. . .” Nothing further has been heard from the Holliday Laboratories and no reply has been received to an inquiry made Oct. 12, 1918. The Council therefore authorizes publication of its report declaring Cerelene inadmissible to New and Nonofficial Remedies.

Correspondence

“THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY HOSPITAL AND INTERNS”

To the Editor:—Relative to the editorial comment in THE JOURNAL, Jan. 4, 1919, p. 46, I believe that the presentation of the facts regarding the Los Angeles County Hospital is so worded as to give a wrong impression of the conditions that exist in this institution. The civil service examinations for interns for the Los Angeles County Hospital are held in San Francisco, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Chicago, and one or two other cities. According to the ranks of the men who take the examinations, the civil service compiles a list. When vacancies occur, the next highest man is called on to see whether he will accept the position.

When osteopaths have been admitted as interns, it simply means that these men took the civil service examinations, and that in due time when vacancies occurred, their names were reached and the positions had to be offered to them. This is due to the fact that a goodly number of the men who take the examinations, and who are high up on the list, do not accept the positions in the first place, or if we wait, then they accept other work. In that way the bunch of eligibles among well trained men reaches an end, and then the only others on the list are those of lesser education and training, who, however, having taken the examinations, are, according to law, to have the privilege of accepting these positions.

There is no thought on the part of the Los Angeles County Hospital authorities to put osteopath interns in that institution. The hospital must, however, have interns, and all it can do is to provide for examinations on a large scale and then hope that well trained men in regular medicine will be in sufficient number on these lists to keep the internships always among that group. In practice, however, it has not worked out that way for the reasons already noted.

GEORGE H. KRESS, M.D., Los Angeles.

“THE SUPPLY OF PRACTICAL NURSES”

To the Editor:—I read with much interest your excellent editorial, “The Supply of Practical Nurses,” which appeared in THE JOURNAL, January 25. Congratulations! I was glad to hear some one with backbone speak up. Truer words were never spoken. The nursing situation here in Portland and in Maine, for that matter, has been, and is, most trying, for just the very reasons mentioned in your editorial.

ADAM P. LEIGHTON, JR., M.D., Portland, Maine.

HARMLESSNESS OF GLASS IN DIGESTIVE TRACT

To the Editor:—The authors of the recent excellent experimental proof of the harmlessness of glass in the digestive tract (THE JOURNAL, Dec. 28, 1918, p. 2127), and that part of the public which has been so greatly worked up over rumors of contamination of food by glass, may be equally interested to recall that this subject was one of practical interest long ago, when murder by poison was not infrequent.

When Benvenuto Cellini was a prisoner of the pope in Rome in 1539, an enemy in the papal court attempted his life by the use of diamond dust in the prisoner's food. As Cellini says:

In itself it is not poisonous at all; but being extraordinarily hard, its sharply pointed angles do not become rounded when it is reduced to powder, as would be the case with other stones. Only the diamond keeps its sharp edge, so that, if it enters the stomach along with food, during the process of digestion it sticks to the coats of the stomach

and the bowels, and as the new food comes ever pushing forward, it is not long before it pierces them and death is the result; whereas no other kind of stone or glass sticks to the organs, but goes on its way with the food.—Life of Benvenuto Cellini, translated by McDonnell, Everyman's Edition, p. 263.

Fortunately for Cellini, the jeweler employed to powder the diamond pocketed the gem and substituted a softer stone, a beryl, which caused no harm at all.

GEORGE W. CORNER, M.D., Berkeley, Calif.

“METHEMOGLOBINEMIA DUE TO POISONING BY SHOE DYE”

To the Editor:—I am glad that Dr. Stifel has so forcibly presented the findings of the cases of nitrobenzene poisoning from shoe dye (THE JOURNAL, Feb. 8, 1919, p. 395). It has long been the custom for shoe dressing manufacturers to add a certain amount of this very dangerous substance to their wares. I am unable to find that it serves any other purpose than the odor it gives the preparation. It would seem desirable that some one should vigorously protest against the reckless use of this particular poison. Having myself seen fatal cases from nitrobenzene poisoning, I am strongly prejudicial against the continued use of this substance as a scent for shoe dressings, soaps and the so-called disinfectants, simply because it is a cheap perfume and covers the unpleasant odors. The medical profession should take a definite stand against useless poisons.

W. S. WADSWORTH, M.D., Philadelphia.

SUBNORMAL TEMPERATURE FOLLOWING INFLUENZA

To the Editor:—During this pandemic of influenza I have observed many patients with a temperature of 94, and several much lower than 94. Some few I find with a decided slowness in the heart's action. Is this low temperature due to a relaxed condition of the entire nervous system and lowered vitality brought about by improper nourishment? In my experience I find that patients having the influenza or those recovering from it are usually suffering with anorexia. This, I understand, would lower the vitality; but I cannot see why the unusual subnormal temperature is so marked.

J. P. BRANDON, M.D., Essex, Mo.

Queries and Minor Notes

ANONYMOUS COMMUNICATIONS and queries on postal cards will not be noticed. Every letter must contain the writer's name and address, but these will be omitted, on request.

OFFICER'S RIGHT TO A MONTH'S PAY WHEN DISCHARGED FOR DISABILITY

To the Editor:—I was a first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps from Aug. 11, 1917, to March 6, 1918, when I was honorably discharged on account of “disability existing prior to my entrance into the service, etc.” I was not given an extra month's pay to set me up in the practice that I had given up. Now, Article III, Section 300, War Risk Insurance Act of Oct. 6, 1917, as amended June 25, 1918, provides that “officers and enlisted men or other members shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted and enrolled for the service, and thereafter entitled to compensation under the act of disability.” In other words, “legally no disorder can have preexisted in a person accepted for military service.” Am I not therefore entitled to an extra month's pay as any man who is honorably discharged?

B. W.

ANSWER.—According to the Act of Congress approved May 24, 1917—the Selective Service Act—“the President is hereby authorized to discharge any officer from the office held by him under such appointment for any cause which, in the judgment of the President, would promote the public service; and the general commanding any division and higher tactical organization or territorial department is authorized to appoint from time to time military boards . . . to examine into and report upon the capacity, qualification, conduct and efficiency of any commissioned officer within his command