

COMPULSORY VACCINATION IN FRANCE.

The following are the conclusions of the committee appointed by the Académie de Médecine upon this subject: 1. Vaccination, with extremely rare exceptions, is an inoffensive operation when practised with care and on a subject in good health. 2. Without vaccination, hygienic measures (isolation, disinfection, &c.) are of themselves insufficient for preservation from small-pox. 3. The belief in the danger of vaccinating or revaccinating during the prevalence of an epidemic is without any justification. 4. Revaccination, the necessary complement of vaccination for assuring immunity against variola, should be practised ten years at least after a successful vaccination, and repeated as often as possible, when it has not been followed by the characteristic cicatrices. 5. The Academy is of opinion that it is urgent and of high public interest that a law should be passed rendering vaccination obligatory. 6. As to revaccination, it should be encouraged in every possible manner, and even imposed by administrative regulations under all circumstances where this is possible.—*Gazette des Hôpitaux*, March 31st, 1881.

TO REMOVE FISH-BONES.

Fish bones lodging in the pharynx are rendered flexible and are finally broken up by a mixture of hydrochloric acid (four parts) or nitric acid (one part to two hundred and forty parts of water) used as a gargle, the teeth being protected by oil or lard. So says Professor Voltolini in *Monatsschrift für Ohrenheilkunde*.

THE CANADA MEDICAL RECORD,

A Monthly Journal of Medicine and Pharmacy

EDITOR:

FRANCIS W. CAMPBELL, M.A., M.D., L.R.C.P., LOND

ASSISTANT EDITORS:

R. A. KENNEDY, M.A., M.D.

JAMES PERRIGO, M.D., M.R.C.S. Eng.

EDITOR OF PHARMACEUTICAL DEPARTMENT:

ALEX. H. KOLLMYER, M.A., M.D.

SUBSCRIPTION TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

All communications and Exchanges must be addressed to the Editor, Drawer 356, Post Office, Montreal.

MONTREAL, JULY, 1881.

IMPORTANT QUESTION.

At the last meeting of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the Province of Quebec Dr. F. W. Campbell, one of the University representatives, raised a most important question, as to the period when it was permissible for a student, under the present law, to pass a year in study with a medical man. Dr. Campbell stated that, to his knowledge, students

had presented themselves at the end of the third year and passed their examination; that the end of the following year these students had returned, with a certificate of having studied during that year with a medical man, and had then been presented with their Diploma. This is, in our opinion, opposed not only to the spirit of the law, but to its letter. Students, according to the Act, have to study four years. They must take three sessions at a Medical School, the first whereof must be that succeeding the passing of their preliminary examination—and they are allowed to study one year with a medical man. All this period of study is, of course, presumed to show its effect by the knowledge which the student exhibits when undergoing his examination. But if he is allowed to pass the year with a physician *after* he has undergone his examination, and to a large extent has become independent of the University, can he be truly said to have studied four years? We do not think that he can. Unfortunately, such certificates are too easily obtained, but, even if the attendance has been faithful, in many cases—the stimulus of a subsequent examination being wanting—the time so passed is time absolutely lost. Far better at once let it be understood that only three years is required, for when the diploma is obtained, and the graduate enters practice, he has the stimulus of competition to urge him to keep up the knowledge he has acquired. To allow him to go to a Physician after his examinations are over, and count it as a portion of his period of study, is absurd. He has no immediate incentive to work, and the result, in nine cases out of ten, is that the graduate finds himself with his diploma, but minus much of that information which he had a year before, when up for examination. And this lost material is matter on which he would have kept himself posted had he gone from College to the struggle for a livelihood, amid the keen competition of Medical practice. So much for the common-sense reasons against such a procedure. But Dr. Campbell claimed, and we think he was right, that any such arrangement of a student's studies is contrary to the Bye-laws of the College, founded on the Medical Act of 1879. Chap. viii., section 11, of the College Bye-laws says: "A certificate of study from a licensed practitioner for the period *intervening* between the courses which the student has attended will be required." This, to our mind, is clear as it is possible for language to make it. We have *italicised* the word *intervene*, and