

reward. But 'thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
Bowes Park, N., Nov. 7th, 1898. ANGUS CAMPBELL.

"THE WATER TEST AS APPLIED TO SEWER CONNEXIONS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I have read with interest the letter in THE LANCET of Oct. 29th by Mr. J. W. Mayne on the above subject. I quite agree with him that the connecting drain to the sewer is often carried out in an unsatisfactory and slipshod manner, but I do not quite understand Mr. Mayne's difficulty. Why should he not test the connexion put in by the local authorities himself? It can easily be done and without very much trouble, and if found leaky and defective, as he seems to think it would be, surely he can compel the persons who have done the work and charged him for it to make it good. I make a point of testing all sewer connexions three or four days after they are executed, and this has been done in a connexion made last year from a large hospital in Mr. Mayne's own district (Wimbledon).

In London, where there are often large brick sewers, the thing is simple enough—to plug the drain from the sewer in the ordinary way, seeing that the plug is secure and watertight, and then test. I may say that I have always found the authorities willing and ready to help me in this matter. Only this week on a very large drainage work I am carrying out at the Incorporated Law Society in Chancery-lane I have had three separate connexions made with the sewer (which are under the jurisdiction of two distinct authorities) and tested in the above manner, although it was necessary to walk a great distance up the sewer in order to get at the connexions to see that they were effectually plugged, and these plugs were in the drain while it was filled with water for 24 hours and three days after the work was executed.

For small pipe sewers of course this method is not possible, so I have the connexions tested by means of one of the inflated bag plugs. The distance to the sewer can easily be ascertained and the bag pushed down the connecting drain nearly to the inlet to the sewer and then inflated by means of the rubber tubing (the bag should be held also by means of a cord), the drain then tested by water, and afterwards the bag emptied and withdrawn. I have no doubt whatever that, as Mr. Mayne states, many miles of defective connexion to sewers are laid and are a source of great danger, but this might, I think, be largely overcome if proper professional supervisors were employed who would insist on seeing that the work was carried out in an effectual manner.—I remain, Sirs, yours faithfully,

H. PERCY ADAMS, F.R.I.B.A.

Woburn-place, W.C., Nov. 4th, 1898.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Mr. Mayne's letter in THE LANCET of Oct. 29th impels me to give a recent experience. A relative of mine was taking a house in a London suburb. By my advice the agreement was not signed until the drains had been tested. They were exposed in the garden as far as the street; the smoke test was applied; smoke issued from every joint without exception. As usual the joints had been cemented in front but not behind (out of sight). This is an old story, but it needs repetition. My friends would have "backed their luck" unless I had been urgent with them, although, strange to say, their drinking-water is taken from a well in the garden and the drain-pipe passes within 8 ft. of it.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

T. C.

Nov. 7th, 1898.

INVERSION OF UTERUS CAUSED BY A "MIDWIFE."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In THE LANCET of Oct. 22nd I notice an annotation headed "Midwives and the Deaths of Children." I think that the following facts will confirm the opinion expressed that the mothers' and the children's lives are sacrificed by the absence of proper medical attendance.

Not many weeks ago I was called to see a midwifery case; the message was that "the midwife could not manage." On arrival at 4 A.M. I found that the patient had been delivered of a female child at 3 A.M.

by an "uncertificated midwife." The patient was dead, lying on the bed in the obstetric position, and on examining the body I found the following state of things. The uterus was entirely inverted, the whole of the uterus lying on the sheet under the patient, only the broad ligaments remaining in the vagina. The placenta was attached to the fundus of the uterus and had been adherent, but two-thirds of the placenta were separated from the placental site, no doubt due to force employed by the midwife; the remaining third I peeled off and returned the inverted uterus into position. There had been considerable hæmorrhage. On questioning the "midwife" she told me that she was called to the deceased at 7 o'clock on the previous evening and that the labour pains were irregular and often at fifteen minutes' interval, that the child came naturally, but when "she went to get the placenta," repeating her own words, the deceased bore down and that it all came at once. The deceased was an anæmic woman in poor circumstances, and this was her second child. The so-called "midwife" stated at the inquest the same as she told me, that she had attended cases for seventeen years and never had a fatal case or one with any serious complications before, and that she had had no training except what she had learnt from her own experience. The coroner severely censured the "midwife" and told her that she would in attending cases do so at her own risk. There can be no doubt, as I stated at the inquest, that the "midwife" made traction on the cord and that the placenta being adherent to the fundus caused the inversion; but the inversion was caused by the ignorance on the part of the midwife and thus brought about a fatal result.

When one reads of cases in THE LANCET of certificated midwives giving ergot before the delivery of the child and then has such a case as this one it impresses the fact more clearly that the sooner these so-called "midwives" are registered and act under proper medical advice one will not see such a lamentable result as the foregoing.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

RICHARD G. WORGER, M.R.C.S. Eng.

Radstock, Somerset, Nov. 1st, 1898.

THE DIPLOMA IN SANITARY SCIENCE OF THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I have once before in the medical press called the attention of the Senators of the Royal University of Ireland to the absurdity of continuing to offer to its medical graduates a qualification which is called "Diploma in Sanitary Science" to candidates passing a qualifying examination in a number of subjects similar to those specified for the D.P.H. Cambridge, or D.P.H. London conjoint colleges examinations. The title of the diploma too nearly resembles that of a qualification such as is usually given to a sanitary inspector. Is a man going to spend six or twelve months in close study and laboratory work to be rewarded with a mere Diploma in Sanitary Science? Evidently the medical graduates of the Royal University of Ireland think such a prize is not worth seeking, for on looking through the University Calendars I find such a diploma offered annually for the last seven years or so, but no record is to be found of anyone having obtained this qualification. Its graduates have to go to other licensing bodies and universities for their Diplomas in Public Health. There is no difficulty in seeing that the fault lies in the name of the diploma this University offers. Therefore I address myself to the Senators of this University through the medium of THE LANCET to remedy the title of the diploma they offer in the special branch of Public Health. And I would venture to suggest (1) either that the name of the diploma be changed to D.P.H. R.U.I., or (2) preferably, as in the University of Edinburgh, that they give after proper examination a B.Sc. (Hygiene). I feel sure if either change be made there will be many graduates going up for the special Diploma in Public Health instead of as at present.—I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

CHARLES LEO BIRMINGHAM, M.D. R.U.I.

Highgreen, Yorkshire, Nov. 4th, 1898.

THE OXFORD MEDICAL MISSION.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Your annotation in THE LANCET of Nov. 5th, entitled "The Abuse of Medical Charities," conveys an