

appeared in the *Journal* of August 9th, 1890, p. 354, saying, 'We regret to announce the withdrawal of the Midwives Bill.' Who is the 'we' who wrote this leaderette?

"Again at the meeting of the Parliamentary Bills Committee, reported in the *Journal* of August 2nd, 1890, p. 300, Mr. Hart is reported as having said, 'A member of the committee sent other documents to the branches attacking the Bill.' I wish particularly to call your attention to this, because in September I sent a second letter to the *Journal*, which was also suppressed, but in answer to which an editorial note appeared stating that if I brought the subject before this Lancashire and Cheshire Branch the *Journal* would find space 'for a report of the proceedings.' This statement appears contradictory and strange in view of the previous official complaint regarding my action in having, by letter, called the attention of the branches to the Bill. I, however, wrote to the branches only because the editorial staff refused to permit a discussion of the Bill in the columns of the *Journal*.

"Again, in the *Journal* of October 18, p. 869, a covert attack was made upon me in a communication headed 'The Branches and Dr. Rentoul,' evidently suggesting antagonism between the branches and myself. I sent a reply to this attack, but again my letter was suppressed.

"Again, in the *Journal* of October 18, p. 922, Mr. Hart is reported as having appeared at a meeting of the East Surrey District of the South-Eastern Branch, and there Dr. Holman and others passed a resolution 'declining to discuss the questions raised by Dr. Rentoul,' evidently because I had not first brought the subject before *this* branch; but I know that the honorary secretary of the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch was asked by me, along with the other branches, to discuss the subject. The subject was one of *urgent importance*, and therefore I could not wait until the branch had acted. Where would the Bill now be had I waited, for only to-day our branch sends in its report upon it? And here I say that Dr. Holman and a few other officials have no right whatever to attempt to muzzle any individual member of our Association who wishes to call public attention to subjects of urgent importance. Lately the *Times* said that although the British Medical Association was founded on a democratic basis, yet in reality its government was of a most tyrannical and despotic kind.

"Again, in October, 1890, I urged that the full text of the Bill should be published in the *Journal*, yet this was not done until February 7, 1891.

"Again, in January, 1891, I was officially requested to attend a sub-committee of the Parliamentary Bills Committee, but as I was officially informed that I should be denied the right at that committee meeting either to move resolutions or vote, I naturally objected to this 'hole-and-corner' mode of procedure.

"Now I am fully aware that Mr. Hart and others, in 1882, drafted a Midwives Registration Bill, and that in the prospectus of the Midwives' Institute a paragraph appears stating 'such a measure is considered by the *British Medical Journal* to be the only remedy against existing evils.' But it must not be taken for granted that the individual who wrote these editorial remarks speaks in the name of our association, much less in that of the entire medical profession. Nor are we, in 1891, to be bound by what the editorials 'we' said in 1882.

"Taking, therefore, all the above facts into consideration, I can come to no other conclusion than that every obstacle has been placed in the way of those who opposed the Midwives Registration Bill, and that this is a serious reflection on the management of our journal. Lately some 300 members of our association have felt themselves compelled to resign membership, and it is humiliating for those who pay a guinea a year to our association to find that had it not been for the kindness of the *Provincial Medical Journal*, and later of the *Medical Press*, discussion on these Bills would have been seriously interfered with. Owing to the opposition of the officials of our journal to freedom of discussion I have been compelled to carry on a large correspondence, entailing an expenditure of over £140. Nor is this all, for now a medical practitioner in London has been induced to put me into the London County Court for a sum of over £6, due, he alleges, because I asked him to initiate a petition against the Midwives Bill. I have, being a member of the Medical Defence Union, asked that the union might defend me, but they absolutely refuse to do so. I cannot understand this conduct, except on the supposition that Mr. Lawson Tait, president of the union, is, like a number of others, venting his displeasure on one who has opposed the Midwives Bill. I am willing to submit all the correspondence."

INVENTIONS, NOTICES OF PREPARATIONS, &c.

WE have thoroughly tested the "Standard Malt Extract," manufactured by the Standard Malt Extract Co., at their works, Mistley, Essex. It is claimed for this preparation that it is manu-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)