

without any signs of labour. On May 9th I was sent for again. She had, when she sent for me, some slight pains, but they had entirely subsided before I reached her place of residence, more than ten miles in the country.

On May 16th (between her eleventh and twelfth month, according to her own reckoning), I was again in attendance. I found the os dilated the membranes ruptured, and a natural presentation. After a long and painful labour, she was delivered of a very large male child: it had perished during labour. On examination, I found encircling the umbilicus of the child, just where the *funis*, joins it, a *bright red ring*, less than two lines wide.

Since 1849, I have observed this red ring in other cases, in all of which there were good reasons for believing that the children had been retained *in utero* beyond nine months. Only one was still-born. Judging from my own experience only, I believe it always indicates retardation, and that in such cases it may always be found if carefully looked for."

The above case together with a similar case occurring in the practice of Dr. G. J. Farrish, of Yarmouth, N.S., have been published in the *London Medical Times and Gazette*. Dr. J. R. Dewolf, Medical Superintendent of the Hospital for the insane at Dartmouth (Halifax) also reports a similar case occurring in his practice. Dr. Dewolf's case is a very interesting one and goes far to prove that the red "ring" always indicates retarded utero-gestation. The subject is worthy the attention of the profession in a scientific point of view, and may also eventually prove of great service in determining what has hitherto been a very troublesome question in medical jurisprudence.

SPITEFUL JEALOUSY.

The October number of the *Canada Medical and Surgical Journal*, which, with its characteristic lateness, came to hand a few days ago, contains an article headed "Wholesale Pilfering," in which the editor appears greatly chagrined because we published, amongst our original communications, two articles from the pen of Dr. Howard, of Montreal, which, it is alleged, first appeared in the *Canada Medical and Surgical Journal*—the one in December, 1872, and the other in July, 1873.

Some time during the month of August last Dr. Howard sent us printed copies of the following articles, "Scarlatinal Pleurisy," and "Fibrous Tumors of the Uterus," which we published in the September number. On the title page of these articles it was stated that the former was read before the *Canada Medical Association in September, 1872*, and the latter before the *Medico-Chirurgical Society of Montreal in June, 1873*; but there was no evidence that they had ever appeared in the *Canada Medical* or any other journal, and consequently we considered them as original articles. We confess that we do not often read the *Canada Medical Journal*, as it is generally so late and stale that it is of very little service to us; besides, we never received the number for December, 1872, and the number for July, 1873, did not come to hand until the LANCET for September was printed; and even if it had, we would not have thought of crediting it with an article, the original of which we had in our own hands; so that to charge us with "pilfering" from its columns is a gratuitous insult, which we have no disposition to pass by unnoticed. Any articles we have ever copied from its columns we have given full credit for.

It was perfectly competent for Dr. Howard to send duplicate copies of his articles to the CANADA LANCET for publication, and that is what it appears to us he has done. We might as well, if we felt disposed, charge the *Canada Medical Journal* with "pilfering" from the LANCET, inasmuch as an article appears in its last issue from the pen of Dr. Hingston, which appeared in the LANCET two months ago. If the articles sent us were reprints from the *Canada Medical Journal* (of which there was no evidence) the editor is himself to blame for not crediting his journal with them. We apprehend the chief cause of grievance, and we have this on good authority, lies in the fact that Dr. Howard should appear to patronize the CANADA LANCET, and that these articles should have been first read and noticed by the majority of the profession and cotemporary journals as appearing in the LANCET, and that excerpts were generally credited to us.

During the three years the LANCET has been in existence we have never once stepped out of our way to attack any of our cotemporaries, except in self-defence; and we regret that we have been called upon the second time to defend ourselves