

the evidence of the witnesses in this case in another issue. We have secured the scoundrel's photograph, and with it we hope to be able to trace and locate his existence in Toronto.

We are also in communication with Dr. Irvine, the physician to Sing Sing Prison, New York, and hope before the next issue to have startling information to communicate to the profession. Anyhow, the mysterious stranger will not occupy a monopoly of mysteriousness as he does at present. The London snake swallowed his mate; our "Frank," by that time, will swallow his dupes or die from the effect.

His career in this province would be sooner at an end if the druggists refused to dispense medicines for him, excepting on a prescription in his own handwriting. He swore he could read and write; let him no longer trade on the skill of the druggists in compounding drugs. It is not at all to the credit of the druggists that they should compound medicines for him and write on the label "Dr. Rossin," when in fact he wrote no prescription, but the prescription credited to him was written by the druggist himself. The anxiety of the druggists to sell their medicines should not overstep the bounds of propriety and true wisdom. He will very soon perish like Jonah's gourd; the light of the "Sun of Truth" will be too strong for his temporary existence; he will seek strange pastures, but every medical man who reads this Journal will know him from the description already given.

Since writing the foregoing, we discovered that Dr. W. C. Chewett, of Toronto, is the gentlemanly owner of the Rossin House Hotel. He has very kindly informed us "that the man calling himself 'Frank Rossin' is either an impostor or lunatic. He cannot well be the son of Maurice Rossin who has been in the Lunatic Asylum here for over forty years. The other brothers, Marcus and Samuel (both dead), left sons—none called 'Frank.' Those of Marcus are living in Hamburg, and Samuel's two boys are in business together in New York. Maurice, the lunatic, was never married, so I do not see how he could have left a son. He was somewhere between twenty-three and twenty-five when he was placed in the Asylum and has been there ever since." The Doctor adds, "Whoever 'Frank' may be, he must have

been in Toronto some time. Before Mr. Nelson leased the house, six years ago, Mark H. Irish was my tenant—not Mike. The man you have is either a rank impostor and deserves to be punished, or a lunatic and ought to be confined."

Comparison made by the above statements of Dr. Chewett, with the sworn statements of the man calling himself "Frank Rossin," reveals what a scoundrel he is. He should be presented to the Grand Jury for making such false statements. The Rossins, we feel sure, have decided objections to his adopting their name. He was careful to claim the lunatic as his father, knowing that his evidence would not be produced, and the measure of his infamous design can be judged from his own evidence.

Original Communications.

THE AFFINITY OF GOUT AND RHEUMATISM.

BY R. SHAWE TYRRELL, M.D., L.R.C.P., LONDON,
TORONTO, CANADA.

The time, no doubt, is rapidly drawing to a close when retention of excess of excrementitious matter will any longer be tolerated during the treatment of diseases in general.

Not a score of years ago the practice in London was, as everybody knows, to lock up the bowels for a fortnight or more during the course of enteric fever, and this mode of treatment was instituted by the very man, viz., Murchison, who enlightened the medical world on the subject of lithæmia, and as his custom in typhoid fever has long since been abandoned, so also has his theory regarding the production of lithæmia been brought into question. The object, however, of this paper is to endeavor to show the close relation which exists between gout and rheumatism. And if the cause of gout is, and has been for some time, quite apparent and beyond dispute, viz., uric acid in excess in the system; and if, on the other hand, the cause of rheumatism is still in doubt, may it not be justifiable to draw attention to this close resemblance between these diseases, and, if possible, to explain why their effects are somewhat different.

I well remember the late Dr. Murchison diagnosing a case of severe inflammatory affection of