

suets in pure preparations. He always found a considerable increase in the quantity, and it was remarkable that those biliary acids produced the greatest effects that were foreign to the animal. Glycocholic acid acted much more powerfully than taurocholic. When a large quantity of taurocholic acid was given to an animal, it was excreted along with the bile. In doses of 4 to 5 grms. the increase was almost always 100 per cent., and if the quantity was still increased an increased flow, even up to 120 per cent. could be obtained. The larger the dose the greater the effect, and not only was the bulk increased but that of the solid constituents, and especially the biliary acids. He had no hesitation in pronouncing the biliary acids to be most powerful certain cholagogues; they occupied a distinct position, as they increased the formation and of course the flow of biliary acids, whilst the others only increased the flow of the watery constituents. These effects as regarded sodium salicylate and the biliary acids were previously known, Prevost, Pinet, Lewascheff, and others had studied the action of the former before him. Most people were also convinced of the action of the biliary acids, and the only service he had performed was to place the action on a scientific basis.

These experiments appear to show that, while most of our so-called cholagogues are of no value, many of them instead of hastening the flow of bile, retard it, and that all our ideas regarding them are out of joint.

But the evidence of clinical experience in regard to their utility is so strong that, to the practical mind, the experiments on dogs with fistulæ, *et al.*, may go to the dogs. No one who has, in his own person, or in that of a patient, seen the bile flow after a mercurial followed by a saline, can for a moment doubt the value of our old friends the cholagogues, and no amount of experimentation and scientific research will drive them from the ground they have so long and so profitably occupied.

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE.

In the past Surgeons have had a practical monopoly of the unpleasant experience of being sued for malpractice.

That this condition of affairs may undergo a change is indicated first by the suit now before the courts in Indiana in which the plaintiff alleges that the defendant physician treated his wife for a heart disease which never existed and overlooked in his treatment a condition which ought to have been diagnosed, and which, if recognized might readily have been cured.

Another case before the Supreme Court in Brooklyn is of interest. Dr. Boyden, under the direction of the Board of School Commissioners, vaccinated a child, and the child shortly afterward developed tetanus, from which it died. The only question which the Court instructed the Jury they were to consider was whether the vaccination was performed in the manner generally practiced by physicians; or, as the Court expressed it, "whether Dr. Boyden exercised the care which a doctor should exercise in the operation of vaccination to prevent any harm arising therefrom."

The testimony was to the effect that Dr. Boyden did not wash the arm nor use antiseptics prior to the vaccination. In this practice he was supported by a number of medical witnesses, who testified that they never washed the arm, and did not regard it as necessary, inasmuch as the abrasion preparatory to the rubbing in of the lymph was in itself a cleansing process removing everything infective; others claimed that they always washed the arm.

From the evidence it was for the Jury to decide what was the usual practice and whether Dr. Boyden departed from it.

The Jury stood, as we are informed by the *Brooklyn Medical Journal*, eleven for the plaintiff, and one for the defendant. The