

1st Middlesex Rifle Volunteer Corps, to be Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel. Surgeon-Captain R. B. Graham to be Surgeon-Major. Surgeon-Lieutenant Evan Evans, 1st Volunteer Battalion the Welsh Regiment, to be Surgeon-Captain. Surgeon-Lieutenant William Owen Evans, 2nd Volunteer Battalion the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, to be Surgeon-Lieutenant.

VOLUNTEER CORPS.

Artillery: 1st Devonshire (Western Division, Royal Garrison Artillery): Surgeon-Lieutenant G. P. Barton to be Surgeon-Captain. 1st Sussex (Eastern Division, Royal Garrison Artillery): Surgeon-Lieutenant E. T. Cox to be Surgeon-Captain. *Rifle*: 3rd Volunteer Battalion the Prince Albert's (Somersetshire Light Infantry): Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. G. Phelps to retire, with permission to retain his rank and to wear the uniform of the battalion on his retirement. 2nd Volunteer Battalion the Royal Sussex Regiment: Philip John Le Rich to be Surgeon-Lieutenant. 1st (Pembrokeshire) Volunteer Battalion the Welsh Regiment: Surgeon-Lieutenant E. Evans to be Surgeon-Captain. 3rd Volunteer Battalion the Essex Regiment: Hugh Neville Adam Taylor to be Surgeon-Lieutenant. 1st Volunteer Battalion the Royal North Lancashire Regiment: James Lea to be Surgeon-Lieutenant. 4th Volunteer Battalion the Manchester Regiment: Surgeon-Lieutenant D. L. Hamilton resigns his commission. 7th (Clackmannan and Kinross) Volunteer Battalion, Princess Louise's (Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders): Surgeon-Major J. H. Hay to be Surgeon-Colonel.

VOLUNTEER MEDICAL STAFF CORPS.

The London Companies: Surgeon-Lieutenant W. E. Miles to be Surgeon-Captain.

ARMY MEDICAL SCHOOL, NETLEY.

In consequence of the war in South Africa the following gentlemen, who were nominated by the Secretary of State for War as Surgeons-on-Probation in the Army Medical School, Netley, for the Royal Army Medical Corps, having passed an examination in the subjects taught in the Netley school, have been commissioned as Lieutenants in the Royal Army Medical Corps:—

A. H. Safford.	G. H. Merry.
A. F. Carlyon.	W. C. Croly.
C. R. Evans.	E. McDonnell.
C. S. Cato.	A. MacLoughlin.
J. A. Hartigan.	A. J. M. Cuddon-Fletcher.
H. C. R. Hine.	R. L. Davies.
J. F. Martin.	C. S. Smith.
J. M. Buist.	C. C. Cumming.

MENTIONED IN DESPATCHES.

In a despatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies signed by Colonel F. D. Lugard, C.B., D.S.O., relative to the West Africa Field Force operations, the following paragraph occurs:—"I noticed that the published list of rewards contained no recognition of the excellent services of the Medical Department, of whose work I spoke in my despatch in the strongest terms at my command. I venture to bring to special notice the name of Dr. W. Poole, Principal Medical Officer of the Force, whose previous record of service in Nyassaland under the Foreign Office constitutes an additional claim upon Government."

In a despatch from Colonel Ternan, D.S.O., to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the name of Captain Haig, I.M.S., is mentioned with reference to services in the operations against Kabarega, late King of Unyoro.

TRANSVAAL WAR NOTES.

The entire medical equipment of the City of London Imperial Volunteers throughout the present war in South Africa is being supplied as a gift to the nation by Messrs. Burroughs, Wellcome, and Co.

Following the practical sympathy shown by the medical men at Newport in placing their services at the disposal of reservists' and militiamen's families, the governors of the Newport and Monmouthshire Hospital have resolved to honour all prescriptions granted by the medical practitioners who are attending the families at their homes.

Sir William Thomson, ex-President of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, has been appointed chief surgeon to a special Irish base hospital which is being equipped by Lord Iveagh. Sir William Thomson will be assisted by four surgeons and the hospital will be stationed on the lines of communication at the places where it may be most urgently required on its arrival in South Africa.

A telegram from the *Times* correspondent at Lorenzo Marques, dated Jan. 2nd, states that "Major Daly's ambulance corps left Dundee for Pretoria on Sunday with 29 wounded. The Boers gave the doctor to understand that he would be allowed to attend the wounded at Pretoria, but he was not even permitted to take them off the train and see them lodged in the hospital, although several cases were critical. The Boer authorities at Dundee behaved shockingly towards the British ambulance, notwithstanding the kindness shown to the burgher wounded. For 11 days the doctor and his men were kept strict prisoners in a compound. During Christmas there was a terrible amount of drunkenness and rowdiness in the town, the Boers going about with loaded Mausers. One twice pointed his rifle at the doctor."

We understand that Dr. Conan Doyle will shortly leave for South Africa in connexion with a stationary hospital.

We understand that the War Office is endeavouring to ascertain how many beds each of the large hospitals in this country will be able to place at its disposal in case of need.

Major Burtchaell, R.A.M.C., who was made prisoner by the Boers at Magersfontein, has, we understand, been released.

DEATHS IN THE SERVICES.

The *Times* announces the death of Surgeon-Major Alexander Gibb Grant, Bengal Army, Hon. Surgeon to the Queen, retired, on Jan. 3rd, at his residence in Connaught-square, Hyde-park.

In future an officer serving in India who has received in action a bodily injury certified by the regulated medical authority to be very severe, though not equivalent to the loss of a limb, will be allowed a gratuity of from three to 12 months' full pay of the appointment held by him at the time of the injury.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNGER MEMBERS OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In the crisis through which our Empire is passing the importance of the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer forces as a support to the army is fully evinced. And as it is impossible to forecast the further demands which may have to be made upon them in the near or distant future it behoves us to strengthen them to the utmost of our power.

Many members and students of our profession are already enrolled in them and are answering the call now made upon them with patriotic promptitude. We venture to take the opportunity suggested by the beginning of a New Year of appealing to such of the younger members and of the students of the medical and dental professions as are still unattached, yet capable of bearing arms or in other ways of helping in Imperial defence, at once to consider the advisability of joining some branch of the service.

FREDERICK T. ROBERTS, M.D., F.R.C.P. Lond.,
Physician to University College Hospital;

EDMUND OWEN, M.B. Lond., F.R.C.S. Eng.,
Surgeon to St. Mary's Hospital;

WILLIAM COLLINGRIDGE, M.A., M.D. Cantab.,
Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Militia Medical Staff; late commanding Militia Medical Staff;

WILLIAM DUNCAN, M.D. Brux., F.R.C.S. Eng.,
Captain Middlesex Yeomanry Cavalry;

J. EDWARD SQUIRE, M.D., M.R.C.P. Lond.,
M.R.C.S. Eng.,

Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Commanding Volunteer Medical Staff Corps (London Companies).

London, Jan. 1st, 1900.

"DENTAL APPOINTMENTS AT GENERAL HOSPITALS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—As you have kindly opened your pages to a correspondence on the qualifications of dental surgeons to general hospitals I hope that the question may not be complicated by considering the case of hospitals having

dental schools attached to them or the qualifications required by teachers in purely dental hospitals. The point for the medical profession to consider is the advantage accruing to the general students or to the general practitioners who may require dental instruction during their hospital studies or after they have secured their diplomas. Unless the character of medical students has greatly changed I do not think that they are likely to seek or to receive information very graciously from gentlemen, however competent, who from their (the students') point of view occupy a professional position so different from their own. Again, a dentist who has taken the additional qualifications is able to take a surgical or medical as well as a purely dental view of the subject either in lecturing or in operating. That the general student requires special instruction in matters dental is often painfully obvious to all educated dentists who have to meet general practitioners professionally and it is not always easy to do what is right for the patient and at the same time cover the position assumed by the medical adviser. For these and many other reasons I think it very desirable that the dental surgeon to a hospital to which a medical school is attached ought to carry both the diplomas of the dental surgeon and of the general practitioner. I also believe the idea that all dental surgeons will one day have the double qualification to be Utopian, and if realised would be injurious to the best interests of the general public so far as dentistry is concerned.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
George-street, Hanover-square, W. JAS. SMITH TURNER.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—May I be allowed to supplement your very excellent annotation in THE LANCET of Dec. 23rd, 1899, upon this subject?

For many years all the London hospitals having medical schools attached required that their dental surgeons should in addition to the licence in dental surgery possess a surgical qualification. Several years ago two of them decided to abolish this rule and required only the L.D.S. diploma for their dental surgery. The authorities of one hospital at the same time relegated their dental surgeon to a similar position to the dispensers of the hospital—that is to say, they were no longer to be treated as members of the staff, they were deprived of their seat on the medical committee, they had no voice in the management of the hospital or school, they had no share in the profits of the school, nor were they constituted paid officials, the sole recompense for their rather laborious services being that their names appeared as members of the staff. I believe I am right in saying they were the only truly honorary members of the staff. If the L.D.S. only was to qualify them for the position why were they to be subjected to the indignity of being placed in an inferior position to any other member of the staff? The charity in question appears to convict itself of inconsistency.

I venture to protest against this invidious distinction and to urge the authorities to go back to the old regulations and restore to their dental surgeon the privileges of which he has been deprived and to require such qualifications as may ensure his receiving the same courtesy from the staff, the students, and the committee of management as is accorded to those in charge of every other special department of a hospital; but this cannot be so if the L.D.S. only is to be a sufficient qualification for the appointment, because the curriculum for that diploma is fragmentary in medicine and surgery and the examination in those subjects and in anatomy, physiology, pathology, therapeutics, &c., is not adequate to place the holder of that diploma on an equal position with the other members of the staff. The dentist should rank equally with other members of the staff, and therefore his name should be found upon both the Dental and Medical Registers which is a guarantee that he possesses the knowledge and has had the education to efficiently equip him to teach medical students. That a dentist's opinions and vote are of value and often of importance is instanced in the discussions at the General Medical Council, where Mr. Tomes, a dental representative, has, in addition to the services rendered on dental matters, also taken a very active, honourable, and important part in questions relating to medical and surgical matters that have been under consideration.

I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,
The Dental Hospital of London, Jan. 1st, 1900. MORTON SMALE.

"THE CONFERENCE AT NEWCASTLE AND THE MIDWIFERY QUESTION."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—IN your issue of Dec. 23rd, "A Physician" has boldly elected to wrestle with the vexed midwifery question, though, in truth, he has not been brave enough to sign his name. He has gripped the subject by the throat in a very determined manner with all the force of first, second, and third seizures.

I have looked through his letter carefully and slowly, and after running my pen through lines that everyone is familiar with, and cancelling others that are scarcely germane, I find myself left with the following sentences: "All are agreed, Parliament and profession, that there is somewhat requiring remedy. That is where we are now. A remedy is to be devised. More, a remedy is going to be devised and enforced. Those who object to all and every remedy misconceive the position. It is no longer a question of what does the profession want or not want, it is which way is the inevitable remedy to be devised and applied? The Houses of Parliament know that well enough. The General Medical Council knows it well enough. Mr. Victor Horsley, as plainly appears by his speech on the subject at Newcastle, knows it well enough. The strange thing is that a considerable section of the profession does not seem to know it," and so on.

Now, these very sentences show, following as they do a reiterated preamble, that the writer of them is just about as helpless in the face of the midwives question as an average country parson is over incense. The mere shrieking "We must do something" in the centre of a grass-grown arena amounts to energetically doing nothing, after all, beyond clearly proclaiming helplessness. Therefore I deem three-fourths of the effort which he has made in his letter to be absolutely useless. I should have been better pleased to see him turn up his sleeves for real battle in the first half-dozen lines. I should have liked to see him draw blood somewhere in the first half column by the home-thrust of some convincing and clean-cut argument. No; the letter of "A Physician" will not tend in any way to help us in our troubles. I cannot avoid the suggestion of dual object which it gives me when I look again over the lines of it. I ask myself: Why has this letter been written? Has it a policy? Is its purport quite clear on the face of it? Is it signed by the medico's name? Still, in all charity, I go on searching and at last I find something—a remedy, "just as was done in the plumber's case." Your correspondent advocates registration of midwives and nothing more, and he points out a few advantages which would follow.

Now, who is there to find fault with registration? No one in their right senses. Registration is good; I myself strongly advocate it, but registration of what? I repeat the gist of my advocacy as set forth and published in 1897 in "Economics, &c., in the Practice of Midwifery"—that midwives as formerly and at present understood should be abolished. Even the name should go. I would have in their place a new body of registered obstetric nurses, properly trained, whose powers and procedures should be strictly limited and who should be supervised at some stage in every case of confinement, no matter where occurring, by a qualified medical attendant who should see each case at least once during or after delivery. What time a nurse should send for a medical attendant should be left to her instructed and schooled judgment. She may deem it wise to send during labour; and she would always be likely to send soon enough, knowing that she was bound to send sooner or later. Thus no case of labour should escape at least a single inspection of a qualified medical attendant—even those living in remote districts, whose lives are as precious as any others. Hence would follow order, discipline, and right practice.

I could not in the space of a letter deal with the innumerable points concerning practicability which a whole scheme involves, but I am prepared to tease out any knotty point or to suggest plans to meet whatever difficult situation should appear to correspondents in THE LANCET who should desire to find fault with my principles as I enunciate them. I would only ask for short and clear objections or arguments or criticisms and I will promise to deal with them as shortly, for the whole subject is a large one.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
London, Dec. 31st, 1899. HAYDN BROWN.