

atropine, morphine, and nitroglycerine, and the liberal use of oxygen gas, I had succeeded in lessening the severity and shortening the period to less than a week, but the results were much less satisfactory than when euphorbia was used, together with the above described combination subcutaneously. For hypodermatic use the following was employed:

R—Morphinæ sulphas. gr. 1-4.
Atropinæ sulphas. gr. 1-150.
Trinitrin, gtt. i. ℞

Sig. For subcutaneous use; for one dose.

The formula adapted for the exhibition of euphorbia as follows:

R—Ext. euphorbæ pilulifera (P. D. & Co's).
Glycerini, āā fl. oz. ij. ℞

Sig. Take one teaspoonful every three hours.

If those who have had experience with this remedy will kindly communicate the results of their observations to me, I will be glad to give them credit in the form of a collective report.

JOHN AULDE, M.D.

1910 Arch street, Philadelphia, Dec. 12, 1890.

A Correction.

To the Editor:—In the issue of THE JOURNAL containing the report of the Mississippi Valley Medical Association meeting at Louisville, referring to my paper upon "Certainty in the Diagnosis of Tuberculosis" I am quoted as saying: "The disease is void of the slightest tendency to self-limitation." This I certainly did not say, nor did Dr. Porter, of St. Louis, in his interesting paper published in the same number of THE JOURNAL, take any such extreme grounds. He called in question Flint's doctrine of self-limitation, restricting the skepticism to cases which had advanced so far that the presence of disease could be established by physical signs. It was upon a series of such cases that Flint's teaching was based. Owing to pressure of time neither Dr. Porter's paper nor mine was discussed, but in conversation with him afterward he clearly explained his position, and I think I am correct in stating it. Tuberculosis, advanced to the production of distinct subjective and objective signs is one thing; the incipient local disease, which, in many cases at least, can now be detected by skilful application of the bacteriological test, is clinically quite another. So far as experiments upon animals can throw light upon the question, there is good reason to believe in the self-limitation, and I would not like to go on record with such a sweeping statement as that quoted. I wrote as follows: "Tuberculosis is a disease which, once well under headway, is not in any marked degree, as compared with other infections, self-limited. Self-limitation is an uncertain staff upon which to lean. We can not deserve the name of workers, nor really win battles nor advance to higher fields, nor even pre-

serve our self respect, by supineiy resting upon such support and awaiting a possible victory." Respectfully,

THEODORE POTTER, M.D.

Indianapolis, Ind.

Shall The Journal be Removed to Washington?

To the Editor:—Please place my vote on the list, as in favor of THE JOURNAL remaining at Chicago.

Q. C. SMITH, M.D.

Austin, Tex., December 23, 1890.

To the Editor:—About the removal of THE JOURNAL and building a house of our own; I think it advisable to do so, and would suggest Louisville, which is neither an Eastern, Western, Northern or Southern city, but truly a central one.

J. W. DAVIS, M.D.

Smyrna, Tenn., December 23, 1890.

To the Editor:—The writer's subscription (as have those for every former one) for Vol. xv of THE JOURNAL will soon be forthcoming, and for the fact above he would regret a break in the file. To the ordinary observer the proposition to remove THE JOURNAL to the Capital or elsewhere must have in its favor some occult reason or grounds, so palpable and strong are the objections. In all forms of journalism the argument for a central place of publication is vital, but in the special case of THE JOURNAL, it is tenfold stronger. The word "Association" gives the key to this statement. Surely reasons, at the present sufficient, and daily augmenting—not to mention success—would induce the common mind to think and say "THE JOURNAL is exactly where it should be." Yours truly,

H. C. MARKHAM, M.D.

Independence, Iowa, Dec. 27, 1890.

MISCELLANY.

THE MATTISON PRIZE.—With the object of advancing scientific study and settling a now mooted question, Dr. J. B. Mattison, of Brooklyn, offers a prize of \$400 for the best paper on "Opium Addiction as Related to Renal Disease," based upon these queries:

Will the habitual use of opium, in any form, produce organic renal disease?

If so, what lesion is most likely?

What is the rationale?

The contest is to be open for two years from Dec. 1, 1890, to either sex, and to any school or language. The prize paper is to belong to the American Association for the Cure of Inebriety, and to be published in a New York medical journal, *Brooklyn Medical Journal*, and *Journal of Inebriety*. Other papers presented are to be published in some leading medical journal, as their authors may select. All papers are to be in possession of the Chairman of Award Committee, on, or before January 1, 1893.