

and a little rounder, while the pigment is perhaps more brown.

Mr. Austen has discovered the important fact that the tsetse fly is present here, a fact which may account for the difficulty of keeping horses in the place. It is not the South African *Glossina morsitans*, but belongs to the West African type which was obtained by Dr. W. H. Crosse at Asaba on the river Niger.

I hope to give details of the further work of the expedition by next mail.

P.S.—Two more of the large anopheles caught in the Wilberforce Hospital have just been dissected. Both contained numerous mature zygotes, some with zygotoblasts (germinal threads). Thus four out of thirteen insects caught in that locality have been found infected. It is now evident that the insects have been infected from man, as no animals are about in sufficient numbers to account for such a large percentage of affected mosquitos.

BRUSSELS CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL HYGIENE.

Most of the delegates to the Conference arrived in Brussels on Sunday, and were entertained at a sort of *Bier-commerz* at the Hôtel Ravenstein on Sunday evening. Among those present we noticed Professors Kaposi (Vienna), Kromayer, Blaschke (Berlin), Neisser (Breslau), Rona (Buda-Pesth), de Amicis (Naples), Rosenthal (Berlin), Dr. and Mrs. Drysdale (London), Dr. Nicholas (Bucharest), Surgeon-Colonel Richards in, I.M.S., Major McPherson, R.A.M.C., Drs. Jullien (Paris), R. Crocker, Mr. Alfred Cooper (London), Drs. Saundby (Birmingham), Augagneur (Lyons), Wolf (Strassburg), and Pontopidan (Copenhagen).

OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE.

The formal opening took place on Monday, at 9.30 a.m. in the Palais des Académies. Delegates, on inscribing their names, were presented with three bulky volumes containing reports and papers to form the basis of the discussions. About two hundred delegates met in a handsomely decorated hall, but which was acoustically very defective. Present besides those above were Dr. Birkbeck Nevins and Miss Leppington (England), Professor Fournier (Paris), etc.

The PRESIDENT D'HONNEUR (M. de Bruyn, Minister of Agriculture) was in the chair, and was accompanied by M. de Trooz, Minister of Education, and M. Beco, Secretary-General of the Department of Public Works, who is at the head of sanitary matters in Belgium.

M. DE BRUYN opened the Conference by a speech in which in the name of the Belgian Government he welcomed the representatives of other countries. He fully recognised the advantages to be gained by comparing the experiences of different nations, and he considered that those who had promoted this Conference deserved well of the public. Their Government was anxious to learn the truth and to do what was best for public health and public morals. The various reports and papers which had been prepared constituted a great mass of valuable material, and he trusted that in the forthcoming discussions a solution of these problems might be found. In conclusion he expressed his best wishes for the success of the Conference upon those subjects which were at once so difficult and delicate, and yet so important to the commonwealth.

Professor MAUBACH, President of the German official delegation, thanked the President for his welcome, and expressed the desire of his Government to associate itself with this inquiry and to derive assistance from the labours of the Conference.

Professor STÜRMER, representing Russia, thanked the President and wished success to the Conference.

Professor SANTOLIVIDO, representing Italy, added a few sympathetic words.

M. BECO introduced Dr. Dubois-Havenith, and eulogised his zeal and industry in organising the Conference.

Dr. DUBOIS-HAVENITH said he was sensible of the delicate nature of the task he had undertaken, and thanked those who had prepared reports, especially Professors Fournier and Neisser. He thanked the Belgian Government for its ready help and countenance, the authors of papers, M. Lejeune, Minister of State, and the Honorary President, M. de Bruyn. He believed they had met to discuss these questions in all

sincerity, without any foregone conclusions; they were not merely a collection of Government delegates, but a meeting of all those most competent by knowledge and experience to throw light upon the subjects under discussion.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

M. BECO proposed M. Lejeune, Minister of State, as President of the meeting.

M. LEJEUNE then took the chair amidst applause, and announced the rules which would govern the proceedings. Upon his nomination M. Beco was elected Vice-President, and Dr. Dubois-Havenith General Secretary.

MM. de Bruyn and de Favereau then left the hall, the delegates rising in their seats.

Professor Ehlers was elected Foreign Secretary. It was the duty of this gentleman to read out summaries of speeches made in German or English for the information of those who could not follow the speakers in those languages, and he performed this difficult task most admirably in a few well-chosen words at the close of each speech.

SYSTEMS OF REGULATION AND VENEREAL DISEASE.

The question before the meeting was: Have the systems of regulation actually in force had any influence upon the frequency and dissemination of syphilis and venereal disease?

Dr. BLASCHKO (Berlin) opened the discussion by pointing out that regulation had so far failed to produce the expected results, and that clandestine prostitution was increased by it. The statistical evidence was contradictory and could not be cited to support the present system. He did not think it was possible to increase the number of registered women, and he hoped that one result of the conference would be to draw the attention of Governments to the other means by which they might oppose the spread of venereal diseases.

Dr. AUGAGNEUR (Lyons) argued eloquently against regulation as having been proved to be an insufficient means. He criticised the statistics that were adduced in its support and pointed out that most of the registered prostitutes had been syphilised and become immune before getting on the register. Comparisons between different towns or between national and professional armies as the French and the English were inadmissible.

Dr. BARTHÉLEMY (Paris) said it was impossible to apply inspection properly without registration, and he contended that free prostitution meant unrestricted syphilisation of the people.

Dr. FIAUX spoke against regulation, but his remarks were unfortunately inaudible.

Professor FOURNIER (Paris) would not trust to statistics; he appealed to common sense. An infected prostitute was safe only when she was shut up; outside she became a social danger. To imprison her in a hospital was no doubt an infringement of liberty, but it was justified by the peril to which society was exposed. He descanted upon the dangers of syphilis, the full extent of which had only been disclosed by modern pathological research; the eye, the nervous system, all the organs suffered from an infinity of diseases due primarily to syphilis. This disease was the cause of most stillbirths, and, moreover, children who were born alive suffered from horrible diseases. He attributed many deformities, such as hare-lip and facial hemiatrophy, to the same source. The opponents of regulation minimised these dangers. He estimated the number of persons who acquired syphilis in France as 17 per cent. of the population.

Professor WOLFF (Strassburg), who was very badly heard, defended his statistics, which had been attacked by Dr. Augagneur. He considered that their experience in Strassburg had demonstrated the utility of regulation.

Professor LASSAR (Berlin) would not go so far as Professor Fournier in rejecting statistics, but in other respects agreed with him. An infected prostitute was a focus of disease which it was the duty of society to remove.

Dr. LE PILEUR (Paris) contested the views of Dr. Augagneur. A syphilitic woman remained a source of danger for years.

Professor NEISSER (Breslau) said he shared the opinions of Professor Fournier; the question must be looked at from a common-sense standpoint. He was opposed to the views of the abolitionists.

Professor OLTRAMARE (Geneva) said that the question had been lately put to the vote in Geneva, and regulation had

been affirmed by a majority of 2 to 1. He considered that the success of regulation depended greatly upon the competence and carefulness of the physicians to whom the work was entrusted.

Professor STÜRMEYER (St. Petersburg) supported regulation, and said that unregistered prostitutes came to the dispensaries in a frightful state.

Dr. NEVINS (Liverpool) recapitulated the statistical evidence against the Contagious Diseases Acts. He contended that there were great differences in different places, whether regulated or not, and that there was no evidence that regulation in any case should be credited with the diminution of disease.

Major MCPHERSON, R.A.M.C., disputed Dr. Nevins's conclusions, and produced a diagram to show that the curve of venereal incidence in 14 regulated and 14 non-regulated towns in Great Britain, closely approximated before and after the period during which the Acts were in force, but during that period separated widely in consequence of the lowering of the rate in the regulated towns.

Dr. DRYSDALE, who was very indistinctly heard, disputed the value of Major McPherson's statistics, and maintained that the movements of troops vitiated all such conclusions.

Dr. KROMAYER (Halle) exhibited a number of tables to show that the British army statistics when analysed indicated that the Contagious Diseases Acts had had a distinctly beneficial effect upon the incidence of syphilis, but had not affected the frequency of soft sores or of gonorrhœa.

Dr. JULLIEN (Paris) presented tables to prove that venereal disease occurred more commonly among unregistered prostitutes, that syphilis was most amongst women between the ages of 17 and 22, and that the same relation existed for soft sores and gonorrhœa.

Professor FOURNIER pointed out that Dr. Jullien's second table showed the great risk of syphilis incurred by very young women, and insisted that there should be power to place such women who were under age in reformatories.

Miss LIPPINGTON (England) argued that the admission of regulation led to worse evils. It demoralised the police, promoted clandestine prostitution, and placed vice under the sanction of the authorities without sensibly diminishing the amount of disease.

Professor SANTOLIVUO (Rome), who was very badly heard as the meeting had partly broken and a good deal of confusion existed, was understood to argue against regulation. He believed that no proper comparison could be made between modern and older statistics, owing to the advances of pathology having brought under the head of syphilis many diseases formerly unknown or undifferentiated.

M. PIERSON (President of the International Society for the Abolition of Regulation) disputed the views of Professor Fournier. He said regulation had failed because women could not be registered, the numbers of registered women remaining practically stationary in spite of the growth of the large towns. Every infected woman infected in turn a number of men, who under the system went free to infect any number of other persons, so that men were as dangerous as women. If all women could be made healthy disease would not be stopped. He asked how it was explained that in some non-regulated towns the incidence of disease was not greater than in others which were regulated. He accepted Professor Fournier's account of the social dangers of syphilis, but held that that did not justify the system.

Dr. AUGAGNEUR (Lyons) summarised the debate and replied to some objections.

Dr. REIMERS (Hamburg) continued the discussion, but could not be heard.

Dr. AUFRÈRE (Brest), a medical officer of the French navy, supported regulation, but allowed that the system was capable of improvement.

Professor FOURNIER again interposed, and repeated his arguments.

It was then 5 o'clock, and the Conference had sat with only a short interval for lunch since 9.30, so that there was general relief when the PRESIDENT rose and adjourned the discussion until the following morning.

SECOND DAY.

On Tuesday, September 5th, the discussion of Question I was resumed.

The PRESIDENT summarised the previous day's debate.

Dr. COMMENGE (Paris) read a long defence of regulation, and was repeatedly called to order by the President for travelling outside the subject.

At length Dr. DUBOIS-HAVENITH pointed out that at this rate the Conference would never come to a decision upon the questions which had been framed, and urged the termination of the discussion on the first question.

Drs. FIAUX and LE PILEUR, although taking opposite sides, agreed in demanding that the debate should proceed.

The PRESIDENT hoped members would confine themselves to the actual question before the Conference, and said that the time allowed to each speaker would in future be ten instead of fifteen minutes.

Dr. COMMENGE continued the rapid reading of his paper.

Dr. FIAUX (Paris) in a second speech demonstrated a table which showed that a considerable proportion of syphilitic registered women in Paris escaped from the police, and were not recaptured.

Professor HOLST (Christiania) said that since the abolition of regulation in Christiania, syphilis had increased 25 per cent., clandestine prostitution had increased, and many prostitutes arrested for other offences, although found to be syphilitic, were yet undergoing no sort of treatment.

Dr. BERTZEN (Christiania) referred to his published statistics for the refutation of Dr. Holst. Regulation had produced an inappreciable effect in Christiania, Bergen, and other Norwegian towns.

Dr. EHLERS (Copenhagen) said the personal elements must not be lost sight of in statistics. Figures had been quoted which to his knowledge emanated from an individual unworthy of any trust.

M. MINOD (Geneva), general secretary of the Abolitionist Federation, disputed the arguments which had been put forward by the other side, and defended his Society from the charge of bad faith.

Professor DE GALATZ (Bucharest) said that in Roumania regulation was not fairly tried, for the law, although excellent, was not enforced thoroughly.

Professor DE AMICIS (Naples) said that in Italy regulation had done good, and its abolition had had bad results.

Dr. DRYSDALE (London), in a second speech, said that there was more syphilis in Paris than in London, in spite of the system.

Dr. BARTHÉLEMY (Paris) denied that registration made women professional prostitutes, as they were so before.

Dr. BLASCHKO (Berlin) contended that it was well known that the English army statistics did not support regulation, and that Dr. Kromayer had confounded primary syphilis with soft sores. The statistics of Dr. Jullien dealt with too small numbers and proved little.

Dr. KROMAYER defended his appreciation of the English figures.

Dr. BERTARELLI (Milan) supported regulation.

Dr. LE PILEUR disputed the relevance of Dr. Fiaux's statistics.

Professor PETERSEN said that regulation worked well in Russia, and moved:

That supervision and inspection are of the greatest importance in preventing the spread of syphilis.

Professor FOURNIER (Paris) said there were good and bad statistics, and was understood to prefer those that supported regulation. He accused the abolitionists of caring nothing for the security of innocent wives and children. If there was more in syphilis in Paris, it was because so many strangers came there.

Dr. DRYSDALE retorted that strangers went to Paris because they believed the women there were healthy.

The PRESIDENT desired to put the question, and there was a general cry for closing the discussion, in the midst of which a member tried to speak.

Professor KAPOSI maintained that only scientific men should vote.

Professor PETERSEN opposed this on the ground that the Conference wished to attain a practical result.

Professor EHLERS proposed to resist the question to the Government delegates only.

This was opposed, and ultimately withdrawn.

After a brief interval for refreshment, the Conference re-

sumed at 12.15, when the PRESIDENT announced that the medical supervision of prostitutes question would not be put, and that the Conference would proceed to the consideration of the second and third questions.

Second question: Is the actual organisation of the medical supervision of prostitution capable of improvement?

Third question: Are tolerated houses of advantage from a purely medical point of view?

Professor STÜRMER (St. Petersburg) continued the discussion, advocating treatment for four years.

Dr. VAN HOORN (Amsterdam) said that Amsterdam showed good statistics in spite of the absence of regulation.

Colonel PANARA (Rome) continued the discussion upon the same lines. He was called to order by the PRESIDENT, and then said he advocated more facilities for hospital treatment.

Dr. SCHRANK (Vienna) said that the work of examination should be placed in the hands of venereal specialists, and that the search for the gonococcus should be continued for two years.

Professor DE GALATZ said that would be impossible. He advocated the appointment of a scientific director at the head of the department with a sufficient number of assistants. The examination of three or four hundred women daily was too much for any man.

The sitting was adjourned at 1.35 P.M. until 9 o'clock on Wednesday morning, no decision of any kind having been arrived at, the discussion having revealed the greatest differences of opinion and the utter absence of any trustworthy data for the formation of sound conclusions. Statistics were good, Professor Fournier said, when they supported you, and bad when they opposed you. No doubt if it were possible to shut up every diseased prostitute until cured some good might result, but it was doubtful if the seclusion of a few for short periods had any material effect upon the spread of venereal diseases. It is perhaps to be regretted that the Conference was not confined to members of the medical profession, as the presence of lay representatives of abolition made the discussion more a party fight than a scientific conference.

THE SANITARY CONGRESS.

[Continued from page 622.]

THE Sanitary Congress at Southampton, the opening of which has been reported in a previous number of the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, was, so far as numbers go, a great success. There were about 2,000 persons—including about 500 ladies—present. These included 800 delegates, representing no fewer than 400 municipalities and learned bodies. Wednesday, August 30th, was devoted to the conferences, and Thursday and Friday, August 31st and September 1st, to the work of the sections.

CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES.

President's Address.—Alderman WALTON, the Chairman of the Conference, gave as his presidential address an account of the sanitary arrangements of the town of Southampton. The town was supplied with excellent water from the chalk. The sewage was treated by precipitation, and then turned into the river Itchen. This, he hoped, would end the nuisance which had existed so long through turning the untreated sewage into the sea near the western shore. All the town refuse was destroyed in their destructor. The floating infectious hospital was being superseded by an isolation hospital, which when completed would provide accommodation for 100 patients. In addition to this they would still have a floating hospital for seaborne cases. Southampton was not in the background regarding their insanitary improvements. They had purchased between two and three acres of the worst part of the town, and were constructing a municipal lodging-house and artisans' dwellings. He thought that local authorities were handicapped in carrying out the requirements of the Local Government Board, for while the private speculator was only restricted by the by-laws of the authority as to the class of building and the construction thereof, the Local Government Board raised all sorts of difficulties, and required a standard of building which no local authority could insist upon in its own district. The port sani-

tary authority, in spite of their wide jurisdiction, were prepared for any emergency. It pressed hardly, however, upon the local authorities, not only of Southampton, but of all the port sanitary authorities, that they should still be called upon to bear the whole cost of the guarding of the doors of the country.

Unhealthy Areas and Municipal Rehousing.—Mr. T. BLASHILL opened a discussion on this subject. He pointed out how inefficient the Act was in action. An authority purchased an insanitary area, pulled down the houses and began to construct model dwellings. Two things happened: The first was that the occupants of the demolished houses flocked to other insanitary areas and made them still more insanitary; the second was that the inhabitants of the new houses were not those of the demolished ones. This happened from one or two causes: in the first place, the authority could not let a tenement of two rooms to more than a certain number of people; therefore if a family of ten were turned out of a tenement for which they paid 3s. 6d. per week, they could not be rehoused under something like twice that sum, unless the authority came upon the ratepayers to make up the deficit.

Councillor BATLEY (Leeds) agreed with the opener as to the inefficiency of the Act, and explained how Leeds was trying to improve their areas, not so much by destruction and reconstruction of the property, as by clearing all obstructive buildings, and he thought that very much good might be done in many towns by this process, which was less costly, and which had the additional advantage that it did not drive the tenants to other insanitary areas.

Councillor PURCELL (Liverpool) said that in that town they were more fortunately situated, as they were working under an Act of their own. Under this Act, he thought that they were really rehousing their tenants. True they were doing it slowly, but the point was it was being done.

Dr. PORTER (M.O.H. Stockport) spoke for the need of having an annual licensing of common lodging-houses. Under the existing general law the rule was "once a registered lodging-house, always a registered lodging-house," unless the licensee had as such been three times convicted of an offence against the Public Health Act, or unless the health officer could obtain closure by certifying, under the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, that the house was unfit for human habitation. A house which was not unfit for human habitation might be quite unfit for a common lodging-house; and one reason why Parliament was successfully asked in Section 61 of the Stockport Corporation Bill, 1899, for power to require annual registration of these houses, was in order to be able to deal eventually with the unsuitable places at present registered. It was believed that such a requirement would in addition (1) conduce to the better condition and ordering of all the registered houses in the borough, by making them annually toe the line of sanitary decency, and, as the registered accommodation in Stockport was wholly insufficient, it would enable the Corporation to license temporarily some of the least objectionable of the numerous unregistered places which were structurally unworthy of permanent registration. These places would thus be brought under regular sanitary supervision until, by municipal or private enterprise, sufficient suitable registered accommodation was provided.

Prevention of River Pollution.—Major LAMOROCK FLOWER (Sanitary Engineer to the Lee Conservancy Board) strongly urged that for purposes of prevention of pollution joint Committees for watershed areas should be established. This would put a stop to the disagreements which were always taking place between neighbouring authorities whose interests were in conflict, and would ensure a greater diminution of the pollution.

CONFERENCE OF PORT SANITARY AUTHORITIES.

President's Address.—The PRESIDENT of the Conference (Mr. Millar Wilkinson) urged that the living accommodation of the sailors of the mercantile marine should be improved. There was no doubt that they helped to convey disease from port to port, and it was very essential that this danger, which was really a great one, should be guarded against. The sailor slept, ate, and lived in a space which, according to law, need not exceed 72 cubic feet, which had to include his bunk, bedding, and belongings. Many of the leading shipowners were, with the assistance of the port sanitary authorities,