

teur, who at once placed a laboratory at his disposal. There he has remained for 17 years. He has had brilliant offers from Russia and America, but has steadfastly refused to leave Paris. He says: "I like the Institute and have numerous pupils. What more can I wish for?" His life, simple and strenuous, has been one of single-minded devotion to the search for truth.—*The Practitioner*, December, 1905.

THE BEHRING INCIDENT.

The question of congress organization recalls the Behring incident, which was so much discussed by the newspapers as well as by the medical profession. What purports to be the "true story" was published not long ago in the *Gaulois*. In that account the responsibility for the sensation is placed on the shoulders of a journalist who met Professor Behring at dinner during the Congress. The Professor, it is said, does not speak much French, and his statement that he had found a cure for *bovine* tuberculosis was misconstrued into an assertion that he had discovered a cure for consumption. We are asked to believe that in this way an enterprising Paris newspaper was misled into publishing a statement, which was not merely premature, but positively false. This explanation may possibly be true, but we regret to say that we cannot believe it to be the whole truth. It is likely enough, however, that Professor Behring's hand was forced. It would seem that he was unwittingly made to play the part of a muzzler to Dr. Marmoreck, to whom, for some reason, the authorities of the Congress were unwilling to grant a hearing. It is certain that the manner in which Professor Behring was put forward was, to say the least of it, unusual. The General Secretary announced in a loud voice at one of the public sittings, where no discussion was possible, that "By order of the President, Professor Behring was to be allowed to make a communication, etc." It is pretty clear that a sensation was deliberately engineered by some one. The profession has grown tired of the frequent announcement of discoveries by well-known scientists; it has been taken in so often that it has also become suspicious. It is a pity that both advertising discoverers and sensational journalists cannot be made amenable to punishment for the publication of false news. The amount of suffering which such exaggerating statements cause is past all computation, and there should be some legal provision to protect the public from what is a particularly cruel form of deception.—*The Practitioner*, December, 1905.