

It therefore seems difficult to say that one who has nothing to do with drugs, or one who reprobates their use in sickness and in health, one who would not throw physic even to dogs, practises medicines. Or that the laying on of hands, whether in a devout manner, or after the more robust fashion of the "osteopathist" or of the "masseur," is practising medicine. That is really more like practising surgery. But no question as to that is asked. Or that the healing of the sick by faith alone is an infraction of the Act.

If the larger meaning is to be given to the word "medicine," that must now be done by legislation, not by adjudication, or by way of opinion under the Act for expediting the decision of constitutional and other provincial questions. And if the public, and not merely the medical profession, need protection against "Christian Science," "Osteopathy," massage, or any other "cure," it might be better not to limit the penalties to those who so practise for hire, gain, or hope of reward, but extend it to all who do the wrong, for wrong it then will be just as much without as with a fee.

---

MEREDITH, C.J.

DECEMBER 7TH, 1906.

CHAMBERS.

CAMPBELL v. CLUFF.

*Parties—Joinder of Defendants—Cause of Action—Pleading—Negligence.*

Appeal by defendants the Corporation of the City of Ottawa from order of local Master at Ottawa, ante 740, dismissing a motion by the appellants for an order requiring plaintiff to elect against which of the defendants he would proceed.

H. E. Rose, for appellants.

H. S. White, for defendants the Cluffs.

H. M. Mowat, K.C., for plaintiff.

MEREDITH, C.J., dismissed the appeal; costs in the cause.

Baines v. City of Woodstock, 6 O. W. R. 601, 10 O. L. R. 694, commented on.