

or any way, before putting on pressure, to ensure yourself that you have no mucous membrane, which is not often caught, I imagine, when you get the stone in the proper position first and have enough water in the bladder to keep the coats slightly distended. I don't think I ever caught the mucous membrane in this case of Mrs. A.'s, and I never saw *one drop of blood* in the urine after any of the sittings. I don't know what the result would have been had I used anæsthetics, but I never used them during the course of lithotrity and my patient had very few opiates or in fact medicine of any kind. She had, however, used, and still uses demulcent drinks.

Correspondence.

THE NEW BRUNSWICK MEDICAL ACT.

To the Editor of the CANADA LANCET.

SIR,—The New Brunswick Medical Act, passed March 25th, 1881, provides that all physicians shall register their names in the Medical Register of the Province and receive a certificate of such registration before being entitled to practice; it also provides that the names of all registered practitioners shall be annually published in the *Royal Gazette*. The Act provides two penal clauses, viz: any person found practicing medicine, surgery, or midwifery in the Province without having registered is subject to a penalty of forfeiting \$20 per day for every day of practice; and any person who claims falsely to have registered is subject to a penalty of \$200. With the exception of the last clause of the Act, which provides that none of its provisions shall extend or be applied to clairvoyant physicians and midwives, the profession and people appear to be protected, but this is far from the truth of the matter. Every registered practitioner should have protection for the following reasons: first, because he is required to expend a large amount of capital and time to qualify him for registration; second, he is required to pay a fee of \$6 for his certificate of registration; and third, under amendments passed to the Act, he is required to pay an annual tax to the Medical Council, or suffer his name to be erased from the Medical Register of the Province. The amendments do not seem to work satisfactorily, as the Medical Register of 1884 contained 200 names, while that for 1885

only contains 120. We have sought a reason for this delinquency, and the answer was, "we do not wish to contribute towards the benefit of the few, or pay taxes for which we receive no equivalent." Now, granting that the practitioner fully complies with the Act and its amendments, what are his privileges? He is legally qualified to practice his profession in the Province and to recover fees for his services; nothing more, nothing less. A quack may practice under his notice from day to day and exact exorbitant fees, while the physician is powerless to prosecute him—the power of prosecuting offenders being entirely vested in the Medical Council, the members of which reside in the cities far from the operations of quackery—and hence the result. "Dr." Sewell travels over the country visiting the sick, and prescribing "Morning Glory," and abuses his patients if they do not purchase his remedies; "Dr." Golden, prescribes cajuput oil locally for congenital cataract and receives a fee of \$18; another "Dr." professes to heal the sick with roots and herbs, and dupes his patients with a mixture of chloroform, ether and aromatics, inflicting physical injury on some, while others are hastened to the grave. Language fails us in depicting the enormity of this imposition upon our profession and people. As members of the medical profession let us assert our rights, and urge our legislature to amend the Act, empowering every citizen of our Province with authority to prosecute offenders, and otherwise vindicate our Medical Act.

PRO BONO PUBLICO.

N. B., Aug. 8, 1885.

To the Editor of the CANADA LANCET.

SIR,—My attention was called to a letter in the February number of the LANCET over the signature of "A Resident Physician," Cornwallis, N. S. The article does not affect the writer personally, but I think it should not be passed over in silence by the profession in Cornwallis. Before rushing into print, it might have been well for a "Resident Physician" to ponder the old adage that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

Only a few days ago I heard a brother M. D. charge your correspondent with the same breach of professional etiquette with which he charges Dr. B. M.D. seemed to be filled with quite as much righteous indignation, but I have not yet