

## PROFESSIONAL ADVERTISING.

The editor of our esteemed contemporary, the *British Medical Journal*, has been cast in damages to the amount of £150 for speaking too strongly of the conduct of one of our profession.

It appears that Dr. Kingsbury, the plaintiff, had permitted his name to appear upon the prospectuses of two hydropathic establishments, and that the defendant journal, in answer to a query from a correspondent, had said that his conduct in doing so was "wholly incompatible with the honor and dignity of the profession," and suggested that he deserved "reprobation" at the hands of his professional brethren. That is the whole case in a nutshell.

Some months ago—November last—we felt impelled to speak on the question of professional advertising, and we then pointed out the unfairness of denouncing and worrying the younger and less distinguished members of the profession for offences of this description, which were in reality no worse, if they were even as objectionable, as those committed every day with impunity by men in the higher ranks of the profession. We said that while many struggling general practitioners were promptly jumped upon for any slight error in the way of publicity, men of high repute did what amounted to the same, or worse, and no notice was taken of it. We spoke strongly on that occasion. We said, after giving instances: "The transparent humbug of permitting this sort of thing to go unnoticed, while the poor practitioner is hauled across the coals daily for offending not one whit more grossly, is a disgrace to the profession," and we say so still.

It is disagreeable and even humiliating to have to speak on this subject, but it is one which must be spoken of so long as things are permitted to go on as they are going at present. Should we not have some new reading of Shakespeare's delightful couplet:

"What in the captain's but a choleric word  
Is in the soldier rankest blasphemy"?

The evidence given the other day at the Manchester Assizes must have been highly amusing, if not indeed confusing and even bewildering, to those who for the moment were happy in not belonging to the honorable profession. Will someone who knows—we do not—inform us what is the difference, socially or professionally, between a hydropathic establishment and a home for inebriates? Will the same gifted person, or some other, tell us why permitting your name to appear upon the prospectus of one kind of establishment to which you are medical adviser—say, a hydropathic establishment—should be penal, "incompatible with the honor and dignity of the profession," while permitting it to appear on the prospectus of another business concern—say, an insurance company—is honorable and dignified?

The whole thing is pitiful in the extreme, and well calculated to demean the whole profession in the eyes of the public—and its own.—*The Medical Magazine*.