

Allow me to inform you that no resolution of this kind has been received by the executive committee of the congress, and that the Article 2 of the Regulations, which restricts to physicians alone admittance as members to the congress, was drawn up by the executive committee last June, and was unanimously adopted by the committee of organization and publicity at its meeting in October, 1903.

It is, therefore, exclusively to these committees that the honor (if honor it be) is due of having restored to the international medical congresses the exclusively medical character which they had always maintained until the Madrid Congress.

I may be permitted to add that the president of the national committee for Great Britain received a copy of the regulations of the congress in December, 1903, and formally congratulated the executive committee on the form given to the article in question.

I shall be much obliged if in an early number of THE JOURNAL you will correct in accordance with the facts the notice to which this explanation refers.

MIGUEL BOMBARDA, Secretary General.

Hôpital de Rilhafolles.

[The committees of the congress are to be congratulated on taking this wise action, before they received any official request so to do.—ED.]

### A Study of a Case of Green Urine.

JACKSON, LA., March 8, 1904.

*To the Editor:*—Apropos of the article of Dr. Cooper with the above title, in THE JOURNAL March 5, page 638, is the following case: While an interne of the Charity Hospital, New Orleans, during 1901, I was called about 2 o'clock one morning to a patient suffering from urinary retention. I found a young negro man with a greatly distended bladder. He was easily catheterized, and an unusually large quantity of urine of a beautiful light-green color was withdrawn. He informed me that he had been taking some pills which he had purchased at a nearby drug store, and which had been recommended to him by the druggist for the cure of "lost manhood." He showed me several of the pills, together with the vial containing them. They were coated with some white substance, and the essential substance was in appearance not unlike methylene blue. The directions were one three times daily. Apparently they were prepared by the local druggist. The druggist had told the man to watch the color of the urine for evidence of the proper effect of the medicine. The patient had been passing green urine for several days before retention took place, and up to that time he was very much elated over what the pills were doing for him. There was no appreciable stricture, nor had he suffered from retention before, according to his statement. It occurred to me at the time that the drug ingested, either through the medium of the urine or by its systemic effects, had caused the retention. There were no other apparent effects, except the psychic, before the man learned better. Unfortunately neither the urine nor pills were carefully examined.

E. M. HUMMEL, M.D.

### The Circulating Medical Article.

CHICAGO, March 14, 1904.

*To the Editor:*—Apropos of your editorial on "The Circulating Medical Article" (THE JOURNAL, March 12, 1904, p. 716), the following letter from Professor Finsen is of interest. It is in reply to a letter from me calling attention to the way in which his name and the reputation of his institute are being misused in this country:

Professor Dr. Wm. Allen Pusey.

Dear Sir:—Thanking you for your letter, I can not but highly regret the abuse which is made of my name. I have not the least to do with the matter, which you speak of in your letter, and there are nowhere "branches" of the Finsen Light Institute, consequently in America neither.

On the other hand, I am hospitable to all physicians, . . . but as you understand it is impossible to me to control the people and to know whether they are going to abuse my name later on or not.

My name is also highly abused here in Europe, but I have been obliged quite to give up to take the matter into my hands, as it would cost too much time and pain, and yet be of very little use.

With my best thanks, Yours faithfully, NIELS R. FINSEN.

It must take a good many Christian virtues to be a scientist like Finsen, and to not be a misanthrope.

W. A. PUSEY.

### A Disclaimer.

RICHMOND, VA., March 14, 1904.

*To the Editor:*—It has just come to our notice that one J. Sills Daniels, M.D., of this city, the proprietor of a so-called cancer-cure sanitarium, and sanitarium for the treatment of diseases of women, especially obstetric cases, an asylum for the unfortunate, etc., who also offers a diploma as a member of the hospital staff for a consideration to any physician desiring it, has without our knowledge or authority, announced us as consulting physicians of the said sanitarium. We desire to stamp such a statement as a piece of unwarranted impertinence, and absolutely without any foundation in truth.

Signed: J. N. URSHUR, M.D.,  
JACOB MICHAUX, M.D.  
LONDON B. EDWARDS, M.D.,  
RAMON D. GARCIN, M.D.,  
B. L. TALIAFERRO, M.D.

## 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.

### CHARGES FOR SERVICES TO PHYSICIANS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

DENVER, March 10, 1904.

*To the Editor:*—In THE JOURNAL, March 5, there appears a communication from Dr. B. P. Anderson of Colorado Springs, relative to a bill rendered him for professional services to his daughter by a physician residing in New York City. From the evidence presented it would appear that our New York friend is engaged in "small business," under the circumstances in which the bill was presented to Dr. Anderson. Dr. Anderson, however, in alluding to the incident, deals with this misguided physician in a most lenient and gentlemanly manner, as he fails to either mention his name or give his address. As a matter of reference to other members of the profession I would suggest that the name and address of this man be published in the columns of THE JOURNAL. The medical profession is filled with men of big hearts, men who stand true to the ideals of the framers of the Principles of Ethics, men who cheerfully respond day or night to the calls of their colleagues and their families with never a thought of remuneration. The conduct of this physician who attended a member of Dr. Anderson's family must be condemned by all decent men in the profession.

CLARENCE L. WHEATON, M.D.

632 Seventeenth St.

NEW YORK CITY, March 8, 1904.

*To the Editor:*—Under the above caption Dr. B. P. Anderson asks for information and quotes an instance in THE JOURNAL, March 5, 1904. The question is one to which some of us have to give pretty serious consideration, and perhaps it would be well to have the question discussed with reference to personal experience, as the matter is one that can not be covered in all of its features by the Principles of Ethics. There are no doubt some consultants whose entire time could be devoted to physicians and their families. Personally, I find that, averaging by the year, one-tenth of my work is for physicians. When I am so busy that it becomes necessary to charge physicians for operative work or for consultation I shall have so much money that it will not be necessary to charge physicians for operative work or for consultation. There is, however, a side feature requiring consideration, and that is time loss for out-of-town work. This means a direct and immediate loss of money, and it has been necessary to make the same charge to physicians that would be made to laymen for time. I do not want pay for work, and, in fact, feel uncomfortable if a physician feels that he ought to make me a present. Most of us, I am sure, consider it a privilege and a pleasure to help out a colleague who is in trouble. On the other hand, in choosing a physician for my own family it was stipulated that he should charge full fees for visits, on the