

take with trepidation, and would hail with devout thankfulness any method which rendered the administration of the anæsthetic swift, sure and safe.

A MALPRACTICE SUIT.

Early in May, at London, there was concluded a suit brought against a medical man, claiming damages for malpractice in the treatment of a fractured ankle. The plaintiff, a young lady, fell and sustained a dislocation of the ankle and fracture of one of the bones of the foot. The limb was treated scientifically by the application of plaster splints, and rest enjoined. This injunction was disregarded, and serious consequences resulted. The jury very properly gave a verdict for the defendant. The medical testimony was perfectly conclusive in regard to the propriety of the treatment. There appear to have been no reasonable grounds for instituting proceedings against the attending surgeon. Indeed, the plaintiff was urged on by injudicious friends in the face of advice from other medical men, who stated that the treatment had been well devised, judicious and correct.

We heartily congratulate Dr. Arnott on the successful issue of this harassing and distressful action. To a conscientious man it is ever a source of regret that his skill and judgment have been called in question, even though no shadow of reason was shown for the doubt. The annoyance, the loss of time, the personal inconvenience, and the probable loss of prestige from the mere fact of his skill being questioned, even though triumphantly vindicated, cannot be compensated for by any monetary consideration, nor yet by the satisfaction of a successful and overwhelming rebuttal of the charges.

A TOXICOLOGICAL PSEUDONYM.—Under this caption the *Louisville Medical News* in its usual forcible and happy style directs attention to the poisonous properties and the easy accessibility of the compound

termed "Rough on Rats." An extract from the *Therapeutic Gazette* in which "the poison—'Rough on Rats' is simply white arsenic" is given and then the thanks of the profession are tendered "to our esteemed contemporary for thus making known its active ingredients." We agree most cordially with all that our vivacious contemporary has uttered on this subject. We also modestly take unto ourselves a modicum of the thanks generously bestowed, for in our issue of December, 1882," Dr. Zimmerman communicated the result of an analysis of this "Rough on Rats" made by Mr. Thos. Heys, in which he says he finds "it consists of white arsenic. (As_2O_3) coloured with a little charcoal. The amount of arsenic is over ninety-nine per cent."

Correspondence.

To the Editors of the Canadian Practitioner:

DEAR SIRS.—In the April number of the PRACTITIONER, in referring to a plan for a Dominion Health Bureau and for the collection of disease reports or statements, which I had laid before a meeting of medical men in the Parliament House here, and which was adopted by the meeting, there was an error, arising, doubtless, from a misunderstanding of the plan, which I should be glad to correct. Absence from home and illness in my family prevented me writing in time for this month's number.

Your remarks, in reference to the plan, I thought very fair, and the error was only this: You stated in effect that, while it provided for salaries for the chairman and secretary of the advisory committee, it did not provide for a salary for the chief officer of the bureau. The plan proposed a salary of \$2,000 for this chief officer, and one of \$1,500 for the secretary of the committee, but no salary for the chairman of the committee. This position being honorary, with a per diem *honorarium* while on duty, the same as other members of the committee.

Further, you thought, and properly enough, the estimated cost altogether too low; but the estimation was only for a com-