for over 20 years was physician (and finally senior physician) and nearly all the speeches on the second reading, and the statement by the Chancellor that "there is one part of the Bill that has escaped the attention of every doctor in the House." Mr. Lloyd George stated that "the doctors proceed in their criticisms on five assumptions, all of which are erroneous." I cannot say that none have done this, but all those with whom I have discussed the measure in private and at public meetings, including Mr. Lloyd George and his friends, have proceeded on the assumption that while some of the profession were opposed to the system of capitation payment, a capitation arrangement is the only workable method; but we suggested that, in the event of a capitation grant being ultimate declared by the Board of Health and the medical profession, neither capitation nor amount is mentioned in the Bill, the minimum capitation fee for ordinary professional attendance (excluding surgical operations and bacteriological and kindred and allied work) is fixed and stated in black and white in the Bill itself at not less than 10s. 6d. per annum, thus leaving it open to increase the amount according to the necessities of particular localities. We have never assumed any attendance on families, but only on individuals. We have advocated some kind of selection by patients (although we thought the point of the Bill was being willing to attend them) being arranged for, a point absent from the Bill. Mr. Lloyd George, when he was told that free choice of doctor was not mentioned in the Bill, quoted Sec. 14: "Every approved society and Local Health Committee shall make arrangements with duly qualified medical practitioners for insured persons to receive attendance and treatment to the satisfaction of the Insurance Commissioners from such practitioners." This clause might protect the patients by mandating that the arrangements so made shall be with duly qualified practitioners, but not otherwise. Mr. Lloyd George said that "not a doctor in the country has taken a step towards exhibiting, so far as the many points round which the doctors' objections have clustered! He added, "They (the doctors) are free to make any arrangements which they like, which the societies like, of which the Insurance Commissioners approve." Did Mr. Lloyd George think he was speaking to children? How can "they" make the "arrangements" which they like when the Bill, so far, provides for their forming only one-ninth, or at most two-ninths, of the Local Health Committee, one-third of which is to be appointed by the approved societies? Mr. Lloyd George is seeking to confer advantages on certain classes at the expense of the medical profession, and the members of the profession are not going to submit to this. Mr. Lloyd George said, "There is absolutely nothing new about anaesthetics which will prevent anaesthetists from making any of the arrangements which they themselves have been recommending during the past few years. True, nor is there anything "prescribed" in the Bill that will affect their interests in any way, and this is what we complain of, particularly as the members of clubs and benefit societies are, to a certain extent, picked lives, for they are medically examined prior to admission and admitted only if medically fit, while the "doctor in the country" has never taken the trouble to inquire if the doctors evident which the Bill would let in might be a laughing-stock of posterity by repairing and decaying the house of our house before looking to these foundations. Mr. Lloyd George clearly showed what his idea of the profession is. He admitted that he had to take some bad and unworthy medical treatment need hesitate to incur them. But if qualified persons be permitted to use these drugs in such a way as to transgress the laws which are known to be essential for safe anaesthetisation, painless surgery cannot possibly be practised without incurring grave risks from the necessary anaesthesia." Science bids us indeed put forward the measure of the Anaesthetics; and when this has been accomplished by legal enactment, may we not be in a position to say that the question is, Where shall we begin? Surely we must, in the first place, inspect the whole fabric from basement to attic, and decide whether any alterations of a structural nature are needed in order that the house, when completed, may conform to modern requirements. Should it be found that such structural changes are needed, surely we must start at the very foundations and work upwards. Let us not become the laughing-stock of posterity by repairing and decaying the house before looking to these foundations. In other words, let us first see that all anaesthetics are placed in the hands of those who have been sufficiently educated to be entrusted with the responsibilities of anaesthesia; and when this has been accomplished by legal enactment, let us direct the whole attention to improving the conditions under which anaesthetics are administered by registered practitioners. I freely admit that the most radical
THE ELECTION OF DR. J. A. MACDONALD AS A DIRECT REPRESENTATIVE.

To the Editor of The Lancet.

Sir,—I wish to thank the medical practitioners of England and Wales for choosing me to be their Direct Representative on the General Medical Council at the recent election rendered necessary by the regretted death of Dr. McManus. Immediately after the result of the election was declared I was called upon to attend the session of the Council at which the National Insurance Bill was discussed, and the report upon certain of its medical aspects prepared, which drew from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the reply published in The Lancet last week. The consideration of the Bill by the British Medical Association in the Representative meeting and the Special Committee has made such great inroads on time and energy that my friends will, I am sure, forgive the delay in returning my thanks; though tardily expressed, my gratitude is none the less sincere.

It shall always be my endeavour to justify the confidence my brother practitioners have shown by electing me to so responsible a position at this critical time.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

Taunton, June 26th, 1911.

J. A. MACDONALD.

THE ADVERTISING OF PATENT MEDICINES.

To the Editor of The Lancet.

Sir,—It may seem ungracious if, in thanking you for your kind notice of the motion I made in the recent General Assembly of the Church of Scotland regarding secret remedy advertisements in the monthly magazine of the Church, I venture to encroach upon your space. Will you allow me to correct a wrong impression which your paragraph in last week's issue is likely to leave upon your readers regarding the decision of the Supreme Court of our Church on the matter in question? The Assembly was practically unanimous in adopting a modification of my motion. The Committee in charge of the magazine had referred in their report to objections urged against certain forms of advertisement, and had reported a marked loss of income due to their refusal to insert questionable notices. Desires of making an end of these practices and of cleansing the pages of the magazine, I moved as follows:

In the first place, I desire to thank the Committee ...... for their care in regard to the selection of advertisements to be circulated in the magazine, and instruct them to carry their endeavours to that end yet further by excluding all advertisements of secret or patent remedies of a medical or quasi-medical description, in order that the disinterestedness and Christian character of the accredited organ of the Church may be above suspicion in that respect.

Although I am sorry to say that some voices were raised in defence of the status quo on financial grounds, by an overwhelming majority my motion, down to the words yet further, was carried, the Assembly agreeing to make its instruction more general than my proposal seemed to suggest, so as to include within its scope other objectionable advertisements also—e.g., of all sorts of bogus bargains.

Permit me to add that I value very highly your words of encouragement. I know you would not willingly do injustice either to the Church I represent or to the committee in charge of its magazine.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

June 23rd, 1911.

WILLIAM A. CURTIS.

CHILDREN’S CONVALESCENT HOME, WESTON-SUPER-MARE.—The annual meeting of the subscribers of this institution, which is in connexion with the Royal Hospital for Children, Bristol, was recently held. The medical report stated that during 1910 the children admitted numbered 326, 359 patients had been discharged during the year, and of these 254 had "recovered," 79 had "much improved." 23 had "improved," and 3 showed no signs of improvement. The financial statement showed that subscriptions and donations had slightly diminished.

The "CONGRESSO NAZIONALE D’IGIENE" AT TURIN.—This, the first of a series of Congresses to be held in future years at one or other of the great academic or industrial cities of Italy, will be inaugurated on Oct. 5th and will sit till the 8th of that month. The agenda paper is both interesting and opportune, prominent among the subjects to be dealt with being "Malaria," by Professor Negri of Pavia; "Industrial Hygiene," by Professor Bianchini of Bologna; "Disinfectants," by Professor Frassi of Parma; "The Hygiene of Schools," by Professor Bordoni-Uffreduzzi of Milan; "Medicaments for Fevers," by Professor Neri; and articles of diet, such as "Sugar," by Professor Giacosa of Turin; "Milk," by Professor Volpino and Professor De Matteis of the same school; and "Drinking Water," by Professor Abba, Professor Volpino, and Professor Cler, also of Milan. Information as to the Congress may be had on application to the President, Dr. Luigi Paglioni, professor of hygiene in the local university.