hold a meeting at Lisbon in April that its members might "personally test the medicines which had been advanced as preventives of seasickness." I prepared the paper rather hastily while absent from San Francisco and without having access to my former paper, in order that it might be submitted to the International Medical Congress at its meeting.

While making corrections I desire to draw attention to a grammatical error on the second page of the paper. *Per orem* should be *per os*.
A. C. GIRARD, M.D.

Triplets Living Over Eighty Years.

WRIGHTSVILLE, PA., Aug. 1, 1906.

To the Editor:—In THE JOURNAL, July 28, Dr. John L. Davis, Cincinnati, speaks of triplets alive at the age of 47, and states that so far as he knows this record is unequalled. In this connection I would say that at Manchester, York County, Pa., on Dec. 3, 1903, there died the last of a set of triplets aged 86 years, 10 months and 6 days. The other two died at the ages of 84 and 80, respectively. This remarkable trio was of German ancestry, of the name of Strickler, a common name in this part of the country. David, the brother, was born last and died first. One sister, Lena, the second born, died second, while Mary, the first born, survived the longest. These people lived quietly and peacefully in the country engaged in agricultural pursuits, which probably added to their longevity. In this case triplets survived to the eightieth year and over. If any reader of THE JOURNAL can report anything equaling or exceeding this it will make interesting reading.

B. A. HOOVER, M.D.

Qualifications and Reciprocity as Viewed by the Illinois Board.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Dr. James A. Egan, Springfield, calls attention to a typographical error in his letter, which was published in THE JOURNAL, August 4. On page 374, line 17, for 1889 read 1899. Nine lines below the same error is repeated.—ED.]

DETROIT, Aug. 4, 1906.

To the Editor:—When I referred to the "disturbed periods" of my worthy brother Egan of Illinois, in my communication to THE JOURNAL, published July 21, I did not anticipate in the least that your readers would be furnished with so complete a demonstration of the affliction so mildly suggested by me. I am truly sorry, not for myself, as I am immune, but for those of your readers who do not enjoy personalities and recriminations.

In my letter I criticised the action of the Illinois State Board of Health in resigning from the American confederation from the standpoint of the reasons given for such resignation and of its subsequent action in passing regulations and qualifications exactly a counterpart of the qualifications of the confederation objected to, and forming the basis for disagreement.

I also criticised the Illinois board for its usurpation of the functions of the state legislature in granting exemption to a class of practitioners under the excuse of reciprocity when the act of reciprocity is impossible *per se*. I also asked Dr. Egan to formulate some rule by which a physician of national reputation could be defined by executive officers less fortunate in observation qualities than himself.

I merely referred to Qualification 2 of the American confederation with the statement that some fifteen states not only believe in the virtue of this qualification but also had adopted it. In his reply Dr. Egan very cautiously refuses to discuss the material questions and contents himself with a very irrelevant abuse of Qualification 2, the Michigan State Board of Registration in Medicine, and my humble self as secretary of such board.

Now, the Michigan board (and myself as its secretary) was and is entirely immaterial to our controversy. My communication was signed as secretary of the American confederation, in which Dr. Egan's board has membership, and I made no reference in my letter either to Michigan or to the

Michigan board. It certainly was within my right to criticise a board in membership, especially so when the reasons given for this board's withdrawal from membership on their face, appeared inconsistent and not in accord with the facts.

As my letter had absolutely no reference to the Illinois or Michigan boards, nor to Dr. Egan or myself as executive officers of such boards, outside of the membership of our respective boards in the confederation, and as Dr. Egan refuses to discuss the questions raised by me on their merits and insists on denouncing the shortcomings of my board and myself, with which your readers at this time are not especially interested, I can only say in a general way, that Dr. Egan's statements regarding my official acts are not based on facts and his conclusions are unwarranted in the light of such facts; I can only ask, in justice to myself and the cause I represent, that your readers review together my letter and Dr. Egan's reply to it. I am content to rest my contentions on such a review.

Dr. Egan fails to see the analogy between the present prerequisite of the confederation, which states that an applicant for reciprocity at the discretion of either board *may* file proof of membership in a recognized medical society, and that such membership *may* be considered in connection with the other evidences of character presented and the Illinois requirement of letters of recommendation with regard to the moral, professional and ethical character of the applicant, from a state, district, county or city medical society in the state from which the applicant comes. He states that he must decline to insult the intelligence of readers of THE JOURNAL by attempting to recognize a material distinction in the above optional requirements.

The trouble with Dr. Egan seems to be that he is unable to distinguish the difference between the "may" and "shall," for he states that the prerequisite makes it incumbent on an applicant to show proof of membership in a medical society, and that a comparison of the two requirements will make the distinction quite apparent. Taking for granted that the prerequisite requirement of membership in a state society was expressed by the word "shall" instead of "may," this would not consistently give a reason for the withdrawal of a board in membership from the fact that it is impossible to formulate a qualification acceptable to all states in membership, and in addition the qualifications of the confederation are advisory, not mandatory.

Dr. Egan's statement that I had expressed an opinion that the prerequisite is unconstitutional is not based on fact. I pronounced the mandatory qualification of membership in a state society, introduced by Dr. McCormack as unconstitutional, but I had no support in this contention from Dr. Egan, who was present. This mandatory qualification was not adopted by the confederation.

Dr. Egan refuses to enlighten me and other executive officers as to the method employed by his board in measuring a physician of national reputation, and also declines to discuss the action of his board in usurping the authority of the legislature and tells me that it is none of my business. I accept his courteous explanation as the only rational method in justification of the action of his board.

In a question as large and intricate as that of reciprocity some degree of consideration must be shown by states, otherwise it would be impossible to accomplish results, and results have been accomplished by the American confederation in an extraordinary degree, over one thousand certificates having already been endorsed through its administration during the past four years.

My valiant and bellicose brother Egan challenges me to meet him and his big brother, the president of his board, at a future unofficial meeting of his personal friends, and to repeat some of the unkind criticisms I have felt it my duty to subscribe to in my former letter, and he states that I have neglected the opportunity of expressing my opinion of his official acts at former meetings at which he was present. Dr. Egan must remember, however, that these meetings were held prior to the date on which he joined the United States Army, Navy