

surgery, it should not be forgotten that this work is for experts only. In 1888 he had himself brought the subject of treating such conditions by intrauterine negative galvanism up before the Philadelphia Obstetrical Society. He succeeded at that time in emptying a number of tubes. Dr. Sarah A. Stevenson, of Chicago, said that notwithstanding the law which has been laid down that electricity is contra-indicated whenever there is pus present, she had for a long time employed it in such conditions. Dr. Sehrung remarked that as electricity is known to cause dilatation of various apertures, it would seem that this agent would greatly facilitate the catheterization of the tubes.

Now I was tempted to review considerable of the author's paper because it is of unusual interest, and because the article might be entirely overlooked, especially by those who do not use electricity, or by those gynecologists who are of opinion that the only treatment for pyosalpinx is extirpation of the tubes.

The great law of surgery—drainage—holds good here as in other conditions, and that drainage through the uterus can be effected is, according to the above testimony and to my mind, beyond a doubt. (Though there may be some exceptions where entrance into the utero-Fallopian opening can for some reason not be effected, and which would be cases for the surgeon.) I have myself treated cases of pyosalpinx, and have seen the pus ooze out of the uterus; the last case is still in my charge but is completely recovered from that trouble.

That a sound can be passed into the Fallopian tubes in the healthy state is also, I assume, an accepted fact. Dr. E. C. Dudley, Professor of Gynecology at the Chicago Medical College, several years ago, in one of his lectures remarked: "Gentlemen, having passed a sound into the uterus a number of times and having determined positively that it is—say three and one-half inches deep, and you subsequently by turning your sound a little to one side or the other, find it suddenly slips in an inch farther without force, you can conclude that you have entered the Fallopian orifice."

Now then, as pyosalpinx is a retention of pus within the Fallopian tube, and as this pus is retained because the utero-Fallopian orifice is closed, undoubtedly by an inflammatory adhesion, from the above testimony, the experiments of Bozeman and Newman with the use of negative galvanization of fibrous strictures of the urethra, and from the well-known dissolving qualities of the negative galvanic current, we are justified in giving this treatment a fair trial. We may thereby save many tubes, and keep many women from undergoing the terrible ordeal of a laparotomy.

JOHN KERCHER, M.D.

#### American Medical College of St. Louis.

*To the Editor:*—My attention has been called to an article in your JOURNAL, headed "*Stirring up the Colleges*," published in the issue of April 7. Will you do me the honor of correcting that which seems to me a great injustice to the American Medical College of St. Louis? Your informant, in speaking of the act of the Missouri State Board of Health, says, among other things, that the Dean of the American Medical College has been notified that this College does not conform to the requirements of the Board, and therefore its diplomas will not be recognized as entitling their possessors to practice in Missouri. I desire to say, that *no such notice has ever been received*, and that your article was the first information I had read on that subject. My attention was called to it by a private letter of inquiry from New York. This College has been in good standing for the last twenty years, and if an action of the kind has been taken by the Board, justice would demand that due notice

be given that the College might have an opportunity to answer to the charges.

I imagine that this damage inflicted, has served as a precedent for abrupt action of other State Boards, hence the great injustice there is in it; among these the State Board of Health of Illinois, a notice of which is given in your JOURNAL of May 5. Had your correspondent in this case given the reason for their action, it would have shown more fairness. Want of proper equipment and apparatus seems to have been the basis of action with the Illinois Board. It is true that some carelessness in this regard had crept in, and when the Illinois committee visited us they came abruptly and gave us no opportunity to supply what might seem to them a deficiency. This College has been taught a lesson and has now undergone a thorough change and has equipped itself. When Boards of Health will give us their standard in these matters they will find the American Medical College perfectly willing to conform to their wishes.

Respectfully,

C. YOUNKIN, Dean.

#### Reply to Dr. Worcester.

RICHMOND, VA. April 25, 1894.

*To the Editor:*—Allow me a few lines in reply to the "open" and "sweet-spirited letter" of your fair correspondent, O. E. Worcester, M.D., of Florida, in your issue of April 21:

1. The age of legal consent in Virginia is 14 years.
2. Twenty years ago I organized a Magdalen Home and have been its President ever since.

Your account of "a domestic chloroformed in a physician's office" must be taken with a "grain of allowance." I have learned to have little faith in the excuses for women's fall told by themselves. It is the old story.

3. The dishonorable doctor spoken of was not worthy of belief. Bad men always believe others as bad as themselves. This man is a slanderer of his brethren. But as I have sent your correspondent my pamphlet on "Woman's Place," where woman's power of self-protection is fully discussed, I need say no more on this subject here.

My advice to young girls going out from the Magdalen Home is to hold their persons sacred and let no man put his hand upon them. If lynching followed lying and betrayal or assault, it might be better.

4. Nine-tenths of the doctors in this city will not disobey the law you refer to. There are always "men of the baser sort," as Paul says, in every city. But I can not discuss this subject with a lady. Though an M.D. married thirty years, with ten children, yet there are some questions I would not think of discussing with my wife, from respect to her finer feelings. I claim and have proven that women are "*four times*" better and purer than men. The shrinking, instinctive modesty in woman which causes her to shun man's gaze and veil her eyes, I hope never to see removed. It is the golden shield that God has given her. No union do I want to see between the sexes, but that of holy matrimony. Familiarity is dangerous. The women at the North who expect and demand that men shall be as pure as women, don't know what they are talking about. There is no excuse for the unfaithfulness of married men. But I did not expect to say so much.

Respectfully,

W. W. PARKER, M.D.

#### Colorado State Medical Society.

DENVER, COLO., May 11, 1894.

*To the Editor:*—As notice has, by some misunderstanding, appeared in the JOURNAL, that the Colorado State Medical Society would entertain the delegates to the AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION on their way to San Francisco on May 30,