

generally recognized, who unconsciously translate into bodily symptoms the emotional states represented by such phrases as "aching for an opportunity," "gasping for a chance," "sick of this job," and so on. The fact that in Dr. Davies's case the pruritus is associated with impotence strengthens the probability that psychological factors are active, as impotence is, in the great majority of cases, a purely psycho-neurotic symptom. (So a's) is premature ejaculation, referred to by "N. D." in his query in the same issue of the *Journal*.)

GLASS PERMEABLE TO ULTRA-VIOLET RAYS.

DR. JOHN N. DYSON (Southport), in reply to the inquiry (February 15th, p. 320) by "Forty Years a Subscriber," writes: Vita glass and similar substances allow about 76 per cent. of ultra-violet rays to pass through them. In a town the smoky atmosphere effectually cuts off all ultra-violet rays. In the winter, even when the sun is shining, the minute particles of water in the damp atmosphere of our island have the same effect. It is therefore obvious that in towns and in the winter—the very places and the time when the rays are most needed—there are few, if any, to pass through even a permeable glass. A further consideration, which is generally ignored, is the following: ultra-violet rays cannot pass through even the very thinnest piece of clothing. (A lamp giving out rays twelve and a half times as powerful as those from the sun itself will not affect the skin of the body if a piece of tissue paper is placed on the skin.) A person dressed, or covered in any way, could not possibly receive ultra-violet rays through vita glass (even if these rays were present). The skin of the face and hands, through continuous exposure, is practically immune. A consideration of these simple facts should enable anyone to judge the amount of benefit likely to be obtained by the use of glass of this type.

MR. G. L. PILKINGTON (St. Helens) writes on behalf of the Vita Glass Marketing Board: We were interested to read your reply to "Forty Years a Subscriber" in the *Journal* of February 15th (p. 320). In the main we are in agreement with the substance of the reply, but there are one or two points which are not in agreement with data in our possession. In regard to the frequency with which the windows are cleaned, our researches here have shown that the effect of a film of dust on the transmission of ultra-violet radiation has, in the past, been greatly exaggerated. Our conclusion, briefly, is that dust does not exert a selective absorptive effect on the shorter ultra-violet rays, but that the absorption is roughly the same for any part of the visible and ultra-violet portion of the solar spectrum. It therefore follows that the amount of visible light entering through a window is a fair index of the amount of the ultra-violet radiation entering also.

INCOME TAX.

Appointment: Motor Expenses.

"J. K." holds a county council appointment and receives in respect of the travelling expenses of himself and a nurse an allowance at "5½ l. per mile, which roughly covers running expenses." Can he claim anything in respect of depreciation of the car, which works out at about £25 per annum?

* * He can claim only in respect of expenses incurred wholly, exclusively, and necessarily in the performance of the duties of his office, and only to the extent to which they cannot be met out of (unassessed) grants made by his council to meet them. It is not possible to press successfully the view that the council's mileage allowance is for running expenses only, unless he can produce evidence from the council that they excluded depreciation when calculating the mileage rate. We assume that such evidence is unobtainable. Consequently it reduces itself to whether "J. K." can prove that he has spent, within the restrictions stated above, sums in excess of the council's grant. If he can do so he should succeed, but as this in effect would seem to be an attack on the adequacy of the grant, he has obvious difficulties to overcome.

Cash Basis.

"J." purchased a quarter share in a practice as from January, 1928; in the following October his partner died and he bought the remaining three-quarters of the practice. For 1929-30 he was assessed on the basis of the whole of the cash receipts for 1928. In 1929 accounts were issued half-yearly, instead of yearly, as in previous years, and the result was to inflate the cash receipts of 1929, of which a substantial portion went to the executors of his previous partner. What should he do in connexion with the rendering of the accounts for 1929?

* * The only suggestion we can make is that for the purpose of the 1930-31 return the account for 1929 should be rendered on the basis of the value of the bookings, instead of on the cash receipts. If that is done, however, the same course will have to be adopted in future years. The assessment for 1929-30 was correctly made on the whole of the cash receipts for 1928 (though again the "value of bookings" basis might have suited "J." better), and we see no escape from an inflation of the 1930-31 assessment, unless the cash basis be discarded altogether.

"Child Allowance."

"SANTOR" has a son who is an articled clerk to a firm of solicitors; he receives no salary, and is attending lectures, etc., at a law school. Is he entitled to the "child allowance"?

* * We fear the facts do not justify the claim, which in effect must be that the son is receiving full-time instruction at an educational establishment. There is no judicial decision on the facts stated, but a case which was heard within recent years on somewhat different facts does not lend support to the claim.

LETTERS, NOTES, ETC.

EPIDEMIC ENCEPHALITIS AND ITS LITERATURE.

It should have been mentioned in the footnote to our leading article on epidemic encephalitis and its literature in last week's issue (p. 295) that the report of the Matheson Commission can be obtained in England from Messrs. H. Milford, Oxford University Press, at the price of 15s. net.

ANTIMALARIAL MEASURES IN EAST AFRICA.

THE EDITOR of *East Africa*, in the course of a letter on this subject, writes: May I crave the courtesy of your columns to reply to your criticism of my comments on Lieut.-Colonel S. P. James's report on antimalarial measures in Kenya and Uganda? I did not, and do not, desire to underestimate the value of "real screening," as you call it, but, writing from personal experience of not a few screened bungalows in East Africa, I pointed out that screening is no safeguard against the presence of mosquitos, citing Colonel James himself as showing that screening is in practice often merely a trap for the insects. My opinion, though that of a mere layman, is, I find, exactly that of Professor W. S. Paton and Dr. A. M. Evans of the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine. In commenting on the screening of only a portion of a verandah you write: "In practice this generally means regular exposure to the dangerous anopheles and protection against the merely annoying culicine." It is obviously easier and cheaper to screen effectively a small portion of a verandah than a whole house, and this is commonly done in East Africa. To such a screened verandah many a dweller in the tropics retires on returning from the afternoon exercise to protect himself from the "dangerous anopheles," which gets busy about sunset, and in practice, as I can confirm from my own experience, he finds the protection effective. I cannot agree that culicines are "merely annoying." Paton and Evans say that "in many tropical countries the most troublesome culicines are those concerned in the transmission of the parasites of yellow fever, dengue, and the filariidae." Finally, in attributing to me the "spurious wisdom" of advocating the "positive advantage" of inflicting on new settlers old-time and now avoidable hardships, and of arguing that antimosquito measures are futile, you entirely omit my emphasis that the settler should pay attention to drainage, water supply, quinine prophylaxis, mosquito curtains, and mosquito boots.

MENTAL DISORDER AND INTESTINAL SEPSIS.

DR. W. J. YOUNG (Harston, Cambridge) writes: In this, as in so many things, Voltaire has shown himself that worst of plagiarists, the man who steals our ideas beforehand. The passage is too long to quote, and Voltaire cannot very successfully be condensed, but in his novel, *Lord Chesterfield's Ears*, the great anatomist Sidrac introduces the argument, backed up by evidence from physiology and from history, that the most powerful spring of human action is "la chaise percée." He tells, with peculiar glee, how the emanations from the dried-up contents of an overloaded bowel pass into and poison the whole system, so as to make the merely melancholic man ferocious. He illustrates his thesis with the tale that Cromwell had not visited his "wardrobe" for a week before he cut off the king's head; that the Duc de Guise and his brother were assassinated because they had vexed Henri III when he was extremely constipated; that the massacre of St. Bartholomew was due to the desiccated temperament of Charles IX, "the most constipated man in his kingdom." The anatomist goes on to state that, on the other hand, too great looseness of the bowels saps the vitality, and that consequently he finds himself unable to credit the legend that the English won the battle of Agincourt when they were suffering so much from dysentery that they fought "with their breeches down," and so had to face the enemy rather than offend the French dandies by turning to them the "cu-nu."

CORRIGENDUM.

IN the report of the discussion on intrathoracic tumours, in the *Journal* of February 15th (p. 285), the name of Mr. A. Dickson Wright was inaccurately given as Mr. W. H. White.

VACANCIES.

NOTIFICATIONS of offices vacant in universities, medical colleges, and of vacant resident and other appointments at hospitals, will be found at pages 46, 47, 48, 43, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56 of our advertisement columns, and advertisements as to partnerships, assistantships, and locumtenencies at pages 50 and 51.

A short summary of vacant posts notified in the advertisement columns appears in the *Supplement* at page 63.