

would give some eight or ten thousand as the number suffering from this disease in Ontario, or about 5 per 1,000 of the population.

With regard to scarlet fever, diphtheria and typhoid fever, no doubt many cases are not reported, and this vitiates the value of the statistics as a means of determining the true mortality ratio of these diseases. In the case of diphtheria we are of the opinion that the death rate is still too high. On a former occasion we drew attention to this. One would not expect a death rate of 13 per cent., under our present method of treatment by the antitoxine serum. If statistics prove anything at all, they prove that a much lower death rate than this should be expected under the early and vigorous administration of this potent remedy.

Some very useful regulations are laid down for the hygiene management of barber shops.

Upon the whole, the report proves what a valuable agency the people possess in the Provincial Board of Health for the prevention of the spread of contagious diseases.

STICKLES v. Drs. W. F. BRYANS and G. B. SMITH, of Toronto.

On the 22nd of January, 1904, Drs. Bryans and Smith issued certificates to commit to the asylum the plaintiff in this action, a married woman.

She was retained in the asylum for sometime and then allowed her liberty. On regaining her liberty, she entered action against Drs. W. F. Bryans and G. B. Smith, for damages to the extent of \$10,000. Drs. Bryans and Smith very properly resisted the action.

The case came to trial on 6th, 7th, 8th, and 10th, October, before Chancellor, Sir John A. Boyd. After an exhaustive and expensive trial, the jury found a verdict in favor of the defendants on every point submitted by the Court.

The learned Judge reviewed the case at great length and with the utmost fairness. He pointed out the facts the defendants were honorable members of the medical profession, that they could have no motive other than the plaintiff's welfare in committing her to the asylum, that their story had been corroborated by a number of witnesses whose truthfulness could not be questioned, and that they had apparently acted with care in coming to their conclusions.

The following questions were submitted to the jury:—

1. Was the plaintiff of unsound mind on the 22nd January, 1904?
2. Did the defendants honestly believe the plaintiff was then of unsound mind?
3. Did the defendants take reasonable care in informing themselves of the material circumstances connected with the plaintiff's condition?