

fession to leave such matters to the control of pharmacutists and thus get rid of the onerous task of dispensing their own medicines, whilst at the same time the druggist should not charge more than what is right for the dispensing, or feel pulses over the counter, but leave the difficult duty of prescribing to those who are specially educated for it.

One other practice should also be condemned. It is impossible to combine the duties of both properly, and yet we have in our midst men who practice as physicians and at the same time superintend drug stores. Such hybrid combinations are injurious to both parties, and we trust before long stringent means will be used to prevent them.

ANTI-VACCINATION.

As we stated in our last issue, the anti-vaccinators, headed by Dr. Coderre, had discovered another supposed case of inoculation of disease by vaccination, and that photographs were being pulished. These latter have since been exposed on our street corners, and were of such a character as to lead to the belief that they were taken after death, though the child is at present living and in good health.

To prove whether this child had received any injury a public meeting of physicians was called, at which there were present a large number of medical gentlemen, some of them being well-known influential members of the profession. We regret that all the profession were not invited, many not knowing of the meeting, as there would have been a larger majority in favor of the resolutions adopted. The anti-vaccinators were in full force, and certainly did not represent many of any ability. The meeting was held in the Jacques Cartier School, on the 15th of September. Dr. Hingston presiding.

The Chairman stated the objects of the meeting, as represented in the circular addressed to each member of the Faculty, which were to consider and pronounce judgment in the case of the child (Labelle), of which use had been made by Dr. Coderre to prejudice the public against vaccination.

After considerable discussion, in which several physicians who had seen the child took part, the Chairman ordered the child to be brought before the meeting. This being done, and all present having availed themselves of the opportunity thus afforded them of satisfying themselves as to the aforesaid phenomena on the

body of the child, it was proposed by Dr. G. W. Campbell, seconded by Dr. Rottot:

That, after having carefully examined the arm of the child Labelle, vaccinated by Dr. Larocque in June last, we are of opinion that from the appearance which the arm now presents, there has been no extensive destruction of tissue, nor any evidence of any injurious virus having been introduced into the system of the child; and that the scar presents the ordinary appearance of healthy vaccination.

The motion was carried by a majority of 40 against 18.

The following resolution was then proposed by Dr. Fenwick, seconded by Dr. E. Robillard:

That, in the opinion of this meeting, the action of certain medical gentlemen in publicly circulating photographs to represent alleged injurious effects of vaccination, is strictly unprofessional and highly censurable, as calculated to mislead the public, and is adverse to the interest of science.

The vote on this resolution was identical with the former one, with the exception of the addition of Dr. Gariepy, who had voted for the amendment, and Dr. Bell, who had come into the room in the interval.

Several gentlemen addressed the meeting, but the main gist of their observations is embodied in the resolutions which have been recorded.

After a vote of thanks to the Chairman for the exemplary manner in which he presided, the meeting came to a close.

One of the photographs exhibited was an highly colored imaginary sketch of the appearance of a supposed transverse section of the arm. It was also elicited that a tight bandage had been applied, which, with the cachectic condition of the child, had induced extensive suppurative action.

One is not surprised to find anti-vaccinators among the ignorant, who do not understand anything of the matter, and therefore ascribe scrofulous eruptions to the introduction of vaccine, nor can we blame them for acting up to the conviction. In one case which came under notice, a mechanic, who had been fined several times in England, and once here, was so opposed to vaccination that he preferred imprisonment rather than have it done; but, on having a thorough explanation of its benefits, he had his six children at once vaccinated. Now, it is just such men as these anti-vaccinators who cause this