

They would therefore request the Medical Profession, or any person into whose hands this may fall, to communicate to either of them such cases, coming within their own observation, as shall serve to this end; giving the place, time and circumstances of their occurrence, with the mode of inhalation adopted, and, especially, information in regard to the following points:—

1st—*The kind of Ether used, whether pure Sulphuric Ether, Chloric Ether, or Ether combined with Chloroform.*

2d—*The period after inhalation at which death occurred;—*

also any other facts which may enable them to form an opinion on the subject of their investigations.

RICHARD M. HODGES, M.D.

GEORGE HAYWARD, M.D.

SOLOMON D. TOWNSEND, M.D.

CHARLES T. JACKSON, M.D.

J. BAXTER UPHAM, M.D.

February, 1861.

CASE OF MALPRACTICE.

We quote the following from the Kingston Daily News, of July 25, copied from the Toronto Globe; and if Dr. Norris of Fort Erie, or some other physician cognizant of the affair, would kindly furnish us the particulars, we would feel obliged. Malpractice, with regard to midwifery is so common in Canada, that the sooner it is put a stop to the better.

“Some time ago we copied from a western paper a narrative of certain facts connected with the death of a poor Irish woman at Fort Erie, who, it was alleged, had been the victim of malpractice. When seized with the pains of labor she sent for a Dr. Beaman, who subsequently brought to his assistance, from Buffalo, a man named Dayton. An inquest was held on the bodies of the woman and her infant. The precise nature of the verdict we do not know, but the effect of it was to let the ‘doctors’ go free, much to the delight of some of the citizens of Buffalo, as attested by cheers and a sleigh procession. We have received from William Norris, Esq., M.D., of Fort Erie, a statement purporting to contain accurate details of the matter. On their correctness or incorrectness we can pronounce no opinion; but if they be true the poor woman and her child have been murdered. We cannot publish Dr. Norris’ letter—the statements he makes are too revolting; but he says: ‘I am willing to brave any consequences which may follow from the tenor of my evidence, corroborated as it is by Drs. Frazer and Burns, and, as to the principal *post mortem* examination appearances, by Drs. White and Cronyn, as also by the Coroner, who is an English practitioner of long standing, who was present during the whole time.’ Dr. Norris also says that the County Attorney, Mr. Raymond, does not intend to let the matter rest. The case is one which demands a full and complete investigation, and if the charges made against the ‘doctors’ are proved, we know of no legal punishment too severe for them.”

MALPRACTICE SUIT.

JUDGE'S CHARGE TO THE JURY.

We copy, below, from the *Elmira (N. Y.) Daily Press* of Feb. 10th. an interesting charge of the judge in a recent suit for alleged malpractice. We think, if he had been a surgeon, he might have made still another point in favor of the defendants, namely, that even with a stiff knee the patient's condition after the operation was no worse, if not decidedly better, than before. The whole tone of the charge is sensible and properly appreciative of the true responsibility of surgeons in such cases.