

At the meeting of the Pathological Society of London for Tuesday, March 20th, the adjourned discussion on Professor Halliburton's paper on The Forms and Significance of the Proteids met with in the Urine will be resumed by Dr. Brodie. Among those who are expected to continue the debate are Dr. Herringham, Mr. Cammidge, Dr. Luff, Dr. Lee Dickinson, and Dr. Parkes Weber.

MEDICAL NOTES IN PARLIAMENT.

[FROM OUR LOBBY CORRESPONDENTS.]

The Midwives Bill.—It is the unexpected which has always to be taken into account in the House of Commons. No better illustration of this ever occurred than the second reading of the Midwives Bill on Friday last week. It was the accident of a series of accidents. Soon after midnight at Thursday's sitting the Bill went over with some others into Friday's list as a matter of form. The Government a few minutes later announced that they would alter Friday's business and take several Government Bills, including the Factory Acts Amendment Bill as the earlier business, so as to prevent the day being counted as one of the Fridays allotted purely to Supply. They were led to do this on account of the temporary illness of the Under-Secretary for War; otherwise the Army Estimates would have come on. When Friday's work began, the Factory Bill was not proceeded with, as strong representations against taking the measure at so short a notice had been made from both sides of the House. This made the bill of fare very light, and the Census Bill and some others were disposed of, and two money votes passed soon after 5.30 P.M. There remained on the paper some private members' Bills, and, as is the usual custom, the Government should have moved the adjournment at once. Mr. Souttar, however, was up, and moving the second reading of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. Mr. Goschen now moved the adjournment of the House, on the ground that it was an understanding that this should be done at the conclusion of Government business. Then the storm burst. The temperance advocates of all parties seized their opportunity, and member after member uttered his protest against using the Government majority against such a Bill. After a wrangle of three-quarters of an hour or so, Mr. Balfour yielded, and then on a brief discussion the Bill was read a second time without a division. Next came the Midwives Bill, and although Mr. de Tatton Egerton, who was in charge of it, was absent, Mr. Heywood Johnstone promptly availed himself of the opportunity, and moved the second reading. As it was not yet 7 P.M., and the dinner hour did not press, the members stayed in force. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, as last year, took the floor against the Bill, quoted figures to show how strong was the opposition of the medical profession, and concluded by moving the adjournment of the debate. Dr. Ambrose seconded this, and a division was at once taken when the adjournment was rejected by 127 to 56. Mr. Vicary Gibbs resumed the debate, and stated that the General Medical Council and the two Royal Colleges approved of the Bill. Dr. Tanner in reply stoutly affirmed that medical opinion was against the measure, and then after a few words in favour of it from Mr. Hazell the second reading was carried by 124 to 34, or by a majority of 90! The Bill was then referred to the Grand Committee on Law, and the House adjourned at 7.45. The division list is published at page 648. The chapter of accidents which ended in this result was as follows: (1) The usual work of Friday—Supply—was postponed on account of Mr. Wyndham's illness; (2) the programme for business placed on the paper for Friday was altered after the House met by the omission of the Factory Bill; (3) the usual course of adjourning at the conclusion of Government business was not followed; (4) there happened to be a strongly supported temperance Bill on the paper, and (5) by this means a large and specially favourable House was kept to enable the friends of the Midwives Bill cleverly to engineer the second reading of their measure. How unexpected it all was may be gathered from the fact that their hopes were so low that only a couple of hours earlier the promoters had introduced the Bill into the Lords in despair of its chances in the Commons.

The Standing Committee on Law consists of the following 68 members:

Asquith, Mr. (East Fife)	Johnson-Ferguson, Mr. (Loughborough)
Atherley-Jones, Mr. (Durham N.W.)	Knowles, Mr. Lees (West Salford)
Atkinson, Mr. (North Londonderry)	Lawrence, Mr. W. F. (Liverpool)
Barlow, Mr. (Frome, Somerset)	Leese, Sir Joseph (Accrington, Lancs)
Bartley, Mr. (Islington)	Loder, Mr. (Brighton)
Beach, Mr. (Andover, Hants)	Loyd, Mr. A. K. (Abingdon, Bucks)
Butcher, Mr. (York)	MacNeil, Mr. (South Donegal)
Carew, Mr. (Dublin)	Meysey-Thompson, Sir Henry (Staffordshire)
Coghill, Mr. (Stoke-upon-Trent)	Milward, Colonel (Warwickshire)
Commins, Dr. (Cork, South-East)	Monk, Mr. (Gloucester)
Cooke, Mr. Radcliffe (Hereford)	Morgan, Mr. Lloyd (Carmarthen West)
Cranbourne, Viscount (Rochester)	Mount, Mr. (Newbury, Berks)
Cripps, Mr. (Stroud, Gloucestershire)	Murray, Mr. Graham (Buteshire)
Curran, Mr. T. B. (North Donegal)	Norton, Captain (Newington West)
Davenport, Mr. Bromley- (Macclesfield, Cheshire)	Pickersgill, Mr. (Bethnal Green)
Dillon, Mr. (East Mayo)	Powell, Sir Francis (Wigan)
Egerton, Mr. Tatton (Knutsford, Cheshire)	Pryce-Jones, Colonel (Montgomery Borough)
Elliot, Mr. Arthur (Durham)	Reid, Sir Robert (Dumfries Burgh)
Evans, Mr. Samuel (Mid Glamorgan)	Rentoul, Mr. (East Down)
Fardell, Sir George (Paddington, S.)	Ridley, Secretary Sir Matthew White (Blackpool)
Flynn, Mr. (North Cork)	Roberts, Mr. Bryn (Carnarvonshire)
Fry, Mr. Lewis (Bristol)	Scoble, Sir Andrew (Central Hackney)
Gedge, Mr. Sydney (Walsall)	Smith, Mr. Parker (Partick, Lanark)
George, Mr. Lloyd- (Carnarvon)	Solicitor General, Mr. (Inverness Borough)
Godson, Sir Frederick (Kidderminster)	Spencer, Mr. Ernest (West Bromwich)
Goulding, Mr. (Devizes, Wilts)	Stevenson, Mr. (Eye, Suffolk)
Graham, Mr. (St. Pancras West)	Ure, Mr. (Linthgow)
Greene, Mr. H. D. (Shrewsbury)	Vincent, Sir Howard (Sheffield)
Haldane, Mr. (Haddington)	Wallace, Mr. Robert (Perth)
Harwood, Mr. (Bolton)	Warr, Mr. (Liverpool)
Healy, Mr. T. M. (North Louth)	Woodhouse, Sir James (Huddersfield)
Helder, Mr. (Whitehaven)	Woods, Mr. (Walthamstow)
Hemphill, Mr. (North Tyrone)	
Hill, Mr. Staveley (Kingswinford, Staffordshire)	
Hobhouse, Mr. (East Somerset)	
Jenkins, Sir John (Carmarthen Boroughs)	

To these, fifteen have been added for the consideration of the Midwives Bill, namely:

Ambrose, Dr. (Mayo West)	Milbank, Sir Powlett (Radnor)
Bonsor, Mr. (Surrey, Wimbledon)	O'Connor, Mr. T. P. (Liverpool)
Flower, Mr. (Bradford)	Owen, Mr. Humphreys (Montgomery)
Gibbs, Mr. Vicary (Herts, St. Albans)	Pilkington, Sir George (Southport)
Hazell, Mr. (Leicester)	Schwann, Mr. (Manchester)
Howard, Mr. (Tottenham)	Tennant, Mr. (Berwickshire)
Johnstone, Mr. Heywood (Sussex, Horsham)	Thornton, Mr. (Clapham)
	Tritton, Mr. (Norwood)

Mr. Laurence Hardy (Ashford, Kent) has been appointed Chairman of the Grand Committee on Law.

The Census Bill was read a second time on Friday last week, and gave rise to a very short debate. The need for a quinquennial census was raised by several speakers, and it was very forcibly pointed out by Mr. Courtney that the movements of the population often made the estimates of the Registrar-General wide of the truth, and that consequently sanitary improvements were often delayed. The President of the Local Government Board agreed in the main with the advisability of a five years' census, but urged that the present Bill stood by itself, that in 1905 it would be possible to provide for it by a special Bill.

The Companies Bill is exciting a good deal of interest in the House, and a financial question concerning it on Monday elicited a reply from the President of the Board of Trade which seemed to indicate that he could not at present state what attitude the Government would take on any particular clause. Mr. Ritchie, however, went so far as to say that the Government hoped the Bill would be referred to a Grand Committee. Clauses II and III, which refer to pharmacy and medicine respectively, are sure to excite a good deal of criticism. They were originally in separate Bills, and were afterwards introduced into the Companies Bill by the Lord Chancellor, and there is no small risk of their being dropped out of the Bill in its progress through Committee.

The Teeth of Navy Recruits was the subject of a question last Monday, in reply to which the First Lord of the Admiralty stated that no statistics are kept of the men and boys rejected for bad teeth, but that the number might be as much as 25 per cent. Careful attention is given to the teeth of candidates as a test of health and suitability for service afloat.