

that effectually prevented the return of the midnight disturber; but from the frequency of association of the names of certain members of the profession in the public press with various illnesses and accidents, it is probable that all surgeons are not in danger of having to appear to answer the charge of profanity either here or hereafter.

Under such circumstances what course shall be taken? It is not well to waste time at the telephone trying to show that the public should not be entertained with information respecting cases of accident or suffering that come under our care. It may be that the public has rights that should be respected, since the melancholy death of Garfield, if not before. It has been clear that the public does take a very great interest in the details of illnesses, the frequency of the pulse, the record of the temperature, the results of probings, as well as of medication; and if America as well as Europe may be properly interested in the case of one prominent man, there is probably no community that will not be interested in the cases of others though far removed from fame. It is hoped, however, that if in the future any shining mark is struck either in America or Europe, the agony may not be prolonged, and it is also to be hoped that after the grave has finally closed upon the victim, it will not be necessary to have set before the public every day the views of many distinguished men upon the sanity of the assassin. To counteract the efforts to give the public such details, strong language on the part of medical men cannot be advised, for milder means will suffice. Let a request be made to suppress the name of the able professional, and the news of a surgical operation will not require four newspaper lines, and the account of ordinary operations, removal of fingers and toes, examinations by prominent medical men for injuries after accidents, when none have been received, will be diminished to microscopical proportions. If these indirect methods of professional advertising cannot be commended, what is to be said with respect to advertisements in regular form? In the code it is stated:

"That in the case of a physician, a surgeon, commencing the practice of his profession, or removing to another locality, a simple an-

nouncement by an unobtrusive card in the "public press is unobjectionable."

This rule is one that has been generally adopted, and as to the time during which the card may be retained, there seems to be no special indication given. Probably it was thought that this may be left to each individual to limit for himself, for after a physician has paid for the advertisement for a time, and realized how little benefit results in directing patients to his residence, who would not otherwise have discovered it, he will be able to see that money laid out in this way does not bring usurious interest. If, however, it is allowable to insert such an unobtrusive card, may not an equally unobtrusive card be inserted to indicate that the physician or surgeon intends to devote his power to only a limited part of the professional field? As in the sister profession, A. B. places under his name "Chancery lawyer," may not the doctor state that his work is limited to the eye or ear, or throat or nose, or perhaps to all of these combined? It is probably within the knowledge of most members of the profession that from time to time in the past have appeared the cards of physicians and surgeons with announcements added in very small type (as if the advertiser was ashamed of it, or else intended that no one should read it), the words, "particular attention paid to the diseases of women," or "to affections of the heart and lungs," or "to the diseases of infancy," or "diseases of the skin;" indeed it is understood that one gentleman in the profession announced "particular attention devoted to eyes, ears, throat and nose, skin and women."

There have been incidents of a not very distant past—within the present month has been seen a card in capital type announcing, "Midwifery and diseases of women a specialty." Such cards illustrate the statement in the code that "it is derogatory to the dignity of the profession to resort to public advertisements or private cards, or hand-bills inviting the attention of individuals affected with particular diseases." But can the same be said respecting another method? Has not the professional man the right to announce that he will only treat the diseases of certain parts of the system? It would seem reasonable to admit this, and let