Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

WOMEN MEDICAL STUDENTS AT KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The question of admitting women students in the Medical Faculty at King's College, London, has recently become urgent. We are constantly receiving applications from women who desire to study medicine here, but up to the present we have only admitted a few who are studying for the first examination (biology, chemistry, and physics) and a few who are taking physiology only for the second examination. Since the amalgamation of King's College for Women with this College we have been in the anomalous position of having opened all our classes to women with the single exception of those held in the anatomy department. As we are incorporated in the University of London this is not in harmony with the principles of that University. We have been for some time perfectly willing to open the anatomy department to women, but have hesitated to take this step because the hospitals associated with our medical school had refused to take on our women students for clinical instruction. St. George's Hospital has, however, made a step forward in admitting a limited number of women students to their wards; that experiment has proved such a complete success that we are hopeful that other hospitals will follow their example. The University has also brought pressure to bear upon us, and the delegacy of the College has assented to throwing open the whole of our medical department to women students next October. In the first instance, however, the number to be admitted will be limited to 20.

We are therefore now in the position to offer medical education to that number of women for the preliminary and intermediate portions of the curriculum, and we have but little doubt, seeing how quickly events are marching at present, that we shall be able to secure later for them the means of completing the final or clinical step of their education.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

W. D. HALLIBURTON,

Dean of Medical Science Faculty, King's College, London
June 23rd, 1916.

THE INFECTIOUS CONDITION OF PATIENTS DESQUAMATING AFTER SCARLET FEVER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In view of the opinion now so generally held that there is but little risk of infection in connexion with patients desquamating after an attack of scarlet fever so long as there is no discharge from the nose or ears, the following incident is of interest and importance.

On June 3rd Captain H. was admitted into Mrs. Arnoldi's Hospital for Officers at Roland Gardens. He had been discharged from a fever hospital in France as convalescent from scarlet fever. He was found to be desquamating very freely on both feet. He had no discharge from either nose or ears. On June 5th he was admitted to an isolation hospital. There were four other officers in the ward to which he had been admitted. On June 12th one of these officers sickened with high temperature and general malaise, and on the following morning the characteristic rash of scarlet fever appeared. The officer had not left his bed for three weeks.

There can be no reasonable doubt that this patient contracted the disease from the officer admitted during the stage of desquamation.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

Green-street, W., June 26th, 1916. DONALD W. C. HOOD.

FAT-HEADEDNESS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—During the past week the two assistants in this laboratory have been called up for service. There are some 80 soldiers in the hospital, and we are constantly required to examine blood, excreta, tissues, make vaccines, and so

on. But the fat-headed committees cannot be made to see the harm they are doing by taking these men from laboratory work (useful to the soldiers) and turning them into ordinary soldiers.

I gather there's no use in appealing, but I hope you'll publish this.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

R. G. HEBB.

The Laboratory, Westminster Hospital, June 27th, 1916.

THE EFFECT OF FERRIVINE AND INTRAMINE ON SYPHILIS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Mr. J. E. R. McDonagh, in his letter in your issue of June 24th, asks for the chemists who do not understand his chemistry. We were thinking chiefly of the remarks made by Professor W. M. Bayliss, F.R.S., at the discussion on Mr. McDonagh's paper on the Rationale and Practice of Chemo-therapy, which he read before the Dermatological Section of the Royal Society of Medicine on April 13th. Professor Bayliss then said, *inter alia*, "I find in the physico-chemical hypothesis much that conveys no definite meaning to me, while the statements appear to be contrary to the knowledge which we possess."

As to the clinical part of our paper, we can only say that our cases were faithfully reported and stand on record for any comparison which may be desired of intramine and ferrivine with other existing remedies. We can assure Mr. McDonagh that we really did see *Sp. pallida* in the preparations made from our cases which had been treated with intramine and ferrivine for some days. No bias on our part could have conjured them into the microscopical field, nor could it have produced the abscesses which occurred in the injection sites of our intramine cases. The cases were perfectly straightforward ones and the therapeutic effect of intramine and ferrivine on them was *nil*.

Mr. McDonagh complains that we have "rushed into print" on a small experience. Had the experience been in any way favourable such a complaint would have been justified; but it was not favourable, and one cannot continue indefinitely to experiment upon patients with remedies which are founded on what Dr. C. H. Browning at the discussion mentioned above described as "the highly speculative discussions in Mr. McDonagh's communication."

If Mr. McDonagh includes amongst those who are gaining from intramine and ferrivine "advantages unobtainable with any other existing remedies" a patient whom he showed at a recent meeting of the Dermatological Section of the Royal Society of Medicine, it is good evidence that his clinical observation is not uninfluenced by bias. This was a man who, after two months' (patient's statement) treatment with intramine and ferrivine, still exhibited active infectious lesions—viz., an ulcerated throat and an anal mucous patch.

We are, Sir, yours faithfully,

L. W. HARRISON,

C. H. MILLS.

June 26th, 1916.

"PIRATE" DOCTORS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In THE LANCET of June 17th Mr. P. Turner again publicly attacks doctors acting as *locum tenens* and as assistants for demanding a reasonable wage. Why? Surely when the wages of other occupations have gone up, some by 150 per cent., and when the cost of foods, &c., has gone up, doctors are equally entitled to raise their wage. He might as well attempt to argue that those doctors now in the army, and who receive £1, £2, or £4 per day and allowances, should not ask so much because those of them who hold public appointments still receive the whole or two-thirds of the salaries from such posts. Let the principals employing assistants or "locums" do as others now do—increase their fees. No one objects to the resident Poor-law hospital doctors increasing their charges from £120 to £300. No one objects to the fact that many of the leading steamship companies are now giving their surgeons £20 and £22 10s. per month and full shore pay for their services. I fancy there is too much mawkish sentimentality being served out during this war time. This "damned iteration" of doctors "fleecing the public" should be stopped.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

ROBERT R. RENTOUL.

Liverpool, June 20th, 1916.