

medical officers who were made members of the Legion of Honour in recognition of their gallant services and we now have the pleasure of recording yet another addition to the distinguished roll. By a presidential decree dated Dec. 24th, 1899, Dr. Nestor Léonce Parin, medical officer of the second class in the Navy, was promoted to the grade of Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, the feat for which he obtained the reward being thus described: “At Tonkin, on Nov. 29th, 1896, during the action of Vinh-Nan-Taï, Dr. Parin went forward under a brisk fire in order to dress the wounds of four soldiers.” The same gazette also records the advancement to the grade of Officer of M. Nicolas Chalmé, apothecary in chief to the Navy, with over 34 years’ service, inclusive of five years and seven months afloat. The new officer’s knighthood dates from June, 1886.

## Correspondence.

“Audi alteram partem.”

### CLUB METHODS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Possibly the following experience of club methods with their medical officers may be of sufficient interest to warrant its publication. I should first explain that the Hand-in-Hand Benefit Society is a small local society which pays its surgeons twice a year for work done in the same way practically as the more widely-known National Deposit Society—namely, for visit and medicine 2s. 6d.; consultation and medicine 1s. 6d.; repetition of medicine, 1s. After I took over this practice five years ago I was surprised to find my payment at Christmas replaced to the extent of 5s. by a receipt for an honorary member’s subscription, and with this a note from the secretary addressing me as “Dear Brother” and simply asking for a receipt. There was never at any time any request that I should become an honorary member.

For the first few years I made no objection, but once when the payment for the half-year amounted to 7s. 6d. I declined having this honour thrust upon me. At the end of last year a payment of £1 1s. was due to me and there came back a cheque for 16s. and the usual receipt. I returned the receipt and explained that I had no desire to become an honorary member and pointed out that there was nothing in their rules making such a step necessary. I received a reply saying that such a course was customary, but on my insisting the payment was completed. Some days afterwards I received a letter, a copy of which is appended hereto as Enclosure A. My reply to this letter is also appended as Enclosure B. I do not think that any further comment is necessary.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,  
C. SCOTT WATSON.

Parkside, Womersley, Guildford, Feb. 24th, 1900.

[ENCLOSURE A.]

Hand-in-Hand Benefit Society,  
17, Friary-street, Guildford,  
Feb. 14th, 1900.

DEAR SIR,—Your letters of Jan. 25th and Feb. 1st were duly laid before the committee of the above society on Tuesday last and I am instructed by them to inform you that owing to your refusal to pay honorary subscription of 5s. your name is to be taken off the list of the societies’ surgeons from this date. Therefore, if you have any account against the society from December, 1899, to Feb. 14th, 1900, I shall be glad to receive same.

Dr. Scott Watson.

Yours truly,  
J. FOSTER, Secretary.

P.S.—I may add that the agent of your district has been informed that your name is taken off the surgeons’ list for the Womersley district and another medical gentleman appointed.—J. F.

[ENCLOSURE B.]

Parkside, Womersley, Guildford, Feb. 17th, 1900.

SIR,—I am in receipt of the letter from your committee dated Feb. 14th. Of course, it is a matter of very little importance to me whether my name is taken off the list of the society’s surgeons, but the whole proceeding is so extraordinary that I desire to make the following remarks on it to your committee.

In the first place, there is no rule that a medical officer shall become an honorary member, and it is distinctly wanting in ordinary courtesy to dock his Christmas payment of the subscription without even asking his permission. Secondly, the subscription is not a large sum, but it is 5 per cent. on a yearly payment of £5, an amount which I certainly did not receive from the society last year and have, I think, very rarely received during the five years I have been here. Third, the members whom I have here are people who, if not in the Hand-in-Hand, would cheerfully pay my ordinary lower fees of 2s. 6d. or 3s. 6d. per visit and from 2s. to 2s. 6d. for consultation and medicine at my

own house. I have taken the trouble to go over several half-years taken at random. In one—the first half of 1897—I find that the patients I attended for you for £4 7s. would have paid me as private patients £6 0s. 6d. and equally without any bad debts. In another half-year 21s. for 28s.; in another £2 9s. for £3 7s. 6d., and so on.

I want to show that your medical officers, if they are situated as I am, are doing you a distinct and substantial favour by attending your members at the fees you pay. For the privilege of doing you this favour you charge them 5s. a year, and not only so but you stop this sum out of their payment for work done without even a “by your leave,” and if they object you take their names off the list of the society’s surgeons. This procedure is so curious that I propose to send an account of it to THE LANCET.

Mr. J. Foster,

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

C. SCOTT WATSON.

Secretary, Hand-in-Hand Benefit Society, Guildford.

## “PRODRIMAL RASHES IN MEASLES.”

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The writer of the interesting annotation on prodromal rashes in measles in THE LANCET of Feb. 24th is not quite accurate when he states that the question of these rashes does not appear to be even entertained in English works. He will find that attention is drawn to the subject both in Dr. J. W. Moore’s “Eruptive and Continued Fevers” (p. 138) and in the “Manual of Infectious Diseases” by Dr. Washbourn and myself (pp. 96 and 167). Dr. Dawson Williams also alludes to it in his article on Measles in Dr. Clifford Allbutt’s “System of Medicine” vol. ii., p. 111. In these books it is particularly stated that these rashes may lead to errors in diagnosis, and especially to mistaking measles for scarlet fever. Secondly, Trousseau, before Henoch, appears to have been well aware of these eruptions, as may be seen by referring to his “Clinical Medicine,” vol. ii., p. 214, of the New Sydenham Society’s Translations, where in mentioning the date of appearance of the specific rash of measles he says: “I perceive, gentlemen, that I am causing you to take up an erroneous impression; I already hear some of you reminding me that I have several times shown you in our nursery wards infants in whom at the second day of the fever of measles small efflorescences were visible in situations where the skin was hot and covered with perspiration. On the next day, or the day after the next, there was scarcely a trace of these efflorescences to be found.”

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Homerton, Feb. 27th, 1900.

E. W. GOODALL.

## DESTRUCTION OF SUPERFLUOUS HAIR BY THE ROENTGEN RAYS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Referring to some remarks I made at the meeting of the Thames Valley Branch of the British Medical Association at Kingston-on-Thames on Nov. 15th, on the beneficial therapeutic effects of the Roentgen rays on certain eruptions of the skin, I can now say that those cases are all doing well. In that of a woman, aged 33 years, who consulted me on Oct. 13th for a growth on each side of the chin of about 30 dark hairs about from half to three-quarters of an inch long, I administered seven exposures of the x rays, with the result that she had slight dermatitis, which got well in about a fortnight. All the hairs have disappeared and show no signs of return. I also had opportunities of seeing a case from the London Skin Hospital, Fitzroy-square, of a young girl, aged 23 years, with numerous dark hairs, which had grown freely on both sides of the face, after 18 exposures, had slight dermatitis and in a month after the last exposure the hairs had completely disappeared. Much care has to be exercised in the length of time of exposure and the number of exposures and regulation of ampère metres in the treatment of these cases.

Two other ladies since, one 25 and one 27 years of age, have had six and seven exposures successively and the skin shows slight electrical dermatitis, with the same successful results. The roots and sheath, when examined microscopically, show a drying up of the hair bulb and root sheath. The exposures in all these instances are less than noted by Dr. Neville Wood in his interesting article on a case reported by him in THE LANCET of Jan. 27th. I opine that we are in a position to say that we now have a very useful method of treatment in these hitherto troublesome growths of hair and an improvement on the tedious method of destruction by electrolysis.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Jan. 30th, 1900.

JAMES STARTIN.