

Mr. Miller states that they (the patient's friends) were satisfied that the blunder lay with the Dr., and advised him (Mr. Miller) to take legal proceedings. We have a letter in our possession from Mr. Thompson, addressed to Dr. Constantinides, in which he emphatically denies having stated that he or any one of his family was satisfied the blunder was the Dr.'s, or advised Mr. Miller to take legal proceedings.

The editor of the *Canadian Pharmaceutica! Journal*, in the last issue, comes out with more zeal than wisdom in support of M. Miller's position, evidently drawing his inspiration from Mr. Miller's *true facts* of the case. He scouts the idea that Mr. Miller could be held in any way responsible, and makes the extraordinary statement, that neither the prescriber nor dispenser could be held liable, but the third party who got the prescription dispensed. This would be a very fine thing for avaricious dispensers, but we fear it won't hold water.

The Pharmacy Act requires that *all poisonous substances* (not prescribed by a medical man of course,) shall be labelled. There is no evidence that the recipe was given by a regular physician; no physician was in attendance, and Mr. Miller was aware of that, and yet he dispenses for an irresponsible person (irresponsible because ignorant of the nature of the medicine,) a poisonous substance without any label to indicate the nature of the drug; and instead of cautioning them as he should have done, he tells them that one might drink the whole bottleful with impunity. No physician, careful of his reputation, ever prescribes for a patient he has not seen and examined, and we maintain that no druggist should dispense a prescription containing powerful or poisonous substances without proper caution, when he is aware that the prescription does not come from the medical man in attendance on the patient.

The idea of Mr. Miller, who is clearly in the wrong, talking about bringing an action against Dr. Constantinides for performing a duty which he (Mr. Miller) himself should have done, is refreshingly cool.

CHLORAL IN TETANUS.—Three cases of tetanus occurring on the continent, are cited in a German journal, in which large doses of chloral administered for several days succeeded in removing the affection. All three patients completely recovered.

ETHICS.

An old correspondent sends us the following :

To the Editor of the LANCET.

SIR,—Is it necessary or becoming for our profession to notice the nonsense that appears in favor of the various theories of the day in the daily papers? The letters that have appeared in the *Globe* lately, signed by a Dr. Cameron, really are nothing more or less than advertisements (paid or unpaid is not my affair) to introduce to public notice a Homœopathist who quotes Sir Thomas Watson as an authority on Homœopathic medicine!!! (*Globe*, 19th June, 1874).

I think it my duty to warn my professional brethren to beware of noticing these, to use as mild a term as possible, absurdities.

Yours &c.,

ALPHA.

June 19th, 1874.

Our correspondent might have gone a little farther and included "Ethics," who has been figuring in the public prints of late. (See *Mail*, June 10th). "Ethics" (in mercy to him we will not mention his name) complains of "the *Globe*-like conduct of the LANCET" because we would not publish his letter of the 18th of May. There were two reasons why we did not wish to insert his letter,—first, we had inserted a letter from him in our previous issue upon the same subject; secondly, it contained so many errors and mis-statements that we could not have published it without a reply; and the letter and reply would have occupied more space than we cared to devote to a subject which did not particularly interest the profession at the present time. But "Ethics" cannot allow his light to be hid, and again betakes himself to the public press and succeeds in getting his letter inserted in the *Mail* and a number of fly sheets struck off for promiscuous distribution; among other places, in the Toronto General Hospital (among his patients we suppose). We leave it with the profession to judge of the propriety of such a course; and whether in this very act of his we have not the best possible justification of our remarks, "that such persons are open to the suspicion of an endeavour to exalt their own personality." "Ethics" states "that had it not been for these public letters, Baxter's bill would at least have met with far greater opposition, not only from the members of the Legislature, but from the medical men through-