Plymouth Hospital (dated June 11th, 1892). Staff Surgeons: Henry A. W. Richardson to Plymouth Hospital (dated June 11th, 1892); H. W. D. Walsh to the *Hecla*, Robt. Benthams, to the *Neptune*, to join July 2nd, and Alex. L. Christie, M.B., to the *Serapis* (all dated June 15th, 1892). Surgeons; Joseph C. Wood to the *Alecto*, Hugh W. Macnamara and Hamilton E. L. Earle to the *Pembroke*, additional (all dated June 11th, 1892); Deputy-Inspector-General Thos. S. Burnett to Jamaica Hospital.—Surgeons and Agents: George B. Elliott to Brixham and Thomas Shonhan to Bonmahon (both dated May 14th, 1892); John F. Newland to Kingstown and Dalkey (dated May 26th, 1892).

VOLUNTEER MEDICAL STAFF CORPS.—The Norwich Company: Charles Hyde Champion Cousins, Gent., to be Surgeon-Lieutenant—*Infantry*: Aberdeen Brigade: Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel A. Fraser, M.D., 1st Volunteer Battalion, the Gordon Highlanders, to be Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel.

VOLUNTEER CORPS.—*Artillery*: The Tynemouth (Western Division, Royal Artillery): Surgeon-Captain J. F. Haswell, M.B., resigns his commission (dated June 11th, 1892).—*Royal Engineers* (Fortress and Railway Forces): 1st Durham: Surgeon-Lieutenant J. D. Leigh resigns his commission (dated June 11th, 1892).—1st Gloucestershire: George Herbert Ward-Humphreys, Gent., to be Surgeon-Lieutenant (dated June 11th, 1892).—*Rifles*: 3rd Volunteer Battalion, the Welsh Regiment: Surgeon-Captain J. L. Leckie to be Surgeon-Major (dated June 11th, 1892).

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

DISPUTED CASE OF SCARLET FEVER.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—As the magistrate criticised severely my conduct in this case, I shall be glad if you will allow me space to explain how it was I acted as I did.

On May 19th I was called to see Emily Williams by the mother, and I was informed by no one that there was anything peculiar about the case. I continued to attend her almost daily through a mild but well-marked attack of right-sided pleurisy, with pain, rapid breathing, and well-marked pleuritic rub. The child was never seriously ill, and was convalescent on the 28th, when my visits ceased. About the 25th a member of the Fulham Vestry called upon me and told me I was attending a case of scarlet fever. This I denied. He mentioned the number of the house at which I was attending, but still I told him he was mistaken; there must be two children ill in the house. However, he made it clear to me that my case was the one the medical officer of health had certified as scarlet fever. When I discovered this, knowing that this member of the vestry would soon be seeing the medical officer of health, I asked him if he would kindly make it clear to him that I attended the case in ignorance, and gave my diagnosis before I knew he had ever seen it, as I had no wish to quarrel with the medical officer of health. The case then came before the guardians, and my diagnosis was made public. As I have always worked amicably with the medical officer of health in his official capacity, and as I received no communication from him, I concluded he had decided to let the case drop. On Saturday, June 4th, I was told in the street that the medical officer of health had gone to the court for an order to arrest my patient. I arrived at the court too late to give evidence. In the evening Mr. Butler called upon me. I had never spoken to or had any communication with him on this or any other matter before.

I should like to take this opportunity for apologising to Dr. Cayley for all the worry the case has been to him. It was too late on Saturday to write, so I simply wired to him asking him to see a case with me; but before the case was brought in to him, Mr. Butler and I explained to him that the magistrate had issued an order for the arrest of the child, on the evidence of medical men who had seen the child on two or three occasions only.

I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

W. F. CLARKE, M.D., B.S. Lond.

P.S.—A bill has been circulated in the district, on which

my name appears. I had no knowledge of or share in the publication of the document before copies were delivered at my door, and I have taken steps to stop its circulation.

Fulham, June 14th, 1892.

THE HOLY PLACES OF ARABIA.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The paper on the above subject, in your issue of the 14th ult., by my friend, Dr. John Wortabet of Beyrout, contains much information, both curious and uncommon. By a printer's error the town of Jidda (Jedda) appears as Tidda throughout the article. Several travellers besides those mentioned by Dr. Wortabet have visited and described the Arabian coastlands—e.g., Irwin, Niebuhr, Seetzen, and Wellsted; and Didier in 1856 reported a journey inland to Taif; but Mecca and Medina remain to be among the least known of the world's cities. Dr. Wortabet quotes Burckhardt's narrative. This intrepid man suffered severely at Mecca from dysentery, and at Medina from fever, which nearly proved fatal, and his death from the former disease in 1817, two years after his return to Egypt, must probably be ascribed to the Arabian visit. A member of our own profession, Robert Richardson, M.D., L.R.C.P. Lond., himself a traveller of no mean rank, happened to be at Cairo, and attended poor Burckhardt in his last illness.¹ When lately in Egypt I sought out Burckhardt's tomb. "The Turks will take my body, I know it," he had said when dying, for as a Mussulman he had lived, and he lies in a Moslem grave. Above is sculptured the full white turban, and below, in Arabic, are the words: "Sheikh Ibrahim, the Moslem, the English Traveller." Dying at thirty-three years of age, when on the eve of entering on his intended life work in Central Africa, Burckhardt left so rich a store of records from the mere preparatory journeys he had taken as to place him in the very first rank of Eastern explorers. As regards the number of pilgrims who visit Mecca, Mr. Wilfrid Blunt computed the "Haj" of 1880 at 93,000. Mr. John Ray, in 1693, quotes an author who speaks of 200,000. The Christian pilgrimage to Jerusalem towards Easter-time is not wholly unlike the Mohammedan in its sanitary aspects, as I can testify; but the numbers are much smaller, and the mortality is far less.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Finsbury-square, June 2nd, 1892.

R. HINGSTON FOX.

THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I note in your columns of to-day's issue, at p. 1330, that a report was approved and adopted by the Council containing a clause to the effect that it is impossible to grant even the mildest of the requests of the Association of Fellows—that for a common room—because the Council regard the Fellows as only a section of the Corporation. Surely this is an admission of what I have always contended, that the Membership gives the corporate existence, whilst the Fellowship is a mere academic distinction. Now comes the question: How is it that seats on the Council are confined "to the exclusive use of any section of the Corporation"? Permit me, in conclusion, to say that the action of the Committee of the Members' Association which I deprecate has nothing to do with the question of appeal. The abandonment of that policy was my own action, based on an opinion which I obtained, and which the Committee generously left me to pay for. My refusal to have anything more to do with them was partly explained by Mr. Ashton Ellis's reply, and is due partly to other matters which are slightly indicated by the nonsense written by Mr. W. G. Dickinson.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Birmingham, June 11th, 1892.

LAWSON TAIT.

ANÆSTHETICS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—After the discussions at the Gynæcological Society last week on anæsthetics, perhaps an account of the after-effects of nitrous oxide and ether on the patients operated on at the Chelsea Hospital for Women during this year may not be uninteresting. The results in 89 cases show no

¹ Richardson's Travels, vol. i., p. 161.