

ing an abortion after the operation. The court in its judgment commented strongly upon the iniquity of the operation and on the grounds that the operation was not successful, was not conducted with proper scientific precautions, and was subversive of the dignity of marriage, and liable to become in case of abuse, a social danger, disallowed Lajartre's claim, at the same time censuring him severely for revealing professional secrets even beyond what the law demands. In the case of the damages claimed by the woman, and the counter charge of Lajartre of abortion, the court thought it very unlikely that a woman, who was so desirous of becoming a mother as to submit to such an operation, would immediately afterwards attempt to procure an abortion, and therefore rejected the counter charge, but as by submitting to such practices she exposed herself to the situation in which she was placed the court decreed that it would be sufficient reparation for her to have the costs of the trial paid by Lajartre.

The *Journal de Médecine de Paris* coincides with the judgment of the court in disallowing Lajartre's claim and in severely censuring him for revealing professional secrets. But thinks it has destroyed the import of its judgment by surrounding it with commentaries which exceeded its competence and which could not bear scientific examination. The *Journal* thinks the operation of artificial fecundation an operation infinitely more practical and less dangerous than most of the surgical methods proposed by American surgeons.

WHILE in the main agreeing with the observations of the *Journal de Médecine*—that the decision rendered by the tribunal was just, and that it went beyond its jurisdiction in making commentaries upon the operation—we think the *Journal* went out of its way to cast an unmerited slur upon American surgery.

At various times we have taken occasion to remark upon the growth of Physiological Science, and to advance the opinion that the Physiology of the present day cannot be properly taught without a competent teacher, and that a teacher to be competent will require to devote his whole time, and whatever of energy he may have, to the task of keeping abreast of the progress of that branch of study. Professor Huxley in his address at the London Hospital Medical College, so exactly falls in with our way of thinking that we cannot refrain from transcribing the following from a report of his address in the *British Medical Journal*: "I will undertake to say it is hopelessly impossible for any man at the present time to keep abreast of the progress of physiology, unless he gives his whole mind to it, and the bigger the mind is, the more scope he will find for it; and, if he is to teach, then, inasmuch as the study has now become practical—and very properly so—this also will involve a large expenditure of time. Now the fact is, you cannot support people in frittering their power away among ten or a dozen places. If students in their first year were taught in two or three central institutions the "Institutes of Medicine," it would be perfectly easy to have those subjects taught thoroughly and effectually by persons who gave their whole mind and their whole attention to them; while, at the same time, the Medical Schools and hospitals would remain what they ought to be, great institutions in which the largest possible opportunities are laid open for practical acquaintance with the phenomena of disease. So that the earlier half of the medical education would take place in the central institution, and the final half be devoted altogether to practical studies in the hospitals. I happen to know that this conception has been entertained not only by myself, but by a great number of persons who are most interested in the improvement of medical study, for a considerable number of years; but I do not

THERE are at present registered at the Toronto General Hospital 325 Medical Students.