hæmorrhage due to placenta prævia. Such a record of course suggests that the method of treatment he describes may be remedial in many almost desperate cases outside obstetric practice. May I ask to be kindly furnished with a little more information as to the composition of the fluid employed for injection? I read, "the ordinary saline solution is used—i.e., a teaspoonful of common salt to the pint of boiled water." Teaspoons vary much in size. Is the teaspoonful to be heaped or level? Or, which would be better, what weight of chloride of sodium should be dissolved in twenty fluid ounces of water? I regret to give the trouble of this inquiry. The materials for searching the literature of the subject are not just now at my hand.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
Birmingham, June 27th, 1896. JAMES SAWYER.

RESEARCH IN COLOUR BLINDNESS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—It is proposed to form a society for the purpose of making researches in colour blindness, instituting proper tests and preventing colour-blind and defective-sighted men from acting in capacities in the marine and railway services for which they are physically unfitted. I shall be glad to hear from those who are interested in the subject and are willing to join the society. The subscription will be 5s. per annum.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
F. W. EDRIDGE-GREEN.
Ravensfield Villas, Hendon, June 29th, 1896.

THOMAS KEITH AND THE CAUTERY.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—There is only one intelligible statement in Dr. Skene Keith's letter, to the effect that his father made some experiments on animals to prove something or other about the cautery. This is the first we have heard of the circumstances. Keith took the cautery from Baker Brown first, as the latter had used it for years before Keith operated. Keith used it in the same way for over thirty years without ever suggesting modification or improvement. It therefore follows that whatever Keith may have proved by experiments on animals had been already completely proved by Baker Brown on the human body. Keith's experiments on animals were, therefore, absolutely useless and unnecessary. If the facts are as Dr. Skene Keith states it would have been better for his father's memory if he had said nothing about them, as nobody ever suspected Thomas Keith of such egregious folly.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
The Crescent, Birmingham, June 22nd, 1896. LAWSON TAIT.

THE BRITISH GYNÆCOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In your notice of the remarks I made at the British Gynæcological Society on June 27th I am reported to have stated that "as a rule no one knew less of the gynæcological conditions in the insane than the medical attendants in asylums." Allow me to state I never made so impolite and false a statement in regard to these gentlemen. What I did say was, that more than once I had been instrumental in preventing the admission or in assisting in the removal of cases condemned to a lunatic asylum. I might have added under the actual direction of one of our most distinguished medical Commissioners of Lunacy. This rather proved how well versed this gentleman was in gynæcology.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
C. H. F. ROUTH, M.D.LOND.
Montague-square, W., June 29th, 1896.

"THE ROYAL MILITARY TOURNAMENT."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Referring to your notice in THE LANCET of June 20th of the Royal Military Tournament I state that peat moss for the stables and baths for the competitors are not novelties but were introduced by the late committee six or seven years ago. The statement that there have been fewer accidents this year than usual, if justified by evidence,

will be very gratifying to all concerned, but the facts given do not bear this out.—I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

London, June 25th, 1896.

VERAX.

* * If "Verax" will read our article he will find that we do not anywhere state that peat moss litter was used for the first time this year. With regard to the number of grave accidents at the tournament they were distinctly few, although there were a great many minor casualties. The hot-water baths in use this year were an innovation.—ED. L.

"THE REMUNERATION OF MEDICAL MEN."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—May I be allowed to add briefly to the comments of your correspondent¹ on the remuneration of medical men? Whilst agreeing with nearly all of his arguments, I wish to point out that we as a profession can do much to help ourselves, especially by inculcating proper ideas of professional dignity and of self-respect into the minds of those who come to our schools for their education. Their minds are young and receptive, and obviously prone to seize upon ideas which obviously accord with their own feelings and interests. I need, therefore, say nothing more about the recruits. But these young men, who are such terrible critics—a fact to which many of their seniors seem singularly blind—must, when they are initiated, deem many of the doings around them very anomalous. What must they think when they hear that the remuneration of the demonstrators who teach them is either nothing at all or about the same as that of a labourer or perhaps of an artisan. Doubtless, they ponder and turn over in their minds all sorts of doubts and queries. They will ask, Who fixes this scale of payment? Medical men. But medical men would not be ungenerous to each other. Besides, when a medical man fixes the remuneration of his brother medical man he is, although he may not know it, fixing his own. Or, perhaps, he thinks his teacher is working for a golden future, but then he recalls X, Y, and Z, and all the other letters of the alphabet too, to whom no golden future ever came and who left their *alma mater* disappointed men with bitterness in their hearts and nothing in their pockets. It seems natural then for our tyro to ask, Why were they not properly paid? and at last he comes to the conclusion either that medical men are heartless and ungenerous to each other or that medical men ought to work for nothing. We have all seen ideas acquired in youth persistent to a green old age. But, Sirs, it would be disingenuous of me were I not to say that I already see signs of improvement in this respect. In many of our schools the juniors are being better paid by the seniors, and this is not due to a sudden accession of generosity, but to the circumstance that a profound change has overtaken medical education. The aspirants for medical and surgical posts do not care to hold unfair demonstratorships in scientific biology, physiology, chemistry, and so forth, so others have to be employed at salaries which, if still inadequate, are not absolutely ludicrous. Even human anatomy, as your advertisement columns show, is tending in the same direction. A return of the emoluments of London lecturers would be rather depressing reading, and it would be seen that academic distinction and brilliant lecturing do not command the rewards of a lucrative practice. Sirs, I do think we ought to remove from our students the object lesson of medical men being ill paid by medical men, and I do not believe it is an impracticable or impossible task. The next thing which leads a student to think that medical men ought to work for nothing is to learn that the staffs of our great hospitals are, with few exceptions, quite unpaid for their hard and exhausting labours, and when they see, in addition, unthinking or unscrupulous men lavishing their time and gratuitous services upon well-to-do and poor alike is it not natural to suppose that they think it is right and self-respecting for them to go and do likewise? Finally, Sirs, I think it is childish to say the ill remuneration and poverty of medical men are the fault of the public. In my experience the public are willing to pay, as far as their means allow, for honest and painstaking labour. But they are misled by the improvidence and portentous way in which many medical men live; by the habit which medical

¹ THE LANCET, June 20th, 1896.