

tumour upon no fixed operative basis but as the peculiar or special circumstances seem to require. No general rule will be found applicable to all cases of pregnancy complicated by a tumour.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Adelaide, S.A.

A. D. LEITH NAPIER.

THE CASE OF SURGEON W. R. KNIGHTLEY, R.N.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I beg to bring to your notice the action of the General Medical Council and the naval medical officer. To abuse the relationship between medical adviser and patient is most reprehensible, but I thought it was a maxim of English law that a subject should not be punished twice for the same offence. To mulct a man in £3000 damages in a civil court and then for the General Medical Council to take away his means of gaining a livelihood is to my mind certainly not justice tempered with mercy.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

FREDK. W. COLLINGWOOD.

Wimpole-street, W., June 24th, 1901.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The proceedings of the General Medical Council are always read with great interest. One turns, after the labours of the week, to the report in THE LANCET with eagerness to note what progress has been made, and how that august body are upholding the honour and dignity of the profession. After the tremendous slap in the face administered to them by Mr. Chamberlain in the case of Dr. Irvine I really thought they would be more guarded as to the course they adopted towards any other sinner who might be so unfortunate as to come under censure, particularly a man holding a position in the navy and so more or less under the ægis and protection of the Government. But it appears that the General Medical Council are bent upon riding for a fall. I deduce this from the extraordinary decision arrived at in the case of Surgeon W. R. Knightley. Anything more unjust, oppressive, and arbitrary can hardly be imagined, and I am astonished at such unfair treatment, so vindictive and opposed to the principles of English law. However guilty the man was he has paid the penalty and should not be tried again for the same offence. A certain punishment has been meted out to him and the infliction of this ought certainly to have condoned the matter. The jury arrived at a decision and awarded a fine they considered would be sufficient penalty, but if that jury had known that as a consequence of their verdict the man's livelihood would be taken from him and that his pecuniary loss would far exceed the sum they in their wisdom fixed upon I am certain the amount would have been put at a far less sum. If the naval authorities take the same view of the matter it only remains for them to keep Surgeon Knightley in his position as surgeon on board H.M.S. *Harrier*. He may snap his fingers in the faces of the General Medical Council and they will be powerless to resent it. It is certainly time the profession had more Direct Representatives and both services should be represented on the Council, which is composed too much of teachers and consultants.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

M.D.

* * We do not agree with our correspondents' strictures on the General Medical Council in this matter. It must be remembered that when a medical man abuses the position which his profession gives him by seducing a female patient he inflicts a terrible blow upon the honour of his calling—that very honour which the General Medical Council should be alert to maintain. Still, it is true that if the jury had realised the heavy penalty that the disciplinary body of the medical profession might later exact from Surgeon Knightley it is possible that they would have awarded less damages to the injured husband. We believe, however, that from a legal point of view damages are awarded as a *solatium* to the husband for his loss and not as a punishment to the person who deprives him of his wife. We do not think the naval authorities will be well advised to ignore Surgeon-Knightley's position. All candidates for commission in the

naval medical service are required to be "registered under the Medical Acts in force," and it would be inconsistent to ask less from an officer with a commission than is demanded from those who aspire to a commission.—ED. L.

"SUGAR-FREE MILK AS A FOOD FOR DIABETICS."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I have read with great interest Dr. Robert Hutchison's article which appeared last week in THE LANCET, advocating the use of a sugar-free milk as a food for diabetics. Dr. Hutchison removes the sugar from the milk by curdling with acetic acid and subsequently washing the curd. He then dissolves the casein in a little potash, afterwards adding cream and a little gelatin and saccharin. The product is then strained. It seems to me that this plan of preparation is unnecessarily elaborate in view of the fact that pure soluble casein is a commercial product. My firm, for example, make tons of perfectly pure casein from the best quality of English milk in the form of a fine white powder, perfectly soluble in water. It contains nearly 90 per cent. of casein along with milk salts. It is practically tasteless, and very cheap. Surely it would be simpler to use this casein directly instead of milk, dissolving a definite quantity in water and adding cream, gelatin, and a little saccharin in the manner suggested by Dr. Hutchison.

I am, Sirs, yours very truly,

Motcombe, Dorset.

CHAS. PRIDEAUX.

"HOSPITAL SUNDAY AND THE NATIONAL ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Although in your attack upon me in THE LANCET of June 22nd, p. 1771, you say of me "he may spare himself the trouble of writing two-column letters to us," I presume that you will allow me a modest corner in your paper for a few words in defence of myself. You say "the hospital authorities have a perfect right to subsidise their schools if they like." If that be so, why have we not an equal right to inform the public that they do so?

Our position is a perfectly proper one. We assert (1) that congregations on Hospital Sunday are asked to subscribe for the tending of the sick poor, and in the vast majority of churches are not informed that the education of medical students will in part be defrayed out of the funds into which their contributions are paid; (2) that as a fact the Mansion House Fund does pay the money so subscribed in the churches into the general funds of hospitals out of which general funds the subsidies to the schools are made; (3) that the clergy can ascertain these facts for themselves if they look at the published accounts of the hospitals; and (4) that it is quite unfair to hide these facts from those who give the money, and that if the clergy will not communicate them we are absolutely justified in taking the only means left us of imparting a knowledge of them to the congregations.

Next let me say that as regards the single specific inaccuracy you think you have discovered in my "Guide to the Charitable," the returns for 1899 were the last available when the last edition of the Guide was printed, and those returns contained Dr. C. Arkle's name in the relation to Charing Cross Hospital which the guide records. If Dr. Arkle be now, as you say, dead, the next edition corrected with the returns of 1900 (only recently published) will be as accurate as was the last. Lastly, I hope I may explain that I myself, and I imagine most reasonable anti-vivisectionists, would not refuse as a matter of conscience a benefit that might be assigned as to its discovery to vivisection. We need not refuse to use a drug because some industrious but irrelevant experiments have been made with it upon animals. We need not accept the hypothesis that the best way to find out the internal construction of an apple is to cut open an orange. And were all the extravagant claims of the vivisectionists true, we are no more morally bound to reject benefits acquired by indefensible means than are the descendants of slave-holders bound to abandon wealth originally acquired by the detestable abomination of slavery.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

June 22nd, 1901.

STEPHEN COLERIDGE.