

## Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

### HOSPITAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.

*To the Editors of THE LANCET.*

SIRS,—Will you kindly allow me to state that the association are making arrangements to hold a conference in London during the second week in October next and that it has been proposed to set down for discussion the following subjects: (1) the inquiry system; (2) payments by patients; and (3) provident dispensaries. It is very desirable that representatives from Ireland and Scotland, as well as from the provincial centres of England and Wales, should attend the conference and I shall feel obliged if persons interested in the hospital question will take an early opportunity of communicating with me in order that a programme may be prepared some time beforehand.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

T. GARRETT HORDER, Hon. Sec.

32, Windsor-place, Cardiff, August 22nd, 1899.

### "ILLEGAL CERTIFICATES OF PROFICIENCY IN MEDICINE, SURGERY, AND MIDWIFERY."

*To the Editors of THE LANCET.*

SIRS,—Though by styling himself a "co-signatory" he shares, and thus diminishes, the slight and discredit he throws upon the signatories, and at the same time emphasises his censure of the documents, Mr. Horsley was not invited by the Corporate and Medical Reform Association to be, and could hardly have been, a "co-signatory" of the memorials to the General Medical Council against certification of unqualified practitioners, or, if he had signed them, have dealt in Council with his own memorials. It should be unnecessary to say that had we considered them "involved," "verbose," "inflated," or "bombastic" they would not have been so couched or issued, nor would any of us have signed them. We do not think many men would be found willing, as Mr. Horsley implies that he was, to sign documents of which they had such an opinion.

We regret Mr. Horsley's apparent desire to disparage memorials which enabled the profession to express its determined opposition to this mischievous certification of midwives and opticians and conveyed the considered views of a large body of his constituents, some at least of whom can scarcely be deemed his inferiors in logical acumen or proper respect for authority. Condemnation of documents so signed would carry more weight and better render the help we hoped from explanation if it were accompanied by any passage on which it may be based instead of by invective not altogether free from some apparent animus such as, we venture to think, scarcely worthy Mr. Horsley's high position in the esteem of his constituents.

The first memorial contained 1028 and the second 1326 words, equal respectively to one and one-third and one and three-quarter columns of THE LANCET or *British Medical Journal*—brief space to fully state in new lights constitutional questions of the first importance, to which, in less serviceable forms, hundreds, or perhaps thousands, of pages and memorials of much greater length have, with far less result, been during many years devoted. It is unfortunate that the text of the memorials is not available to your readers, and Mr. Horsley affords no clue to the passages or expressions to which he takes exception; but if every word of each memorial merited one or other of his hyperbolic adjectives we as yet perceive no reason why the faults of our memorials should relieve him of the duty of moving to rescind the Council's sanction of such certification if he considered it illegal. His opinion as to this most important question of legality, as well as some useful illustrations of our faults in the memorials, will still oblige us, having, indeed, been our objects in this correspondence.

We regret that Mr. Horsley did not take definite action to rescind, instead of merely demanding unnecessary inquiry into, proceedings of the Council that we certainly hold, and

hope that he holds, to be illegal. We regard his abstention from such action with the more concern in the light of his advocacy of a policy of surrender on the question of midwives registration; because if the Bill of the British Medical Association became law certification of midwives would at once become legal and the rescission he speaks of useless. We do not believe there is any real public demand for, or any justification of, such a measure, nor any necessity for such a policy of surrender, which is inconsistent with Mr. Horsley's election pledges, and we hope to have his invaluable support in the determined resistance we are organising to such mischievous and retrogressive legislation, to which, we understand, he yields only on the mistaken ground that it is inevitable. The gravest obstacles to such resistance are the successive "surrenders" of the principles at stake, (1) by the General Medical Council; (2) by the Council of the British Medical Association; (3 and last), and most injurious of all, by Mr. Horsley himself should he adhere to that mistaken policy instead of uniting in the "uncompromising resistance" unanimously called for by the Stratford meeting and thus ensuring its success.

We are, Sirs, your obedient servants,

JAMES A. MYRTLE.

J. HIGHAM HILL.

T. GRANVILLE HOCKRIDGE.

F. LORIMER HART.

R. F. TOMLIN.

TOM R. TAYLOR.

Guilford-street, W.C., August 21st, 1899.

### ERYTHROL TETRANITRATE: A CORRECTION.

*To the Editors of THE LANCET.*

SIRS,—In THE LANCET of August 19th, p. 533, in the report of the proceedings of the Section of Pharmacology and Therapeutics at the meeting of the British Medical Association at Portsmouth, it is stated that I had a patient taking as much as one drachm of erythrol tetranitrate twice a day. What I did say was that one of my patients had taken half a drachm in 24 hours, but this in divided doses, the largest dose being six grains. I seldom, however, find it necessary to give more than one grain three times a day. This dose, as a rule, most effectually wards off attacks of angina pectoris.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Cambridge, August 21st, 1899.

J. B. BRADBURY.

### THE ADDRESS ON TUBERCULOSIS AT PORTSMOUTH.

*To the Editors of THE LANCET.*

SIRS,—Into your excellent report of my address on Tuberculosis at Portsmouth a few errors have, shall I say almost necessarily, crept in. The spray which Flüge found so virulent was not made of the deposit from the sputum, but is the spray from the coughing patient. Hæmoptysis does not "always" arise at the tuberculous nodule—it may be "aneurysmal" for instance—but it often does. Out of 4000 consecutive necropsies made at Leipzig under the care of Birch-Hirschfeld in 40 per cent. tubercle or its traces were found, not by any means always pulmonary. I therefore suggested not that a number thus enormous suffer from pulmonary phthisis, latent or manifest, but that of the great many who do in no small number its passage through mild stages to obliteration might be unnoted, the patient being regarded as but anæmic, overworked, or a little "off colour" otherwise, and the true nature of his disease unsuspected.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Cambridge, August 22nd, 1899.

T. CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

### "THE EXTIRPATION OF MALARIA."

*To the Editors of THE LANCET.*

SIRS,—I have read with much interest Major Ronald Ross's lecture on the Extirpation of Malaria. There are one or two questions I would like to ask him concerning matters not fully explained in the lecture:—1. By what method does the plasmodium malarie pass from the mosquito into the blood of man? 2. Does he deny that there are any ways