

D. Thompson, A. D. Watson, J. B. Whitely; E. R. Woods, J. D. Wilson, P. C. Walmsley. *Final*: Frank Bentley, Lafayette Bentley, T. G. Brereton, James Baugh, J. C. Burt, Wm. Bonnar, G. S. Beck, J. F. Bell, E. E. Book, Wm. Brett, E. Bedard, G. W. Clendenan, A. Cameron, G. S. Cleland, A. P. Cornell, R. M. Coulter, W. J. Charlton, L. E. Day, G. C. Dowser, J. T. Duncan, C. R. Dickson, J. G. Davidson, W. F. Eastwood, Ira A. Freel, R. M. Fisher, A. C. Gaviller, R. W. Garrett, Wm. Gilpin, Wm. Hanbridge, A. J. Henwood, D. A. Johnston, J. M. Johnston, W. H. Johnson, C. E. Jarvis, James Lafferty, J. G. Menie, T. M. Milroy, M. McPhoden, H. P. McCausland, H. R. McGill, T. F. McMahan, J. F. O'Keefe, L. C. Prevost, S. R. Rogers, D. B. Rutherford, David Rose, B. L. Riordan, H. H. Reeve, T. J. Symington, J. E. Shore, A. D. Smith, Alex. Stark, J. M. Stewart, W. F. Shaw, T. H. Stark, E. D. Vanderwort, R. R. Wallace, A. B. Welford, C. A. Weagant.

#### SUIT FOR MALPRACTICE.

This was an action brought against Dr. Wm. Brock, of Bismarck, by a Mr. Malcolm, and was tried at St. Thomas, April 7th. The particulars are as follows: The plaintiff received an injury to the shoulder, and went at once to Dr. Brock for treatment. The Dr. pronounced it a severe bruise; said there was no displacement, and had the patient under observation about five weeks. At the expiration of this period, the man being very anxious about his shoulder, on account of the severe pain he experienced, consulted two other physicians separately, both of whom told him there was a dislocation. A short time after this (about eight weeks after the receipt of the injury) he went to the hospital in London, when the surgeons recognised a dislocation, and made an attempt to reduce it, but without success.

At the trial three surgeons subpoenaed by the plaintiff, Dr. Tye, of Chatham (formerly Thamesville), and the two local doctors who first saw patient after defendant had treated him, agreed in saying there was a subcoracoid dislocation of the humerus, so well marked as to leave no shadow of doubt in their minds. The

defendant stated there was no dislocation, and had been none since the injury. It came out in evidence, however, that he had on two different occasions tried extension with the heel in the axilla, with the intention, he said, of *stretching the nerves and thereby lessening the pain*. The other doctors called on behalf of the defence were not put in the witness box. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff with damages, \$900.

There was no attempt to show any negligence on the part of the defendant, but simply want of skill. There can be no doubt that he committed a grave error in judgment, and, while he was doing his best for his patient, the price demanded for his error appears to us very high. While we sympathize with Dr. Brock, who, during his practice of eight years, has always been careful and painstaking, we hope that he and others will learn from the result of this unfortunate case the great importance of insisting on consultations in all cases of injury at or near the joints where the symptoms are at all severe or obscure. Unfortunately, some medical men, with a perversity which is entirely inexplicable, as well as inexcusable, persistently object to consultations. Such conduct is both unjust and impolitic: unjust, because it deprives the patient of the advantages which may accrue: impolitic, because it throws on the surgeon's shoulders the full responsibility of any mishaps which may arise

#### DOES IT PAY?

Our readers are probably tired of seeing our reiterated protests on the subject of "newspaper offences against the profession," and would, perhaps, be glad to give up the crusade in disgust, for many think, "*Le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle*." However, we do not despair, for doubtless, like other hydraheaded monsters, this too, can be exterminated by courage and perseverance. Where the perception of ethical niceties is blunt, and the regard for other people's feelings callous, it is generally found that the nerve supplying the pocket is peculiarly sensitive, and accordingly we appeal to recalcitrant newspaper men through this channel of communication, and enquire, "Does