

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

SIR,—In the last week's number of your JOURNAL there is a leader, headed "The Soho Hospital for Women", which has been brought under the notice of the General Committee of that charity, as it reflects upon them and two of the medical officers; and I am directed by the committee to request your insertion of the following brief statement, referring not to your comments upon their action as the governing body of the hospital, but to a misstatement of facts, which you will no doubt gladly rectify. You state that "Dr. Protheroe Smith, who is one of the committee who have passed this degrading rule, had, we believe, previously secured his own position by arranging for himself an absolutely permanent tenure of office. The contrast between this and the terms which he has assisted to impose upon his colleagues is so striking, that it must be hoped he has some explanation to offer, which may modify the very ugly look of the part which he appears to take in this transaction."

The explanation is exceedingly simple. The statement here put forward is not only inaccurate, but, in its essential particulars, the exact reverse of the facts.

The bye-law, No. 19, applicable to "Honorary Medical Officers", under which all the present members of the medical staff, to whom the writer of the article refers as "disposed to resign their office on professional grounds", accepted and have held their respective offices for a succession of years, runs thus:

"On 31st day of December 1854, and on 31st day of December in every alternate year from that date, all acting honorary medical officers (excepting officers appointed before the year 1850) shall go out of office".

Under this rule, established more than twenty years ago, it so happens that Dr. Protheroe Smith, the originator and founder of the hospital, and whose appointment therefore, dates anterior to 1854, is not affected by it, and does not vacate his office every alternate year.

But, when notice was given that it was proposed to strike out the word "alternate", making the vacation of office annual, Dr. Protheroe Smith, being a member of the General Committee, moved that the clause, by which he had been heretofore exempted from the operation of the law, be omitted, and the amendment was accepted by the committee. He, at the same time, tendered his resignation as a member of the committee.

It will be manifest, therefore, that so far from Dr. Protheroe Smith having "previously secured his own position by arranging for himself an absolutely permanent tenure of office", as erroneously assumed in the article in question, he not only himself moved the rescinding of the exemption clause, giving him that permanence of tenure, that he might stand on the same ground as his colleagues, but desired to withdraw from the committee, and he has not attended or taken any part in the subsequent acts of that body.

So far, therefore, as Dr. Protheroe Smith is concerned, he stands free from all implication in the proceedings of the General Committee, and they trust to your sense of justice to give immediate insertion to this rectification of the facts.

As to the propriety or justice of the measures taken by the committee in regard to the alteration of the bye-law, and the bearing of such act upon the position or status of the medical staff, together with your comments thereon, I am to state that they have no remark to make; but, in fitting time and place, they will be prepared to vindicate the course adopted.—I am etc., EDWARD D. STEAD, Secretary.

Soho Square, London, March 4, 1874.

DR. SNOW BECK ON PERCHLORIDE OF IRON IN POST PARTUM HÆMORRHAGE.

SIR,—In a paper in your issue of to-day, Dr. Snow Beck says—"In September 1872, I forwarded to the Secretary of the Obstetrical Society, Dr. W. S. Playfair, some of the following cases, with a commentary. After a few weeks, I was informed that the President, Dr. Braxton Hicks, considered the paper to be 'of a controversial character'; and, as the statements contained in it differed from those which Dr. Barnes had previously made on the same subject, the paper could not be allowed to be read."

Permit me to say, that this gives an entirely erroneous impression of what actually occurred. The paper was declined, not because the President considered it to be of a controversial character, but because the referees of the Society's papers judged it to be entirely unfit for pre-

sentation to the Society. They came to that conclusion, partly on account of the many offensively personal remarks which it contained, and partly because a large proportion of the cases seemed to be merely based on the hearsay evidence of monthly nurses, or other unqualified observers, which they therefore deemed to be quite valueless for any scientific purpose.

Those who are acquainted with Dr. Snow Beck's controversial amenities, will, I am sure, feel grateful to the referees for their decision.

I am, etc., W. S. PLAYFAIR,

Late Secretary to the Obstetrical Society,
5, Curzon Street, Mayfair, Feb. 28th.

SIR,—In your impression of the 28th ultimo, there is a paper on Perchloride of Iron, in which Dr. Snow Beck mentions that, when Dr. Heywood Smith's paper on that subject was read last year at the Obstetrical Society of London, "all expression of opinion contrary to the views of Dr. Barnes and Dr. Hicks, was endeavoured to be suppressed by noisy clamour."

Allow us, sir, to assure your readers that this statement is erroneous. The discussion on the value of perchloride of iron in the treatment of post partum hæmorrhage, was singularly welcome to all those who were present at the two best attended meetings of the last session. Not the slightest attempt was made to interfere with the most complete freedom of discussion.

Dr. Graily Hewitt, Dr. Routh, and Dr. Bantock, could tell you, sir, that on the first night of the discussion, they were very attentively listened to while advocating views opposed to those of Dr. Barnes; and at the adjourned meeting, while the President limited all speakers to fifteen minutes, he actually allowed Dr. Snow Beck to speak for nearly an hour, during which he was listened to with most commendable patience. A reference to pages 50 and 65 of the fifteenth volume of the Society's Transactions, will show how freely and carefully the subject was discussed.

We are, etc.,

THE HONORARY SECRETARIES.

Obstetrical Society of London, 53, Berners Street, March 4th, 1874.

MILITARY AND NAVAL MEDICAL SERVICES.

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE.—List of gentlemen who competed successfully for appointments as Surgeons in Her Majesty's British Medical Service at the competitive examination, held at the London University on February 16th, 1874.

Ward, B. L.	2221	Pratt, W. S.	1540
Gallwey, J. G.	1995	Gormley, J. A.	1444
Prendergast, J.	1912	Fass, J. E. W.	1368
Hickson, G. B.	1905	Young, F. S.	1355
Miller, W. B.	1890	McCreery, N.	1350
Jagoe, B. K.	1725	Greene, J. J.	1345
Smyth, C. C. H.	1706	Martin, J.	1296
Smith, J. A.	1545	Turner, C. P.	1235

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.—The following candidates for Her Majesty's Indian Medical Service were successful at the competitive examination, held at Burlington House on February 16th, 1874. Thirty-six candidates competed for eighteen appointments; and all were reported qualified.

Leckler, H. M.	2590	Lancaster, J.	1985
Corbett, J. L.	2558	Yeld, H. P.	1985
Mair, E.	2370	Warden, C. J. H.	1925
Benson, P. H.	2335	Wilkins, J. S.	1890
Browne, S. H.	2327	Smith, J. G. Malcolm	1875
Armstrong, J.	2325	King, W. G.	1840
Dawson, L. R.	2213	Fullerton, J. C.	1835
Warder, R.	2210	Patterson, D. A.	1820
Shircore, J. C.	2090	Barren, W. A.	1720

THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

WE are unable yet to state with any certainty whether Sir Galbraith Logan retires from active service at the end of the present financial year. Although we can well understand that the prospect of repose may be very pleasant after more than forty years' service, it is also not unreasonable to suppose that the present Director-General may wish to see things a little more settled before he finally takes his leave. It has been rumoured in well informed quarters that Sir William Muir, to whom the succession would naturally fall, is not specially desirous of the honour, and would certainly not accept office on the terms of retrench-