

after weighing counsel's opinion the committee determined that no further legal action should be taken. The eminent counsel consulted pointed out that "the validity of the power of expulsion does not prevent the by-law complained of being questioned in so far as it purports to impose restrictions upon meetings and discussions, and that the voluminous evidence collected by the plaintiffs shows the existence, in early times at all events, of the rights of the commonalty to be summoned to meet from time to time, and, when so met, of freely discussing all matters concerning the common craft." Counsel further expressed the opinion "that the evidence, however, tends to grow less distinct as time goes on, and that it is questionable whether these rights, though never in terms taken away, had not suffered largely from general encroachments by the governing body and fallen by lapse of time into disuse."

It is now the duty of the special committee to point out that the expenses of the action at law must be promptly met, so that the four nominal plaintiffs—Messrs. Warwick C. Steele, Wm. Ashton Ellis, Jabez Hogg, and W. G. Dickinson—may be speedily relieved from the responsible position in which the adverse judgment of Mr. Justice Romer places them. The committee, on behalf of the whole body of Members, fully realise and share the plaintiffs' responsibility, and, moreover, consider also that they have a strong moral claim upon the Members of the College generally, and they look with perfect confidence for a willing and substantial response to this appeal.

The exact amount of the costs has not yet been ascertained, but if the President and Council of the College press for their costs, then the committee have reason to believe that the whole will not be less than £2000. Be this as it may, the Members of the College will, we feel assured, not allow the plaintiffs to suffer, but by generous assistance testify to their courage and self-abnegation displayed in the important contest in which they have been engaged on their behalf.—Signed, on behalf of the Special Committee,

GEO. DANFORD THOMAS,

Feb. 22nd, 1892.

Chairman and Treasurer.

Subscriptions may either be sent direct to Dr. G. Danford Thomas, Park Lodge, Paddington, W., or to the National Bank, Bayswater Branch, W. (*Steele v. Savory Fund*).

DR. ROOSA'S TREATISE ON DISEASES OF THE EAR.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I crave permission to make a few remarks on your able review in THE LANCET of Feb. 20th on Dr. St. John Roosa's equally excellent book on "Diseases of the Ear." Your reviewer, no less than the author, has done good service in calling attention to "conclusions which are fearlessly stated," and which, when I read them, appeared to me almost as an echo of opinions which you permitted me to express in THE LANCET of July 6th, 1889, and April 11th, 1891. If the echoes of your reviewer are re-echoed by your journal from time to time until they reverberate sufficiently to reach the ears of the medical profession, and through their influence the ears of the public, you will, as you have been on former occasions, be the means of exposing and checking abuses that are harmful alike to the profession and the public. On the subject of electricity (*vide review*) the author in this edition omits certain paragraphs upon the value of electricity as a diagnostic agent, "which he now frankly confesses have not sufficient basis to be of practical utility." Now (*vide THE LANCET*, April 11th, 1891), "perhaps because tinnitus, due to degeneration and some other causes, is of a constant character, the kind of electricity which finds favour amongst its advocates is the constant current; but whether this or the interrupted is employed, it is generally the personally conducted and continuous as long as possible." Whether for diagnostic or curative purposes, the results are practically the same; so there is no advantage on dwelling upon the different reasons which prompt its employment.

Again (*vide review*): "He also gives us a plain opinion on the value of operations upon the tympanic membrane and ossicles in non-suppurative affections of the middle ear, and plainly hints at their experimental nature and generally disappointing results." Now, on incision of the tympanic membrane, with division of the tensor tympani (*vide THE LANCET*, July 6th, 1889): "Its history includes a flight of the imagination, a brief notoriety, and a burial in oblivion so rapid as falls to the lot of few achievements in surgery."

Again (*vide review*): "Dr. Roosa speaks in condemnation of operations upon the nose in cases of deafness, and he shares in the opinion of some others that those who now enthusiastically adopt and advise these operations will in time relinquish them." Now (*vide THE LANCET*, April 11th, 1891), on removal of the middle turbinated bone: "As a surgical procedure this operation is outside the pale of serious discussion, and I mention it only as an example of a bubble remedy, that the very mention of it may possibly hasten its inevitable bursting."

I have not as yet had the opportunity of seeing this edition of Dr. Roosa's book, though I am familiar with previous editions, but I hope that he may have echoed what I have said on the subjects of so-called artificial eardrums and the injections of pilocarpine. On the former (*vide THE LANCET*, April 11th, 1891): "Now practically any form of artificial membrane that is advocated presupposes that all perforations which require protection and pressure can have them usefully applied by one form, the fact being that each perforation requires management, to be acquired only by experience, after careful examination, and when any support of the kind is wanted it must be regulated by the patient, his sensations being the guide in regard to pressure." On the subject of injections of pilocarpine, which were some time ago revived in this country, I say nothing. Professor Politzer, who made the original experiments in 1879, disposed effectually of them in THE LANCET of Jan. 3rd, when he spoke of "practitioners who subject their patients to a long and wearisome course of treatment with pilocarpine," and added: "I feel it my duty to say that they are not too conscientious in the discharge of their calling." You will, Sirs, I feel sure, forgive me for occupying so much space in repeating, and so accentuating, these various points, when you reflect, as I hope you will be able to do ere long, that your journal has been mainly instrumental in putting limits at least, if not a full stop, to the employment of some useless remedies.

I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

Savile-row, W., Feb. 22nd, 1892.

W. B. DALBY.

LARYNGEAL AFFECTIONS AFTER INFLUENZA.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—During an attack of influenza all the effects of catarrhal inflammation may be observed. Most of these effects are so frequently seen as to be familiar to all. There are, however, complications and sequelæ which are less common. Some patients have been attacked with œdema, coming on in some cases suddenly, in others insidiously. Hæmorrhages from the larynx have been more common and generally very slight. During convalescence ecchymoses and purpuric spots have been observed. Venous congestion, a rare affection in this locality, has been noticed. But the most interesting consequences are neuroses. The paralysis which may be seen in catarrhal laryngitis of course forms the larger proportion of these neuroses; but this note is intended to draw attention to the sequelæ rather than the complications of influenza. Paralysis commencing in the throat after convalescence and extending to other regions has so precisely simulated that which follows diphtheria as to suggest a doubt as to the nature of the original attack. But other paralyzes, more localised, have also come on after the patients had returned to their avocations. The most commonly affected muscles have been the crico-thyroidei laterales, the thyro-arytænoidei externi et interni, and the arythænoideus. Thus we get more or less paralysis of adduction, either single or double, with corresponding loss of voice. Almost as frequently the action of the thyro-arytænoidei interni and the crico-arytænoidei and crico-thyroidei is impaired or abolished; and as the last named is affected by the superior laryngeal nerve, neuroses of sensation as well as motility result. Anæsthesia and hyperæsthesia of the larynx have also been observed, but the extensive range of normal sensibility in different persons renders it difficult to demonstrate minor degrees of such deviations. Neuralgia is rare, and I have only met with one case following an attack of the present epidemic. I may mention among sequelæ setting in very late choreic movements and spasmodic affections, as well as the stammering of the vocal cords described by me in THE LANCET of Nov. 15th, 1879. These cases are rare. It would appear that these cases of late sequelæ are indications that the effects of influenza remain for a considerable period, and the proportion of