Queries and Minor Notes.

ANONYMOUS COMMUNICATIONS will not be noticed. Queries for this column must be accompanied by the writer's name and address, but the request of the writer not to publish his name will be faithfully observed.

REQUIREMENTS FOR MEDICAL PRACTICE.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., Sept. 20, 1902.

To the Editor:—Will you kindly give me through these columns the legal requirements for practicing medicine in Arizona, Colorado, Mexico and British Columbia? J. P. W.

ANS.—In Arizona an examination and satisfactory diploma are required. In Colorado a diploma approved by the State Board of Medical Examiners. In Mexico a rigid examination in the Spanish language and elaborate identifications of the individual and his medical credentials. In British Columbia an approved diploma, identification and a satisfactory examination.

SUPPRESSION OF URINE.

PARIS, ILL., Oct. 20, 1902.

To the Editor:—In the fall of 1880 Mrs. S. had complete suppression of urine. After trying diuretics for more than a week, we prescribed a glass of water every two hours, and in less than twenty-four hours her kidneys began to act. In case the stomach would not retain water, I would give a salt solution either by enema or hypodermically. Is it not possible that in Dr. Seller's case (*THE JOURNAL*, October 11, p. 915) the sweating, vomiting and purging had something to do with the suppression?

W. H. TEN BROECK.

Correspondence.

Organization.

WICKLIFFE, OHIO, Oct. 13, 1902.

Your article on the chaotic condition of the medical profession as regards its power and influence with the public because of its lack of organization and unity is very timely and to the point. It is to be regretted that the medical profession with all its boasted learning and conceit does not command any power political or civil, compared to organized labor to-day. The profession is not so numerous but that if it were so thoroughly organized as labor, and its individual members more governed by the single-mindedness and good sense of which it boasts, it could wield a tremendous power in politics and could command any reasonable compensation it demanded for services rendered to the state, corporations or individuals. Members of the profession of theology and law far outstrip us to-day in the respect and power they command in state and civil affairs.

If this were not so we would not have the hordes of competent physicians all over the country that we have to-day struggling with poverty and coming to old age without a competence, hardly able to earn enough to live decently and educate two or three children as they ought.

I will cite the condition of the profession in Ohio to-day, which could be remedied by organization. The coroner of Lake County treats 350 lodge members for \$1 a year each. He has a contract to treat the poor of a population of 2,500 people, three-fourths laboring people, for \$25 per year—worth \$300 to \$500, also a contract with the county directors of infirmity to go a distance of nearly five miles and treat the inmates for \$100 a year. Township trustees, in nearly every township in the state, farm out the poor for treatment in many instances to incompetent or unscrupulous physicians, for about \$50 a year for work that if fair fees were paid would amount to anywhere from \$200 to \$500 a year.

The Lake Shore Railroad Company does not pay any of its local railroad surgeons, a pass being the only remuneration. At Ashtabula, Ohio, there is more than \$1,000 worth of work in the yards every year. At Collinwood, where the yards of the L. S. & M. S. R. R.—the greatest shops in the world—are located, employing nearly 3,000 men, two young surgeons are paid the magnificent salary of \$100 a year for tending to the accident work of all employees. The P. & W., now a branch of the B. & O., at Painesville, Ohio, where their terminal employs a large number of men, pay the surgeon \$100 a year, I am told by a doctor who once held the appointment.

The writer has been doing the accidental surgery for a small steel structural plant, recently moved to this place from Cleveland. Recently I charged \$1.50 for removing a speck of steel from the eye of an employee. I had also dressed a scalp wound for another employee which took more than an hour, and in which it was necessary to insert five stitches; the patient was suffering from slight concussion and the wound and hair was filled with clot and shop dirt. My bill for this was \$5.

The company informed me that it had not paid more than \$1 for removing bodies from the eye, nor more than \$3 for dressing any scalp wound, in Cleveland. That they would pay such and such fees for such and such injuries, and hoped that I would see very clear to render services to employees at terms stipulated by them, and that if I would reduce the above rendered bill to \$1 and \$3 respectively, they would mail check.

The members of the profession are constantly humiliated and insulted by wealthy corporations, state, county and city officials. Why? Because, as a lawyer once said in an important case, "doctors are all a set of d— fools," and because the profession is not organized. If the physicians of this county and Cuyahoga were organized as they should be with a uniform fee bill, having a black list and protection features, I could reply to the officers of that plant that the profession of the county had a fee bill, the terms of which I could not deviate from, and that if they did not want to pay my charges for services rendered I did not have to do the work. As it is, if I do not accept the fees the company offers, the work will go to another physician and the company knows it can get plenty of doctors to do their work for whatever they are willing to pay. What the medical profession needs is a leader, to take it out of the valley of poverty and humiliation, a Mitchell, as the miners have, or a Morgan, as the trusts have.

F. H. TODD, M.D.

Unfair Tests.

SAN FRANCISCO, Oct. 11, 1902.

To the Editor:—In your editorial on "Unfair Tests," in the issue of October 4, you discuss the criticism by the *Pacific Medical Journal* of the questions in pathology submitted by the California State Board of Medical Examiners. In order that your deductions should have full value, it seems to me fair that a full knowledge of the truth of the facts in your premises should be given you. You suppose that the writer of the editorial in the *Pacific Medical Journal* is correct in stating that some were rejected for failure to answer the questions to which exception was taken—"Define cryoscopy," and "What are the characteristic lesions of Hanot's cirrhosis." First, as to the truth of this. The editor of the *Pacific Medical Journal* is dean of a recently organized medical school in San Francisco and president and manager of its board of trustees. Out of a class of 40 or more graduates from this school, 11 chosen ones took the examination; certain of the others have openly stated that they never intended to take any state examination, and our worthy governor has recently given one of these a medico-political job. Of the 11 who took the examination, 6 failed in 4 or 5 of the 9 subjects. From the other two regular schools of San Francisco represented at the examination, there were 48 candidates, and 3 failed. Only one candidate was conditioned in pathology, having obtained less than the required 60 per cent.

Secondly, over 75 per cent. of the candidates defined Hanot's cirrhosis more accurately than you have done in your editorial. This places the statement of the editor of the *Pacific Medical Journal* where it belongs. As you say yourself "from the published questions, the examinations seem eminently fair in all other respects," I think it only just to your readers to state that the examinations were particularly easy and were easily marked. A few questions may have been asked rather to test the kind of teaching done in some of the schools than to catch the students; but when a school, in this age, graduates a man who defines intussusception as "the susceptibility of some people to disease," it is time that the respectable element of the profession take steps to protect itself as well as the public by ascertaining the quality of the teaching in our institutions.