

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE FLEET STREET WEEK FOR "BART.'S."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I wish to appeal through your columns to all the many doctors who are ex-Bart.'s men to support our effort for this hospital. Fleet-street devoted the whole of last week to an effort to lessen the great burden of debt which is slowly stifling the activities of the hospital. Over £40,000 have now to be found each year beyond the income of the institution. Add to this a bank overdraft of £25,000 and the position is plain. Many big movements were successfully promoted last week, and if we are strongly supported by all old students of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and any sympathisers that they can bring, such efforts will be a real help.

Subscriptions will be gratefully received by the Hon. Treasurer, "Fleet Street Week for 'Bart.'s," Anderton's Hotel, E.C. 4.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

F. H. WILKINSON,

Oct. 31st, 1921.

Joint Organising Hon. Secretary.

"SUNDAY CLOSING" AT BRITISH SPAS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I read with much interest the paragraph in your issue of Oct. 22nd, and Dr. Fortescue Fox's letter in to-day's LANCET. I entirely agree with Dr. Fox. I have given mineral baths for many years, and have a personal knowledge of the treatment practised at some foreign and British spas, and I am convinced that a seven-days' week is a drawback in bath treatment, and that a day's rest is of decided benefit once a week at least, and in some cases twice a week. It would be interesting if some of the physicians at our British spas would give their opinions and experiences on this point.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

LESLIE THORNE THORNE.

London, Oct. 29th, 1921.

CONTRACT PRACTICE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—No one will disagree with the statement made by the Federation of Medical and Allied Societies in THE LANCET of Oct. 22nd that many panel doctors give of the best to the service. But how about the majority? It was stated in 1911 that large contract medical work was bad for patient and doctor. Has the profession changed its opinion? If the system is sound why are such large numbers of patients refusing to see insurance doctors, and why in London, out of 7000 names in the Medical Directory, only about 1400 are on the panel? In the *Daily Telegraph* of Oct. 15th, 1921, Sir Dyce Duckworth, referring to the panel system, is stated to have said, "That it had resulted in general failure and had tended to lower the public respect for worthy practitioners. . . . The medical profession had been placed in bureaucratic hands, whose tyranny was injurious to its honour, its independence, and its dignity." In the *Hearts of Oak Journal* for October, 1921, a writer stated that in his district 25,000 out of 125,000 insured persons had not chosen their panel doctor. A writer in the *Daily Mail* some time back informed us that 500,000 insurance persons had refused the same "benefit," and if one takes into account the large number of patients who, although they have panel cards, never go near a panel doctor, the number must be millions.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

Streatham, S.W., Oct. 29th, 1921.

E. H. WORTH.

NATIONAL PROVIDENT SCHEME.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It is now announced in the daily press that there is a great middle-class rush to enrol in the above scheme, through which hospital doctors are to be had for £1 a year. Four general hospitals in London are named as having joined in the scheme. As regards one of them—the Hampstead General and North-West London Hospital—it may be of interest to state that the Medical Committee, after careful consideration of the working arrangements (prospectus dated September, 1921), have informed their board of management of their unanimous decision that the members of the honorary medical and surgical staff are not prepared to take any part in the working of the scheme. A majority of the medical committees of the London general hospitals seem to have acted in the same way, and to have been supported by their governing boards. It is difficult to see how the medical staff of any hospital can retain the title of honorary and at the same time become the paid servants of a commercial insurance company which buys their hospital time and services.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

G. A. SUTHERLAND,

Senior Physician to the Hampstead General Hospital.

Oct. 31st, 1921.

Obituary.

FRANCIS ARTHUR BAINBRIDGE, M.A. CAMB.,
M.D., D.Sc., F.R.C.P. LOND., F.R.S.,

PROFESSOR OF PHYSIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

BY the premature death of Francis Arthur Bainbridge, at an age when he had hardly reached the fullness of his power, medical science loses a worker who had made substantial contributions to several of its other branches, before he settled down to follow his natural bent as a teacher and investigator in physiology. At one time he had intended to give himself to clinical medicine, though even then he was making important contributions to pure physiology; indeed, his work on the relation between lymph-flow and glandular activity, dating from this period, is perhaps the most clearly finished of his investigations. Later he turned for a time to general pathology, holding for some years the Gordon lectureship at Guy's Hospital. For a further period he was on the bacteriological staff of the Lister Institute, and several publications on the food-poisoning group of bacteria form a record of sound work in this department of experimental medicine. His real chance, to follow the line of his most genuine inclination, came with his appointment to the chair of physiology at Newcastle. Here he began a valuable series of investigations on the mechanisms coördinating the activities of the heart and the respiratory centre, which he continued after his return to St. Bartholomew's to the chair of physiology there, and which he had still in hand to the end. His own personal contact with these problems, and the wide and critical knowledge of the literature which he acquired in their pursuit, gave a high value to the monograph on "The Physiology of Muscular Exercise," which he published at the end of 1919, and which met with warm appreciation from all who could value its sound and scholarly qualities. As a teacher he was conscientious and increasingly successful, and gave evidence of the high standard which he achieved, to a wider circle than that of his own immediate pupils, in the well-known student's Text-Book of Physiology, which he wrote in collaboration with his colleague at Newcastle, the late Prof. J. A. Menzies. The loss of these two, in the space of a few months, is a loss which the teaching of physiology in this country will find very difficult to make good.

The following appreciation of Bainbridge has been written for us by one with the very best opportunities of knowing him as he was.