

PRURITUS OF WOMEN.

LOCAL TREATMENT.—All acquainted with the incessant suffering which some women undergo from pruritus at the period of the menopause, must be very desirous of being made acquainted with a prompt remedy for so distressing an affection. Whether it arise from the presence of prurigo, urticaria, eczema, herpes or whether it exists without any eruption at all, it is alike difficult to allay, as the great number of remedies which have been proposed testifies. Of these veratria is by far the most efficacious. When the pruritus is localised at the groins, arm-pits, walls of the abdomen, or behind the ears, gentle friction night and morning with an ointment, consisting of thirty parts of lard and a quarter of a part of veratria, usually gives relief. When the pruritus is generalised, the internal administration of the veratria is preferable. Two centigrammes should be made into ten pills with liquorice powder, of which from two to six should be taken daily, either half an hour before, or three hours after meals. Only one should be taken at a time, an additional one being given each successive day until the maximum of six (three milligrammes) is attained.—*Dr. Chévon, in Le Progrès Medical.—Med. Times.*

THE CANADA MEDICAL RECORD

A Monthly Journal of Medicine and Surgery.

EDITORS :

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

R. A. KENNEDY, M.A., M.D., Managing Editor.

ASSISTANT EDITORS :

CASEY A. WOOD, C.M., M.D.

GEORGE E. ARMSTRONG, C.M., M.D.

SUBSCRIPTION TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

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

MONTREAL, NOVEMBER, 1885.

The *Canadian Pharmaceutical Journal* for November says the following decision was recently given by Hon. Justice Johnson in the case of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Quebec, *vs.* Theobald Chive. The action was brought in the Circuit Court for \$50 penalty under the Stat. 42 and 43 V., c. 37 and amendments, for practising medicine without being a registered licensee (10th April, 1883). "Two instances are specified :

First, one Ad. Martel, whom he treated, and received thirty cents; second, Jos. Archambault, whom he treated, and got eighty cents (20th March, 1884). He pleads that he never practised medicine contrary to the Statute, but that he is a licensed chemist and druggist, and has a right to sell and recommend his drugs and wares, and that he did no more. Secondly, he pleads prescription. The plaintiff, in his declaration, alleges that the reason he did not bring the action before was the absence of the defendant from the province. There is no evidence of practising medicine or prescribing it in the sense of the statute. In the first case, the man Martel was suffering pain from inflammation of the bladder, and told the defendant so, and the latter recommended a lotion or liquid in a bottle for which he charged thirty cents. This would seem a small fee for a prescription by a physician, and was evidently only the price of the physic or stuff that he used and had a right to sell. In the second case, the witness says he was weak and wanted a tonic, and got two bottles for which he was charged and paid forty cents each. It would be straining the law to apply it to such a state of facts as this. The defendant is proved to be a licensed druggist, and he had a right to recommend his wares, and receive the price of them, which is all he did. I see nothing about prescription or limitation of action in the statute, and nothing was cited, but that is unimportant under the evidence.

No. 3,466. This is another case against the same man for another and different offence under two sub-sections of sec. 88, *i. e.*, for illegally assuming the title of doctor, physician, or surgeon, or any other name implying that he is legally authorized to practice medicine or surgery, etc., or for assuming in an advertisement, a written or printed circular, or on business cards or signs, a title, name or designation of such a nature as to lead the public to suppose or believe that he is a registered or qualified practitioner of medicine, etc. There is a demurrer pleaded to this action; but I think the allegations are sufficient. They say that the defendant held himself out as a practising physician by printed labels on bottles of medicine which he sold, but using the words *Dr. Chive* on them. But there is besides a specific allegation that he has assumed a designation of a nature to cause it to be supposed that he is practising as a physician. Therefore, if he has by these labels