

Upon the whole, we think that the prospects for conservative surgery in such cases—in the interests of both mother and child—were never brighter than at present. May we not, therefore, hope that, with the wonderful advancement which is now being made in this department of surgery, it will soon be demonstrated beyond a doubt that Cæsarean section, or some of its modifications, is quite as safe—if not safer—in all cases than craniotomy, and that this latter murderous method of destroying the lives of innocent babies may be soon known as one of the things of the past.

### PHYSICIANS AND THE SCOTT ACT.

In the month of August, Dr. W. S. Boyle, of Bowmanville, was charged with violating the Scott Act by selling whiskey under the garb of medicine, which, however, was not expected to be used for purely medicinal purposes. It appears from the evidence that the doctor was in the habit of prescribing medicines, and making up the same for his patients in pint bottles, charging from fifty to eighty cents for each consultation and medicine. It was contended by the prosecution that, in certain instances, such bottles contained simply whiskey, with some ordinary vegetable bitter. After a somewhat lengthy trial the doctor was found guilty, and a fine of thirty dollars was imposed upon him.

Dr. Boyle, through the press, affirmed very strongly that he had not violated the Act in any way, and appealed from the decision. We are not certain whether the case is finally decided, but understand that the appeal was not allowed. Whether it is to be carried any further we know not.

We have no comments to make upon the merits of this particular case so far as the verdict is concerned, but have to regret exceedingly to find a doctor engaged in this petty business, giving regularly his advice and medicines, in almost wholesale quantities, for such fees as fifty and eighty cents.

The main question as to whether doctors and druggists, in many Scott Act counties, are guilty of violating the law is a very serious one. A physician, by virtue of the authority given

to him by his license to practice medicine, has, of course, ample opportunity for breaking the law; but the very fact that he is invested with great power and high responsibility makes any such violation a crime contemptible in the extreme; and we can only express the hope that any physician found guilty, on indubitable evidence, will receive the severest punishment which the law can inflict, together with the unmitigated contempt of his *confreres*. We would like to see our profession at all times honorable in the highest sense of the word, and certainly must at least insist upon the observance of ordinary honesty and decency.

### THE REMOVAL OF THE UTERINE APPENDAGES.

The operation for the removal of the uterine appendages, though comparatively new, has become rather common in various parts of the world. Many conservative surgeons are protesting strongly against the excessive zeal of Lawson Tait's numerous disciples, who, as they affirm, do not observe sufficient care in their discrimination of the cases which actually require this radical method of cure. Although we must admit there is some ground for such contention, still we feel assured that the brilliant results obtained in properly selected cases prove beyond doubt that it is not only justifiable, but that it is a great boon to suffering humanity. The number of women—bedridden for prolonged periods—who have been relieved and restored to health and vigor by this operation in recent years, has grown so large that extreme opposition is almost disarmed.

Recent events in England suggest caution to surgeons, as far as their own interests are concerned. An eminent surgeon in Liverpool had an action brought against him by an hospital patient upon whom he had operated. The charge was that he had removed the uterine appendages unnecessarily, without giving proper information as to the nature of the results of the operation. It was claimed there had been a serious change not only in the life of the patient but also in that of her husband. The evidence for the defence showed that the woman suffered frequently from menorrhagia,