on August 27, 1866, and died on January 31, 1874. For the patient called "Anne Sahingetar," we found the record of Anne Saekkingstad, who was admitted on December 17, 1871 and died on March 11, 1873. Nothing was found about a postmortem examination. To find further data would take much time.

It appears that Feeney's information, including the spelling of the names, was obtained from an article by Hansen entitled "The Bacillus of Leprosy," which was published in 1880 in the Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science (Vol. 20, pp. 92-102). The two other articles by Hansen that appeared in the same year under virtually the same title, one in Norwegian in Nord. Med. Arch. [12 (1880) No. 3, pp. 1-10], and the other in German in Virchow's Archiv. [79 (1880) 22-42], have been examined and found identical with the one in English cited.

The purpose of this thrice-published article, written after Neisser's 1879 article 3 had appeared, was partly to assert Hansen's priority in the discovery of the bacillus. First it tells of the search of the blood of leprosy patients for anything significant, and then (to quote), "After having employed myself for a lengthened period in these investigations of the blood, I proceeded to those of the tubercles, and shall communicate, as follows, a few of the memoranda I made during that time." He does this in considerable detail, on what, it seems, was a consecutive series of specimens examined in various ways, each for several days, the total covering a period of about three months.

Hansen did not state specifically that these were actually the first observations of rods in the little brown bodies, but it seems safe to assume that they probably were. If he had seen them before, he would not have spent much time on the blood, at that time, as he said he had. It may therefore be concluded that it was in early 1873 that Hansen's first observations of the bacillus of leprosy were made.

Dept. of Microbiology
The Gade Institute
University of Bergen
Bergen, Norway

—THE M. VÖGELSANG

To the Editor:

I have acquired a copy of a recent revision of the Constitution and By-laws of the International Leprosy Association, based on an action taken during the recent International Congress of Leprology held in Rio de Janeiro, [The Journal 31 (1963) 462 and 470].

This new revision, without pagination and without any indication of its source (i.e., by what or whom it was printed) bears only the signature of the Secretary-Treasurer of the IIA. Detailed check of it against the 1954 version as published in The Journal, with certain changes made at the Tokyo Congress in 1958 in mind, shows that there
is only one new change. That is a single sentence added to an item of
the Bye-laws, quite unrelated to its immediate context.

The revision is supposed to pertain to the products of a certain
class of meeting. To clarify that point it must be understood that the
Constitution contemplates, without stating the fact precisely, that two
kinds of meetings may be held. To quote:

6. Meetings.—It shall be a purpose of the Association to hold general meetings or
congresses at such intervals and under such conditions as may be determined by the
Council (italics added).

It is not clear at this point whether or not "general meetings" and
"congresses" are synonymous, or are alternative terms, but that they
would be alternatives is made certain later—although not clearly.

Section 5(d) of the Bye-laws provides for two kinds of congresses,
(1) convened by the Association (obviously at its own expense) and
presided over by its President; or (2) "convened and supported by
another entity, such as a government, with the Association cooperat-
ing . . ." in which event the presiding officer may be chosen locally—
which has always been the case at our quinquennial congresses.

The next paragraph pertains to meetings of the Association as
such, and as revised at Rio it now reads (the added part in italics):

(c) All addresses and scientific papers read before a meeting of the Association as
such shall be the property of the Association, and shall be forwarded by the Secretary
concerned to the Journal of the Association to be considered for publication. If, however,
notice has not been received by the authors within three months from the date of receipt
by the Editor that the papers have been accepted and will appear in the Journal in the
near future, the authors will be permitted to withdraw them and offer them for publica-
tion elsewhere.

Since there has never been a meeting of the Association as such,
nor is there likely to be any in view of the limited finances, the purpose
of the amendment is not evident.

It cannot apply to Congresses such as have been held, for in every
instance all addresses and scientific papers have been regarded as the
property of the Congress for publication in its Transactions. Before
Rio, where he was unable to be present, the editor always selected, from
among the papers presented, a few for publication in the Congress
Number of The Journal, and—for lack of definite right to them—ob-
tained the permission of the Congress authorities for such use. The
authors were not necessarily notified, for they had submitted their
manuscripts with the expectation they would be published in the
Transactions, but there was often occasion to correspond with them
about the papers selected for use in The Journal.

That these parts of the Bye-laws should be radically revised is
evident, but the revision adopted at Rio and especially distributed by
the Secretary of the Association is not pertinent or helpful. It only
serves to confuse the matter.

Culion, Philippines

H. W. Wade, M.D.