
Liverpool, Feb. 24th, 1873. Hon. Surgeon, Liverpool Dispensaries.

AFTER-ATTENDANCE IN MIDWIFERY CASES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—At the last meeting of the Sydenham District Medical Society one of the members called attention to the statement in your journal of the 25th ult., that it is usual for the medical attendant in midwifery cases to attend the patient for eight or nine days after the confinement gratuitously. A discussion on the subject followed, and I was requested to write to you, stating that the following note occurs in the tariff of medical fees recommended by this Society to its members:—"The midwifery fee does not include after-visits, except amongst the poorer classes, where the minimum fee of 21s. is supposed to cover the after-visits when these are few and the patient does well."

I was requested to state further that the same rule exists in the tariff of the following societies:—The Manchester Medico-Ethical Society, the Lothians Medical Association, the Wolverhampton and South Staffordshire Medical Society, and the Shropshire Medico-Ethical Society.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

B. N. DALTON, M.B.,
Hon. Sec. of Sydenham District Medical Society.
South Norwood, Feb. 17th, 1873.

* * * We did not mean to say that after-visits should be gratuitous, but that they should be included in the fee. We think it desirable that in ordinary cases such a fee should be charged as will cover the necessary visits.—ED. L.

WILDING v. HILL.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In your criticism in last week's LANCET on the above case, you evidently were not acquainted with the following points:—

1. The only proper persons for a workhouse are the houseless destitute.
2. The guardians alone are the legal custodians of all persons in the workhouse; their deputy the master.
3. The medical officer has no legal power to dismiss or forcibly retain any inmate; his office consists in giving a certificate in the event of unsoundness of mind, or suffering from disease under the Contagious Act, to the master, and it is the medical officer's duty to report all under certificate within fourteen days to the guardians. In *St. Pancras Workhouse there is no infirmary*.

Now, as Sarah Wilding was not a houseless destitute person, but reported by the relieving officer to have a very comfortable home, with friends to attend her, friends to assist her, near the parish surgeon, and was not and never had been of unsound mind, and free from any contagious disease, it was contended that she ought not to have been detained in the infirm wards of the St. Pancras Workhouse, a workhouse full to overflowing, and thus keeping out distressed objects of relief.

This old woman maintained herself until she reached eighty-four years of age, and only now gets 3s. per week to assist her in her lodgings. She has worked at her trade to the time of her detention in the workhouse, and continues to the present time to partially support herself in that way. Her eyesight is excellent; never wears glasses; her memory is clear and retentive; and her desire for remunerative occupation as great as ever. The distinction of pushing her out of the workhouse into the street, and permitting her friends to take her, appears to me never to have been considered by the medical officer.

The legal question is settled: the guardians have no power legally to detain any pauper desirous to leave after proper notice, except in lunacy and contagious diseases, and in her