

mate is an unfortunate mistake on your part, and most injurious to me.

I venture to hope that you will hasten to rectify your error, otherwise I will be compelled to justify myself by a recourse to the same means employed against the *Post*. This would be disagreeable to both parties, but I shall not shrink from any sacrifice in order to obtain redress.

I remain, Sir,

Yours, &c.,

(Signed,) J. EMERY CODERRE.

Dr. Coderre is wrong in inferring that our condemnation of his action in introducing his nostrums for general sale had anything to do with the death of the child of Mrs. Bourdeau. We condemned him because, being a regularly qualified physician, and occupying a position of honor and respectability in one of the Medical Institutions of the country, he has seen fit to introduce and advertise for sale among the public three remedies, viz.: "*An Infants' Soothing Syrup*," "*A Tonic Elixir*" and an "*Expectorating Syrup*." This act is one which is totally at variance with the Code of Ethics adopted in England, the United States and Canada. Such conduct in any other city but our own would have at once brought the offender before some competent Medical tribunal. Even here we hesitate not to say that the great majority of the profession condemn in most unmeasured terms Dr. Coderre's action in this matter. If Dr. Coderre prefers to maintain his right to advertise these medicines, no medical man will deny it to him, but at the same time the profession can and will claim the right to say that he has exceeded the bounds which medical etiquette allows him, and that in the interest of the profession he should not continue to hold the medical appointments which he does. We expressed the opinion that his *Soothing Syrup* was dangerous. Will he deny it? Are not all soothing syrups dangerous? Have they not all at some time or other caused death? If so, is this not proof that they are dangerous? Are not all medicines which contain narcotics, dangerous? Do they not always require caution in their administration? Is it not a fact (we believe, it is) that the public will give with greater carelessness a remedy purchased at a drug store, in the form of a patent or proprietary medicine, than one in prescription form the hands of a medical man?

As regard the *Tonic Elixir*, Dr. Coderre is angry because we call it a quack remedy. He says, "My '*Tonic Elixir*' has never been given as curing the

ills to which you allude. Look at the directions, and you will find that they merely say 'This Elixir has been successfully administered for over twenty years.'" Dr. Coderre adds, "I could publish more certificates than would fill the columns of your journal, were it necessary to attest the efficacy of this preparation." We confess that Dr. Coderre's logic, as quoted above, is not to our mind sound. "It has never been given as curing," he says, and yet almost without another dip of ink he adds: "It has been successfully administered;" and again, that he "could publish more certificates," etc.; etc. If it has not been "given as curing," what was it given for? If it has not "cured," how has it been "successfully administered?" or what were the certificates he possesses in such large numbers given for? We called the remedy a quack one, because it is a proprietary medicine, sold indiscriminately over the counter to whoever asks for it, the sales in most cases being due to advertisements in the public newspapers, which state that it has been successfully used in a large number of named diseases. This class of remedies are usually called "quack medicines," even although the appellation of "quack" cannot sometimes be applied to their inventor, as is the case in the present instance. Dr. Coderre infers that we and our friends judge harshly of his preparations because they can be bought from the chemists without an order, and consequently without our friends and ourself getting what he calls the usual commission. Dr. Coderre makes here, as he supposes, a strong point against physicians' percentages. We think, however, that it is a poor rule that won't work both ways, and, as Dr. Coderre undoubtedly takes his commission from the indiscriminate sale of his medicine, we fail to see how he can make a point against anyone who may receive a percentage from his regular prescriptions. At the same time we desire to say that we do not do business in the way he indicates. As to our friends—well, we are pleased to say they are so well known that they can be fully trusted, and we have yet to hear of their doing anything to stain their professional standing. In the exercise of our function as a professional journalist we have felt it our duty to write as we have done. It has not been a pleasant task, but the action of Dr. Coderre in advertising these remedies has placed him, in the opinion of many of his professional brethren, in such a position that they believe he should either withdraw his advertisements or resign the various medical appointments which he now fills.—[*Ed. Canada Medical Record.*]