i the morning without any medical assistance whatever, and this circumstance reflects very little credit on that wretched parsimonious system, which, apparently intended to consign poor lying-in women to chance—women, too, who are afterwards acknowledged to be paupers, relieved out of the parish funds, and yet most unjustly denied the services of the medical officer in the time of their utmost need, because it involves an expenditure of ten shillings! I would rather be the man to attend these cases for nothing than him who would refuse all just remuneration. Supposing Catherine Duffy, or any other of the five cases I have lately attended without an order, had been the wife of a poor-law guardian instead of a poor, destitute Irishman, she would undoubtedly have had some consideration bestowed upon her, and not been allowed to struggle through the pains and penalties accompanying childbirth without prompt and able assistance. What difference is there, I would ask, between the Queen in labour and Catherine Duffy? None whatever. I repeat, Sir, the system which would deny medical aid to poor lying-in women cannot be too severely deprecated. It is not only un-English, but grossly barbarous.

Now, with regard to the refusal of the fee. Article 182 says—"In cases in which any medical officer, either for the workhouse or a district, shall be called on, by order of a person legally qualified to make such order, to attend any woman *in, or immediately after, childbirth,*" &c. This settles the question at once, and on these words I found my claim. I was called into the house of Catherine Duffy by her husband on the afternoon of the same day on which she was confined; I supplied her with medicine, and visited her again; besides this, I prescribed for and supplied her husband with medicine. In fact, I saw the woman fairly over the puerperal state, and discharged my duty conscientiously, and in strict compliance with the plain provision in Article 182.

In your letter there is some ingenuity; at all events, there is a lamentable oversight in your quotation (it may have been dusk, as it soon is in November), I mean, in omitting the words which I trust I have rendered so legible as not to be overlooked this time, and confining yourself with all stress (the gas no doubt had just been lit) to the following, *nor were you called in afterwards under circumstances of difficulty or danger.* Now, I would humbly ask, how do you know this? The board certainly cannot tell the circumstances—the relieving officer cannot tell—nor can you yourself tell. In fact, the circumstances of the case, in a medical point of view, are only known to myself; and, therefore, I beg to submit to your good judgment that the words I have underlined above, are neither more nor less than a gratuitous assertion. I would remind you, in all humility, that Article 182 awards ten shillings for all ordinary cases, but for extraordinary cases, involving "*circumstances of difficulty or danger,*" the medical officer is entitled to twenty shillings; and it is right such a distinction should be made. I mean no offence by these remarks, nor do I harbour any ill-will. I but follow out the law, and I desire nothing but what is reasonable and just.

In conclusion, Sir, I am of opinion that a medical officer, who, in order to discharge faithfully a most responsible duty, is compelled to walk about the streets at all hours of the day and night; to sit for hours together in garrets and in cellars, amidst filth and destitution, amidst squalor and wretchedness, unseen it may be, but no less useful on that account; such a man, I say, ought not to be deprived by any chicanery, however subtle, of a paltry sum of ten shillings, especially when the law has provided for its honourable payment.

Under these circumstances, I protest, respectfully yet firmly, against the decision of the board, and I ask, again, for a more rational and considerate management of these important cases. I may just observe, that Catherine Duffy, Mary Taylor, and Sarah Bird, have all received parochial relief immediately subsequent to confinement, and that I was called out of bed to attend upon the two latter.

I have the honour to be, dear Sir, your obedient servant,
Halifax, Nov. 19, 1849. **FREDERICK SMITH GARLICK.**

P.S.—To this letter I have as yet received no written reply, but I understand the fees have all been allowed, with the exception of that for Catherine Duffy. **F. S. G.**

ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE FORCEPS IN MIDWIFERY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—“Oh that mine adversary had written a book!” exclaimed the most patient of mankind. My waspish adversary

has written his book; he has brought the affair to a tangible shape, and he must endure the consequence.

THE LANCET of January 13th, 1849, contained an article from me, “On Employing Instruments in Midwifery,” in which I stated, that of 1484 labours, three only were delivered by the forceps, being rather less than one in 494. And this I stated in furtherance of the late Dr. D. D. Davis’s reasonings on this important subject, as contained in the following passage from his “Elements of Operative Midwifery”:—“Upon the whole, therefore, I am much inclined to the opinion, that it cannot be absolutely necessary to have recourse to the use of the forceps or the lever more frequently than once in 300, or at most in 250 cases, in order to ensure for puerperal women the greatest possible advantages attainable from the employment of these obstetric powers.”

Eight months passed away, when, in THE LANCET of September 22nd, appeared the first letter of Mr. C. Stewart, Sen., containing a graceless and illiberal attack upon me and my practice, winding up with these remarkable words:—“I cannot coincide with the opinion of Dr. Davis, that ‘it cannot be absolutely necessary to have recourse to the use of the forceps more frequently than once in 300, or, at most, 250 cases,’ and unhesitatingly give it as my conviction, that such a limited use of them is far from ‘ensuring for puerperal women the greatest possible advantages attainable from these obstetric powers.’ Indeed, I would not readily affirm that they may not be employed with advantage in as great an average as one in fifty.”

To this bumptious letter I gave a “laconic” reply in THE LANCET of November 24, simply calling the serious attention of Mr. Stewart to some midwifery statistics of Dr. F. H. Ramsbotham, by which it appeared, that of 26,776 women, only thirty-four were delivered by the forceps, being less than one in every 787 cases!

THE LANCET of Saturday last contains a second letter from Mr. Stewart, wherein he says,—“The object of his paper was, to show that the instrument, as recommended by almost all teachers and writers on the obstetric art, is rarely had recourse to, and always as a desperate resource, and that therefore its use is much more limited than safety dictates, or reason demands.” Here, then, we are at issue. My object in publishing a statistical record of midwifery cases occurring in my private practice, was just the reverse. I believe the forceps are very often had recourse to rashly, and unnecessarily, in order to save time and trouble, and more particularly by practitioners who pride themselves upon their mechanical abilities.

Mr. Stewart next finds fault with what he calls “a half table of statistics.” Why a “half table”? Why travel out of the record, when the question between us only refers to forceps cases?

I now desire to call Mr. Stewart’s attention to Dr. Simpson’s able letter, “On Operative Midwifery,” in the same LANCET, wherein he gives a table showing the proportion of deliveries by forceps in different obstetric institutions—thus:

Lever—London	1 in 518
Simpson—Edinburgh	1 in 472
Collins—Dublin	1 in 617

Will Mr. Stewart, after this, continue to maintain that the forceps may be employed with advantage in as great an average as one in fifty cases? Did he use the forceps eighty times in attending the 4000 accouchements spoken of by him? If so, how forcibly the words he quoted from the Mantuan bard, “Quæ ipse miserrima vidi, et quorum pars magna fui,” apply to himself, and the words which immediately follow, “Quis talia fando temperet a lacrymis?” to the numerous readers of THE LANCET.—I am, Sir, yours obediently,

Margate, Dec. 19, 1849. **JOSHUA WADDINGTON, F.R.C.S.E.**

MR. SAXTON OF MARKET DRAYTON, IN REPLY TO THE LETTER OF DR. WOOD.*

Market Drayton, December 1849.

SIR,—Before again asking Mr. Wakley to give his opinion on the question of medical etiquette at Market Drayton, it is necessary to point out to him the misrepresentations you have made; and of this my intention, I think it proper to give you intimation.

In the first place you state that I made use of this expression to you—“They ought to have known better than to have sent for you, and you ought to have known better than to have gone to see him.” This is totally incorrect, a ruse to draw attention from my real charge against you—viz., of omitting

* Vide the Lancet, No. 21, 1849, p. 568.