countenance any such action on the part of medical men, whether con-certed or otherwise? As I propose sending your reply to the medical papers, may I trouble you to put it in as concise a form as possible? Yours very faithfully, F. R. HUMPHREYS. P.S.—As the time is very short may I suggest a telegram in reply. November 16th, 1901.

Dr. Sam.Woodcock telegraphed : "Strongly discountenance such action. Will write." His letter follows: "When speaking at Stratford on the 8th inst., I expressed disapproval of concerted action on the part of medical men such as that to which you allude in your letter. I said that this attitude was not high-minded nor patriotic, neither calculated to gain the ear of Parliament nor the sympathy of the public, but was rather likely to promote legislation

of the public, but was rather likely to promote legislation that would be unwelcome to the profession." Dr. Hayward telegraphed: "Heartily condemn such pro-ceedings as unreasoning cruelty. Writing further." In his letter he said: "I cannot imagine any member of an honoured profession wilfully endangering the life of any woman in labour by refusing to assist her in any dif-ficult or dangerous situation simply because a midwife has heap in attondance. This shows a worst of common source been in attendance. This shows a want of common sense, in my opinion, as, in blind revenge on midwives in general, the men so refusing endanger the lives of poor women; and I hold that if any man refuses to attend and there is no time or opportunity to get other help, the man is really culpable for any danger which comes to the patient, and if fatal results occur, is morally guilty of manslaughter. While doing all in my power to place obstetric nurses in their proper position—under the direct supervision of some qualified and registered medical man in all cases-I should most heartily condemn anything like systematic cruelty to poor women in danger, as even if its results were what is evidently desired, I consider it would be an unwarrantable cruelty."

Mr. George Brown replies as follows: "I am much sur-prised that you should deem it necessary to ask such a question as, in your letter of November 16th, you have made yourself the mouthpiece. It has been my invariable custom, yourself the mouthpiece. It has been my invariable custom, since I have had the honour of belonging to the medical pro-fession, if well enough, to go to all cases of midwifery emergency, regardless of the question of payment or who may have been in attendance. After well-nigh thirty years of practice I certainly should not say or do anything contrary to my established rule, whether successful or unsuccessful at the forthcoming election." Fearing that Mr. Brown had mis-read my letter, I wired as follows: "Please reply to my only question your, attitude if receleted towards medical question, your attitude if re-elected, towards medical practitioners acting as mentioned in my letter." In reply I received a note as follows: "I wrote and posted reply to you about two o'clock this morning. I am overwhelmed with work and find it very difficult to reply to all my correspondents.

Mr. George Jackson answers as follows: "In reply to yours received to-day, I may say that I do not approve of the method suggested, and could not countenance it in any way. At the same time, I think a medical man is quite justified in demanding that the midwife should retire from the case before he undertook it, especially if it was known that she habitually exceeded her duties."

* We have received the following further note from Mr. G. Brown: I feel strongly that such a question should not have been asked of the candidates, and therefore I have not sent Mr. Humphreys a categorical reply. I cannot believe that any considerable section of my professional brethren would be so wanting in common humanity as to act in the way suggested. Some months ago J was a candidate for a seat as a borough councillor, and was inundated with letters from cranks and others asking if I would support this or discountenance that. It is pleasing to state that no one asked whether, if elected, I would discountenance arson, burglary, or any more heinous crime.

Provincial Candidates. SIR,—The letter, p. 1489, of "F.R.C.S." brings very forcibly to one's mind the position of Mr. Horsley, as he is one of the foremost in advocating that provincial representatives be re-turned at this election. How was it four years ago he, a

metropolitan, opposed a "provincial" candidate, Sir Walter Foster, for the vacancy caused by the resignation of a pro-vincial?

When speaking at Bedford in support of Drs. Glover, Drage, and Woodcock, he "dwelt on the advisability of direct repre-

and woodcock, he "dwelt on the advisability of direct left sentatives being general practitioners;" and then within a year he came forward himself, who is not a "general practitioner." His prominent advocacy of provincial candidates at this election causes one to conclude that he intends remaining as the Luc duration of the advisor informer is that the London representative, so the obvious inference is that his wish coincides with that of "F.R.C.S."—namely, to oust Mr. George Brown, as expressed so elegantly in the former's letter as "a gracious act !"

Men, however eminent, will use their logic for their own objects, forgetting we have memories, and records of their past sayings and doings. One cannot help thinking of Mr. Edmund Owen's comparison at Cheltenham of Messrs. Horsley and Whitaker re martyrdom.

Would it not have been more disinterested and consistent for Mr. Horsley to have resigned now, as he promised, and allowed Messrs. Brown, Jackson, and Woodcock to be elected, and so save "the cost of an election in 1902?"

It was Mr. Horsley himself who increased the number of representatives residing in London from two to three !-I am, etc.,

Manchester, Nov. 15th. G. H. BROADBENT. ** Has our correspondent forgotten that the lawyers held that Mr. Horsley would have been ineligible for re-election had he resigned?

THE PREVENTION OF TUBERCULOSIS.

WORCESTERSHIRE.

As a result of the County Conference on Tuberculosis it has been decided to establish a sanatorium for the treatment of consumptives in Worcester. Lord Cobham has offered a suit-able site at Romsley, near Clent, and local committees have been appointed to collect subscriptions. A donation of $\pounds_{1,000}$ for the building fund has been received from Dr. Corbett on behalf of the estate of his brother, the late Mr. John Corbett, of Impney, who had taken great interest in the promotion of the sanatorium.

Ватн.

At a recent meeting of the Bath Board of Guardians it was decided to arrange for the treatment of the Bath pauper consumptives locally, and not to join with Bristol in establishing a sanatorium for the reception and treatment of cases of phthisis belonging to the two Boards.

THE METROPOLITAN HOSPITAL SATURDAY FUND.

Sir J. Crichton-Browne, speaking at the annual meeting of the Hospital Saturday Fund at the Mansion House, advocated the claims of the National Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis to the support of all who were interested in hospitals. Any success which might attend the work of that Association tended to relieve the pressure on the hospitals, both in the wards and in the out-patient department. He asked that the Hospital Saturday Fund should aid the National Association in respect of the sanatoria for consumptives which were being established as the result of its efforts.

The following resolution, proposed by Mr. R. B. D. Acland, was carried unanimously:

That this meeting of representatives of the Hospital Saturday Fund cordially approves the efforts that are being made by the National Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, and offers its hearty co-operation in disseminating among the workshops and places of business in London any information as to the means that may be adopted to prevent the spread of this terrible disease.

¹ BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, November 28th, 1896.

A WINDOW in memory of the late Dr. William Marsden, founder of the Cancer Hospital, Brompton, was unveiled in the chapel of the loopital on November 16th by the Bishop of London, who in an address said that for a thousand years the hospital governor of every hospital in Europe was the bishop of the diocese, and although it was impossible for that to be the case at the present date, he liked to think that there was a special connection between every hospital and the Church.