

from medicinal doses, and the results of employing any particular drug too long"; should he do so it is highly probable that he may find that the subjects remain, whilst he himself is "swept away."

Permit me, Sir, in conclusion to express the opinion, which is, I know, shared by many, if not all, of my colleagues on the Board of Examiners in Medicine, although I have no right to speak in their name, that the step which has been taken is wise and not retrograde, that it will not "foster the crammer and discourage sound teaching and research," and that it will be beneficial and not "disastrous" to the student.

You will, I feel sure, be glad to learn that so far from causing "a heavy financial loss" to the College of Physicians, a slight saving in the expense of the examinations will result from this decision. No examination in pharmacology has yet been held, and none will now be necessary.—I am, etc.,
Clarges Street, W., Feb. 25th. J. K. FOWLER.

SUBJECTIVE VISUAL SENSATIONS.

SIR,—In accordance with a suggestion of Dr. Gowers, who delivered the Bowman Lecture of the Ophthalmological Society last year upon the Visual Phenomena connected with Epilepsy and Migraine, we are desired by the Council of the above Society to invite from members of the medical profession any observations they may be willing to record. It would seldom be possible to obtain accurate descriptions or drawings of such sensations from laymen, but it is felt that valuable information might be obtained if members of the profession who are themselves the subjects of migraine would put into writing detailed accounts of the visual symptoms from which they suffer in connection with an attack. The value of these descriptions would be enhanced if they were accompanied, where possible, by drawings or diagrams of the appearances. It seems likely that the knowledge of the natural history of migraine and allied cerebral conditions might be greatly increased if a large number of such well-recorded experiences could be gathered together and classified. The nucleus of such a collection has been formed and presented to the Society by Dr. Gowers, and the Council will be very glad if any of your readers who can do so will help to enlarge it. We shall be glad to receive any communications that may be sent to us.—We are, etc.,

S. H. HABERSHON, } Hon. Secs. of the
70, Brook Street, W. } Ophthalmological Society
J. B. LAWFOED, } of the United Kingdom.
99, Harley Street, W.

February 24th.

NUTROA FOOD.

SIR,—My attention has been called to an advertisement in pamphlet form of a food called "Nutroa," which is stated to have the same composition as my "ideal diet for children." I wish to state:

1. That the use of my name in these advertisements is without my sanction.
2. That the expression "ideal diet for children" has never been used by me in any of my writings.
3. That the figures quoted are taken from my work on *Chemical Physiology*, which gives the average minimum diet (a very different thing from ideal diet) for persons of different ages. The figures selected by the advertisers are those for children between the ages of 6 and 15. The entirely different figures given on the same page for infants under the age of 1½ year are ignored.

Nutroa food is advertised as a substitute for human milk, and therefore presumably intended for those under 18 months of age.

I may state in conclusion that since seeing the advertisement I have examined a sample of this food, and that I do I do not consider it in any sense a substitute for human milk.—I am, etc.,

King's College, Feb. 21st.

W. D. HALLIBURTON.

THE ABUSE OF MEDICAL CHARITIES.

SIR,—In view of the existing Battle of the Clubs, the following cognate incident may be of interest. Three weeks ago a patient of mine acknowledged that she had for over two years been attending, almost weekly, at the Marylebone General Dispensary, 77, Welbeck Street. She is in a good

position, occupies a house of a rental of over £40, and pays my bills readily.

I spoke to the husband, and pointed out that his wife was doing wrong (1) to herself, by having two independent medical men; (2) to me, by her mistrust; and (3) to a charitable institution, which does not profess to aid such cases as hers.

I then wrote to the secretary of the dispensary, asking if there were any inquiries made, or any wage limit, as my patient said that "lots of other women do the same, and even come from Eastbourne." (The third class return fare is 9s. 6d.) I got a reply, after waiting a week, saying my letter would be laid before the Board.

I ask, Sir, your help to ventilate such cases as these, in the hope that more care may be taken in administering charity and less injury be done to the general practitioner.—I am etc.

Manor Road, N., Feb. 25th.

GEORGE ELAM.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE LAY PRESS.

SIR,—With reference to an article which appeared in the *Globe* on February 18th, I have received the enclosed letter from the Honorary Secretaries of the Medical Society of London, which I have their permission to publish. I should feel obliged by your kindly inserting the same in your next issue.—I am, etc.,

Wimpole Street, W., Feb. 25th.

HERBERT F. WATERHOUSE.

The Medical Society of London,
11, Chandos Street, Cavendish Square, W.,
February 24th, 1896.

DEAR MR. WATERHOUSE,—Your note of the 20th inst. was considered by the Council this evening. They regret that your case of bone grafting shown to the Society on February 10th should have been commented upon in a non-professional paper, which unfortunately also mentioned you by name. The Council have ascertained that the paragraph appeared entirely without your knowledge, and sympathise with you in your annoyance at the occurrence.—We are, etc.,

AMAND ROUTH } Hon. Secs. to the
G. R. TURNER } Medical Society.

SIR,—My attention has been called to a brief laudatory notice of my name in one of the daily papers—which was also, I am informed, copied into one or two others. I need hardly state that this notice was inserted entirely without my knowledge, sanction, or approval; but it may interest some, and serve as a warning to others, to mention how it came to be inserted. One evening I was talking to a friend at my club, who happens to have taken an interest in my career, and I chanced inadvertently to mention one of the circumstances to which the paragraph makes reference. He was, I knew, an author of some standing and merit, but I did not know he was connected with any journal, or I should have been more on my guard. He thought he was doing me a kindness by causing the insertion of a paragraph in the column of "Personal News," and I subsequently had some difficulty in convincing him to the contrary.

Such notices, as far as I am aware, do one absolutely no good with the public, and are very rightly disapproved of by the profession. Perhaps sometimes members of the latter carry matters a little too far by ostracising and blackballing an innocent neighbour for such an occurrence without troubling to think or inquire; but it is certainly desirable, both on grounds of principle as well as of policy, that a medical man's name should not appear in the lay papers, except under very exceptional circumstances. It is, as I have unfortunately found out by experience, impossible to foresee and prevent non-medical papers from quoting one's published writings, but it is certainly possible to beware of literary friends who are likely to be connected with journals, and to caution them early in the acquaintance that mention of a doctor's name in a lay paper is not only not a kindness, but a severe blow to the professional reputation of a medical man who wishes to take up his work on high lines.—I am, etc.,

Upper Berkeley Street, W., Feb. 25th.

THOMAS D. SAVILL.

IRISH DISPENSARY ELECTIONS.

SIR,—As I am one of the practitioners referred to in the extract from the *Dundalk Examiner*, published in the *BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL* of February 22nd, I wish to state I was in no way a party to any arrangement with any man, or set of men, on the occasion referred to.