

clinical picture into account, I was reluctant to open the abdomen in that particular case, and assumed the responsibility of waiting and watching. Fortunately, the patient recovered. The symptoms immediately improved, after I had succeeded in getting a very copious discharge from the bowels, which I effected by repeated moderately small enemata of glycerine and warm water thrown into the rectum and colon. I considered well before deciding against operation. I was not positive that perforation had occurred, and I felt that if I opened the abdomen with the girl as sick as she was that the result would be very likely fatal. Not very long before I was present at an operation where appendicitis was supposed to exist. Laparotomy was performed, and the case was found to be typhoid fever. There was no perforation, and death occurred. I was struck with what Dr. Adami said. We are bound to consider it as it is borne out by Dr. Armstrong's experience in the cases which he has operated upon. Dr. Adami tells us that he believes that the important reason for the great mortality in these cases where operation is performed for perforation is due to the fact that there is a great want of the fibro-plastic exudate thrown out, and that the powers are lowered, the patient is in a bad state to stand operation.

While Dr. Armstrong tells us that the intestine united well, he says that the abdominal wound was slow to heal, and after twenty-one days he scraped the abdominal wound, and it again failed to unite, because, I believe, the exudate was not thrown out which produces union. It seems to me in severe cases we cannot expect any very great advance in the results obtained, in those cases, from surgical treatment. Of course, there is no question it is the only means offered to a patient; nevertheless, it will continue to be a grave condition, and one where I think no very brilliant results can be expected.

Dr. WESLEY MILLS.—It seems to me that this discussion is characterized by one thing at all events, namely, healthy difference of opinion, and, seeing that the history of medicine is rather characterized by a tendency to follow what is new and restricted rather than some broad princi-