

The last paper read was "On Some Varieties of Dyspnoea met with in Bright's Disease," by Dr. R. P. Howard, of Montreal.

THE SURGICAL SECTION.

also met at half-past three o'clock, and again in the evening, under the presidency of Dr. Roddick, who opened the proceedings of the section in the afternoon by thanking them for having appointed him as president of the section, and suggesting that in future all presidents of sections should be notified at the previous annual meeting, so that they might give an address on the special subjects of the section.

Dr. Blackader, of Montreal, read a paper on a "Case of Congenital Lipoma of the Foot."

Dr. Fulton, of Toronto, read a paper on "Thoraco-Plastic Operation of Estlander."

Dr. Serrifton, of Huntingdon, contributed a paper on a case of Hemorrhoids.

Dr. Fenwick, of Montreal, then read his paper on "Abscess of Abdominal Parieties, extending from Meckel's Diverticulum."

Some discussion ensued on this paper, in which Dr. R. P. Howard, Dr. Sullivan, Dr. King and Mr. Lawson Tait, the great exponent of abdominal surgery, and others, took part. Mr. Tait believed that in cases of obscure diseases of the abdominal parieties we should cut in and search for the cause. He considered it quite as legitimate to do this as it was to give a dose of opium to relieve suffering.

The following papers were also read :—

"Ligature of Anterior Tibial Artery in a case of Compound Fracture of the Leg," Dr. Shepherd, Montreal.

"Burns and their Results," Dr. Gardiner, London, Ont.

"Actions and Uses of Naphthalin," Dr. James Stewart, Montreal.

"Brief Remarks upon Fifty Cases of Trephining of the Mastoid," Dr. Reeves, Toronto.

The second day's proceedings opened shortly after ten o'clock, the president, Dr. Sullivan, of Kingston in the chair.

The minutes of the previous day's meeting having been read and confirmed,

Dr. MULLIN, of Hamilton, read the report of the Committee on Ethics, in which he recommended that any member not feeling himself in accord with the rules of the association should withdraw from it. He called attention to the reports appearing in the newspapers describing surgical

operations, etc., and deplored the frequency of such notices. The public had rights which should be respected, and since the illness of President Garfield it had been proved that they took great interest in the progress of the sickness of a public man. But he did not see the necessity of giving minute details and recording such operations as the removal of fingers or toes, with the name of the professional attendant, as likely to advance or benefit either the public or the profession. He also denounced the publication in the daily or weekly journals of the cards of regular practitioners. The tendency of professional advertising was increasing daily, but he believed that the general public would willingly take notice and advantage of any specialty in a practitioner without advertising.

Dr. BOTTSFORD (St. John, N.B.) moved that the report be received and placed in the hands of the Publishing Committee for publication.

Dr. DUPUIS said he could not, in justice to himself, allow this report to be adopted without saying a few words. When he asked certain questions at the last meeting of the association he was not aware that a medical code for Canada had been published. The reason he gave the press a *resume* of his remarks was that the Kingston *Daily News* had published a very incorrect report of them. He had asked whether it would not be as well to let notices of medical men's doings appear in the press, and his reason for putting this question, which gave so much offence, was that the papers were full of such reports. He could give an instance of a gentleman who had risen to eminence in the profession chiefly through frequent notices in the press. All he had sought was to bring this matter into discussion. If the association objected to any views of his, let it do so without repudiating the man and stigmatizing him as a freebooter. He had during his twenty-six years practice always endeavored to be bound by the principles of medical etiquette, and to do unto others what he would others should do unto him.

Dr. MULLIN said he would be very sorry to make any statement reflecting on any member of the association unless circumstances amply justified it. It was easy to see that Dr. Dupuis, in asking certain questions at the last meeting of the association, expected an affirmative answer and held affirmative views. He had then quoted the opinion of the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, who