(*f*) The cross-indexing of the causes of insanity (Table X), *e. g.* enabling it to be seen into how many alcoholic cases heredity entered, or how many puerperal cases were also adolescent, etc.,

are examples of possible further efforts in this direction.

4. Supplementary tables. For instance, one detailing the degree of insane heredity, and associating it with neurotic, phthisical, and alcoholic heredities.

5. Any revision of the present nomenclature of mental diseases in Table XI, and the separation therein of symptomatological from ætiological terms.

THE HYPODERMIC ADMINISTRATION OF MORPHIA.

Dr. J. B. Mattison, Medical Director, Brooklyn Home for Narcotic Inebriates, offers a prize of 400 dollars for the best paper on the subject:—

Does the habitual subdermic use of morphia cause organic disease?

If so, what?

Contest to be open two years from December 1st, 1901, to any physician, in any language.

Award to be determined by a committee: Dr. T. D. Crothers, Harford, Conn., Editor *Journal of Inebriety*, Chairman; Dr. J. M. Van Cott, Prof. of Pathology, Long Island College Hospital, Brooklyn; and Dr. Wharton Sinkle, Neurologist to the State Asylum for the Chronic Insane, Philadelphia.

All papers to be in the hands of the Chairman by or before 1st December, 1903; to become the property of the American Association for the Study and Cure of Inebriety; and to be published in such journals as the committee may select.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"F. S. S." *v.* "Resartor."

GENTLEMEN,—I have to inform "F. S. S." that no collaboration was practised in preparing my strictures; indeed, none was wanted. I thank him for his recognition of care on my part. Perhaps it was due to this care that he was not able, in his rejoinder, to make a frontal attack on the positions taken up by myself. "F. S. S." is aggrieved by my assuming that he recommended the adoption of average residence in place of residence on January 1st of each year as a basis for statistical computations. He bids me read his review again. I have done so, and in the light of his recent translation of the first paragraph I must congratulate him on the production of a fine cryptogram. I have gone further, and re-read his review of the previous year,(1) and find that he advocated therein this same basis of average residence. But on that occasion he added that if the Commissioners adopted it they might safely work out percentages to two places of decimals. Where, then, is the grievance? and why should he now write that a tyro in arithmetical reasoning could see that such a summation could not possibly be taken as a basis for working ratios and proportions?

However, it now turns out that "F. S. S.," in recommending this "only fair estimate," only meant to give the Lord Chancellor a better estimate (to two places of decimals?) of the amount of work the Commissioners have to do annually. But even on this footing, why should not the Commissioners tell their own tale of work in the way they may think best?

I still think that "F. S. S." is mixed on the subject of recovery rates. "I merely desired to emphasise the fact that such a yearly aggregate increase must in a measure affect the calculation, be it the average number resident or the admission rate which may be chosen." That is just where he is mixed. This crisp statement exactly confirms my reading of his original review. How can yearly aggregate increase affect recovery rate on admission? It is a fact that yearly aggregate increase depends largely on failure to recover; in other words, recoveries affect

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.203.813 Published online by Cambridge University Press