

Newspaper Directory shows there are above a hundred in the United States alone); and since each paragraph is not signed by an M.D., etc., the source from which it is obtained is unnoticed and unknown. Again, for these trivial ailments, a medical practitioner is rarely consulted. He has, therefore, rarely an opportunity of expressing verbally the genuine interest which he may truly possess in minor affections, and none whatever in the way of pointing out preventive measures.

We would therefore most emphatically point out that for all this knowledge in regard to the cure of disease, the public is indebted to that large class of thoughtful and philanthropic men, learned in all the known laws of nature, who are daily spending much time and money in investigating the commonest affections of everyday life, and gratuitously publishing the results of their research.

THE MEDICAL LIBEL CASE.

This was an action for alleged libel instituted by Dr. Lennox, one of the physicians of the "International Throat and Lung Institute" of this city, against Drs. McCammon, of Kingston, and Bray, of Chatham, members of the Ontario Medical Council, for statements made by them at the meeting of the Council in June last, and reported in the *Mail* newspaper of that date. At this meeting the question of appointing a public prosecutor came up for discussion, during which special reference was made to Drs. K. & K. and Souvielle, of "Spirometer" fame, as quacks; also that Canadian physicians, who hired themselves to quack American firms, who were thus enabled to practice under cover of a Canadian practitioner's license, were also practically quacks. Dr. McCammon, it is alleged, referred to such parties as "medical prostitutes who were a disgrace to the profession," and prevented the bringing of the quacks to justice. Dr. Lennox, who is a licensed practitioner, felt himself aggrieved by Dr. McCammon's remarks, and sued for \$10,000 damages, for defamation of character, claiming that the statements made injured him personally and in his profession.

The defence in the action was that the plaintiff was not mentioned, inferentially or by name, and the defendant, Dr. McCammon (whose case was the first called) was not at that time aware of the existence of the "Throat and Lung Institute,"

and also that he did not use the words given in the *Mail's* report, although they were to that effect. The case was tried before Judge Rose—Dalton McCarthy for the plaintiff, and Christopher Robinson for the defendant. Dr. Lennox, the principal witness in the prosecution, was rather severely handled by the counsel for the defence, with reference to the extravagant statements published in the advertising columns of the *Mail* and other papers. The statements referred to, the witness claimed, were written by "Souvielle." A number of medical men were present during the trial, and considerable interest was manifested in the case. The ruling of the judge in the matter of privilege on the one hand, and the necessity of proving malice on the other, was not satisfactory to the counsel on either side, and they consequently agreed that his Lordship should enter a verdict for the defendant, and allow the points of law to be argued before a full bench, with leave, in case the judge's ruling is not sustained, to enter a new trial. We have no doubt this will be the end of the matter, and we congratulate Drs. McCammon and Bray on the result. They were but doing what they conceived to be their duty in the position in which they were placed. We believe these actions were instituted more with a view to a free advertisement for the "Spirometer men" than for any other purpose, and if they are satisfied with the result of the trial in this respect after the report in the *Mail*, the general profession, at all events, has no occasion to complain.

Inasmuch as the defendants have been put to great expense, inconvenience and loss of time, in defending these suits, and as they were acting in a public capacity, and in the interest of the general profession when the alleged libellous statements were made, we think their expenses should be borne by the Medical Council. As an example of how such things are done across the Atlantic, we would refer to the "Bower and Keates' case."

THE BOWER AND KEATES' CASE.

The case of civil and criminal prosecution against the above named gentlemen has stirred to its very depths the fraternal sympathy, and called forth the moral and pecuniary support, of our professional brethren in England. In the autumn of 1882, Drs. Bower and Keates performed the opera-