

## Selections.

INTRAVESICAL INJECTION FOR CHRONIC CYSTITIS.—The *North American Practitioner* for May gives the following :

R Guaiacol . . . . . 75 grams ;  
 Iodoform . . . . . 1 drachm ;  
 Sterilized olive oil . . . . . 3 fluid ounces.

M. For injection into the bladder.—*New York Med. Jour.*

RHUS AROMATICA IN INCONTINENCE OF URINE OF CHILDREN — Dr. Ludwig Freyberger, clinical assistant to the Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street, London, recommends the liquid extract of rhus aromatica in this complaint. He records thirty cases treated with gratifying results, and says that the astringent taste and disagreeable odor of the liquid extract of rhus aromatica are sufficiently disguised by syrupus aromaticus. The dose employed was five to ten minims for children two to five years old, ten to fifteen minims for children five to ten years old, and fifteen to twenty minims for older children. A very convenient formula is the following :

R Ext. rhus aromaticæ liq . . . . . min. 10 ;  
 Syrup. aromatici . . . . . “ 20 ;  
 Aq. destillatæ . . . . . ad dr. 1.  
 S. : Three times a day.—*Treatment*, May 12th.

THE PROHIBITION OF THE CORSET IN RUSSIA.—We learn from the *Gazetta degli ospedali e delle cliniche* for June 16th, that the Russian Minister of Public Instruction has issued, on the grounds of public health, a decree prohibiting the use of the corset by women. This is government interference with a vengeance. Such matters are not at all fit subjects for such interference, but only for the education of the people. Even if the entire profession were agreed that the corset was an unmitigated evil to the individual who wore it in all cases and under any circumstances, such a meddling decree would be a tyranny like prohibition laws, anti-cigarette laws, and so forth. Such measures are not on a par with the suppression of public nuisances, such as the control of noxious trades, because those ordinances are for the protection of the many against the few, whereas such decrees are an attempt to forcibly protect a man against himself in opposition to his own free will, and in regard to matters which other people choose to consider bad for him. This reasoning would justify anything—and is, in fact, the very reasoning which was adduced to justify the tortures of the inquisition.—*New York Medical Journal.*