

context, argue that this means she may practise medicine; for the former offence she is penalised to the extent of £20; if she practises medicine she is disqualified.

Registration by this Bill is compulsory, and by the restrictions and instructions in the appendix, which is a part of the Bill, she is not left to say what is normal and what is not, but told under what conditions she must send for a doctor. It is to be hoped that at the next meeting of the Parliamentary Bills Committee this as it is, or modified, will be adopted and printed for presentation to the Legislature. It will be the most effective way of stopping the Bill of the Midwives Institute.—I am, etc.,

Old Trafford, April 8th.

JAS. BRASSEY BRIERLEY.

SIR,—In the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of March 21st, and again in the issue of March 28th, you call attention in an editorial paragraph to the approach of the date fixed for the second reading of the Midwives' Registration Bill, and you advise those who are opposed to the Bill to lose no time in writing to their representatives in Parliament asking them to oppose it. Both paragraphs are avowedly hostile to the measure. It is the first time that the JOURNAL has declared itself on the side of the opponents of registration. On March 24th, 1883, you alluded to a case in which a midwife at Birkenhead had been censured by the coroner, and you concluded the paragraph with these words:

"Once more the necessity for legislation for the examination and registration of midwives is brought before us. An excellent Bill is already in existence and generally approved and adopted. The action of Parliament alone is required. In the meanwhile the lives of mothers are daily sacrificed by ignorant and self-sufficient women who undertake the duties of a calling requiring careful training and guarantees of efficiency. Public safety demands the attention of our legislators to put an end to this disgraceful scandal."

Those of us who agree with the views you thus so forcibly expressed not unnaturally regard your change of attitude with surprise and disappointment. The conditions that then seemed to you to call for legislative interference remain unaltered. It is, therefore, difficult to understand why you now oppose the legislation that you then thought so urgently needed. It cannot be that you have been influenced by anything specially objectionable in the present Bill, for you complain that it has not yet been printed. Nor can it be anything objectionable in the Bill of Lord Balfour, upon which the present Bill is based, for your attitude towards legislation last year—when Lord Balfour's was the Bill under discussion—remained friendly as before.

In the meantime, however, I appeal to those who are in favour of the present measure to be up and doing. I feel sure your sense of fairness will prevent your refusing the insertion of this appeal. You say: "The promoters of the measure are active and are sure to make much of any apparent apathy on the part of the profession." Substitute the word "opponents" for "promoters" and the statement would be at least equally correct. The Bill has much more to fear from the apathy of its friends than from the activity of its enemies.—I am, etc.,

Brook Street, W., March 28th.

CHAS. J. CULLINGWORTH.

#### MIDWIVES REGISTRATION ASSOCIATION.

SIR,—We trust that you will allow us to remind those members of the profession who are in favour of the education, registration, and supervision of midwives, that a Bill for securing these objects has been set down for second reading in the House of Commons on May 6th.

We desire to point out that no time should be lost in bringing the question under the notice of Members of Parliament, and putting the case for legislation fairly before them.

We are aware that a number of our brethren are opposed to such legislation, but we know also, and we think it very important, that Members of Parliament should know that a number are in favour of it.

The object of this letter is to urge the advocates of legislation to give their active support to the present Bill, which is identical with the Amended Bill of Lord Balfour of Burleigh,

introduced and read a second time in the House of Lords last year.—We are, etc.,

ROBERT BOXALL, M.D., } Honorary Secretaries of  
ROWLAND HUMPHREYS, } the Midwives Registration Association.

27, Fellows Road, N.W., April 13th.

#### RAILWAY SURGEONS.

SIR,—The National Medical Aid Society arranges with medical men to attend certain people at so much per head. The great railway corporations do just precisely the same thing, only that they do not pay the medical men so well. There is a disposition on all hands to blame the medical men who accept medical aid appointments, while those who accept railway appointments at a lower rate are not as yet subjected to a whisper of reproach. How is this?

The General Medical Council has passed an unfavourable opinion on medical aid surgeons. Why does it not extend its condemnation to railway surgeons also? If the General Medical Council would only do this, then the railway surgeons would have strong grounds for asking for some increased payment. I see in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of March 21st that one railway surgeon has thrown up his appointment in disgust. It would be kind if he and some others would invite, through your columns, correspondence from railway surgeons, with a view to combination for the purpose of bringing the matter before the General Medical Council and seeking some redress of their grievances. Railway surgeons are individuals unknown to one another and widely separated, and it appears to me that united action could be best promoted by such use of your columns as I have suggested. I know no other way.—I am, etc.,

April 13th.

AN UNFORTUNATE RAILWAY SURGEON.

#### EXCISION OF TUMOUR OF THE LIVER.

SIR,—In the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of March 14th, 1896, I observe that Mr. Robson, in quoting my case of resection of the liver, thought the growth was pedunculated. On the contrary, the portion resected was triangular and continuous with the liver without any peduncle whatever.—I am, etc.,

Philadelphia, April 3rd.

W. W. KEEN.

## NAVAL AND MILITARY MEDICAL SERVICES.

### ARMY MEDICAL STAFF EXCHANGE.

The charge for inserting notices respecting Exchanges in the Army Medical Department is 3s. 6d., which should be forwarded in stamps or post office order with the notice. The first post on Thursday mornings is the latest by which these announcements can be received.

EXCHANGE WANTED.—A Field Officer, Army Medical Staff, who arrived in Punjab, India, this troping season, 1895-6, is desirous of exchanging home with an officer of field rank whose tour expires 1896-7, or would exchange places with a field officer serving in the Mediterranean, West Indies, or Bermuda. Please state terms to Field Officer, A.M.S., care of Manager, BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, 429, Strand, London.

### THE NAVY.

FLEET-SURGEON ROBERT TURNER has been placed on the retired list with the rank of Deputy Inspector-General, April 10th. His commissions bear date: Surgeon, September 7th, 1868; Staff-Surgeon, December 26th, 1879; and Fleet-Surgeon January 9th, 1889.

The following appointments have been made at the Admiralty: MICHAEL J. O'REGAN, Surgeon to the *Victory*, April 7th; ERIC E. KERSHAW, Surgeon to Malta Hospital, April 14th; RICHARD H. WAY, Surgeon to the *Howe*, April 14th.

### ARMY MEDICAL STAFF.

SURGEON-LIEUTENANT-COLONEL B. M. BLENNERHASSETT, C.M.G., has been selected to succeed Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel G. J. H. Evatt, M.D., as Secretary and Registrar at Netley Hospital. Dr. Evatt will succeed Surgeon-Colonel A. F. Preston, M.B., as Principal Medical Officer at Hong Kong on the approaching advancement of the latter to the rank of Surgeon-Major-General.

Surgeon-Major-General JOHN COLAHAN, M.D., is placed on retired pay March 30th. He entered the service as Assistant Surgeon May 25th, 1858; became Surgeon March 1st, 1863; Surgeon-Major April 1st, 1873; Brigade-Surgeon July 16th, 1884; Deputy Surgeon-General October 16th, 1889; and Surgeon-Major-General April 14th, 1894. He was Principal Medical Officer in Ireland, where he succeeded Surgeon-Major-General Collis in 1894, but has no war record.

Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel JAMES COATS, M.B., retires on retired pay April 15th. He was appointed Assistant Surgeon April 1st, 1871; Surgeon