

and had been from that quarter for some weeks previously. I could get very little information to confirm the statement that there is an outbreak of "colds" after the visits of strangers to the island, and the present generation of islanders do not appear to support the idea very strongly.

Small-pox, in 1724, is the only epidemic, other than that to which I have referred, which has been experienced in the island, and in the event of the introduction of any virulent form of infection to this "virgin ground" the results might well be appalling.—I am, etc.,

H.M.S. *Lowestoft*,
First Light Cruiser Squadron.

R. W. B. HALL,
Staff Surgeon, Royal Navy.

INFANTILE PARALYSIS AND ITS TREATMENT.

SIR,—In the oration to the Medical Society of London on "Infantile paralysis and its treatment," which was published in the *BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL* of May 30th, I made a statement which might lead to misapprehension regarding the origin of the operation of spino-facial anastomosis.

In mentioning this operation under the heading of "nerve crossing" it was stated that in 1895 Ballance met with gratifying success when he united the facial to the spinal accessory, thus leaving the impression that this was the first occasion on which this operation had been performed. The same operation, however, had been carried out by Drobnik in 1879, and, although Ballance operated upon his case in 1895, it was not published by him until 1903, when it was grouped with several others.

The first reported case was published by Faure of Paris in 1898, and the second—which was the first published in this country—was that of Kennedy of Glasgow in 1900. This case was of importance from being the first in which independent volitional movements of the face resulted from the operation.

This correction I think it right to make in order to preserve historical accuracy regarding the subject.—I am, etc.,

Liverpool, June 11th.

ROBERT JONES.

PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH.

SIR,—In your brief report of my somewhat lengthy address on Public Health Research to the Society of Medical Officers of Health at their annual provincial meeting, your reporter has fallen into an error, which, as it relates to the supposed policy of the Medical Research Committee under the National Insurance Act, I must ask you to be good enough to allow me at once to correct. I explicitly avoided anticipating any of its proposals beyond making a general statement as to the broad view which the committee was disposed to take of the scope of medical research and of the methods or inquiries by which such research was to be pursued. I said nothing as to its proposed relations with new laboratories or with existing laboratories. My address was not on the work of the committee, but on public health research, and especially on the manner and spirit in which it should be carried out. The reference to laboratories appearing in your report was in connexion, not with the work of the Research Committee, but with the recent proposal by the Chancellor to devote a considerable sum to the provision of increased laboratory facilities for carrying out the numerous examinations now required for clinical and public health purposes. I expressed certain views regarding such laboratory services, which I had previously submitted at some length in a memorandum to the Astor Committee.—I am, etc.,

Aberdeen, June 13th.

MATTHEW HAY.

MODEL SCHEME FOR THE TREATMENT OF TUBERCULOSIS.

SIR,—In the model scheme for the treatment of tuberculosis there are two additions which might be made with advantage in my opinion. (1) Paragraph II, Section A (ii) will probably not be faithfully followed by many borough councils, and therefore, I think, an income limit of, say, £160 should also be a condition of treatment. (2) There is no mention of a management committee of a dispensary. In London that will consist of representatives of the hospital, the L.C.C., and the borough council, etc. I think we should insist that the practitioner, panel or non-panel, should also be represented—a management committee could scarcely be efficient without.—I am, etc.,

London, N.E., June 17th.

C. E. EVANS.

THE SPECIAL FUND: TRADE UNION OR TRUST?

SIR,—It seems more than a pity that the commendable efforts of Messrs. Wallace Henry and Fothergill—both able exponents of their respective policies—should have failed to give rise to a desire on the part of the average member of the Association to enter into a discussion of such great moment. The maintenance of such a correspondence involves an enormous amount of time and careful thought, and such efforts are worthy of a better fate. It behoves us, therefore, to learn a lesson in time from this apathy, for that is what it is. This apathy on a question of the very greatest moment will be reflected in the Divisions when meetings are held at which Representatives will be instructed to vote which of these methods is to be adopted to safeguard our non-existent fighting fund. Let us therefore profit by past experience. Let us boldly face the fact that the voice of the Divisions will not be the voice of the Association.

Fortunately this is a question to be settled purely by the members of the Association, and we have a machinery for obtaining the opinion of the men who cannot attend their Division meetings. I mean the Referendum. I make bold to say that the failure or refusal to make use of the Referendum on such a momentous question will be a crime against the Association. Going round amongst the members, one finds the most acute difference of opinion on this great question. There are many who feel so strongly that they affirm that if a trade union is formed in connexion with the Association they will resign forthwith and persuade their friends to do the same. On the other hand, there is a rapidly growing section of the members which thinks that such a step constitutes our only hope. Finally, there are not wanting members of the profession who would join the Association as soon as it countenanced trade unionism. I earnestly hope that if my suggestion should be blessed by the powers that be, the plea of causing further delay may not be allowed to prevail. We have delayed so long that a few more weeks cannot signify. We are further off having a fund to-day than we were twelve months ago, owing to the way in which the fund enthusiasts were put under extinguishers prior to and at the Special Representative Meeting in 1913.

The Referendum and the sincere hope and belief that whatever the result the minority will loyally fall in with the expressed wishes of the majority can save us from committing another crowning blunder.

In conclusion, may I ask if it is really worth while risking any injury to the Association by squabbling about how we shall deal with a fund which we certainly have not got and which we probably shall never have.—I am, etc.,

Gillingham, Kent, June 14th.

C. COURTENAY LORD.

SIR,—I should like to emphasize one question asked by Dr. Fothergill in his letter to the *JOURNAL* of June 13th.

Are not the advocates of trade unionism for the medical profession, after all, reactionary, rather than progressive, in their ideas?

For the sake of the Association, I hope that the Representative Meeting will negative the change, as I am confident that if the position be carried by the trade unionist factions there are many members who would resign and leave the trade unionists to work out their own salvation.—I am, etc.,

Bedford, June 15th.

S. J. ROSS.

ROYAL MEDICAL BENEVOLENT FUND.

SIR,—We have carefully read the letter of the President and Treasurer of the Royal Medical Benevolent Fund and also that of Messrs. Beale and Co. in your issue of last week.

It is true that Mr. Justice Joyce decided that Miss Glenny's legacy must be paid to the Royal Medical Benevolent Fund and not to Epsom College. He so decided because he was of opinion, as a matter of construction, that the words of description used in the will more aptly applied to the Fund than to the College. He ruled as inadmissible evidence which Mr. Crosse, who prepared the will, was ready to give as to the intention of the testatrix, but in so ruling he did not lessen the force of an observation he made in the course of the hearing to the