

Cormac and others with similar results to those above mentioned. Amputations, excisions and operations for necrosis have been successfully performed, not a drop of blood appearing in the wound during the entire period of the various operations. This plan of operation seems admirably adapted to cases in which the system has been much reduced by previous disease and where the loss of even a small quantity of blood may prove destructive of the patient's life. By thus husbanding the vital fluid the patient is in a much more favorable condition for rapid recovery after the operation, than when it is conducted in the ordinary way, with the necessary loss of more or less blood, and consequent diminution of the vital forces of the body. It is a valuable improvement and cannot fail to come into general use, and the profession owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Esmarch for bringing it so prominently under their notice. The only exceptional cases in which it might be dangerous to apply the elastic bandage are those where amputation is performed for gangrene, or where septic abscesses exist. In these instances some of the poisonous material might be forced into the circulation and be attended with disastrous results. The plan of Esmarch will be found very suitable for the removal of vascular tumors when situated in the extremities, and especially when surrounded by important vessels. The profuse hemorrhage by which the various steps of the operation are usually much obscured will in this way be almost wholly avoided, and the safety and expedition of the operation greatly facilitated. We hope soon to hear of its being tried by some of our own surgeons, when we will be in a better position to speak positively as to the results.

ALLEGED MALPRACTICE—NONSUIT.

At the late assizes in St. Catharines, an action was brought against Drs. Cross and Downey to recover damages for alleged maltreatment of a case of fracture of the forearm. The plaintiff (Theal) received a fracture of both radius and ulna about the middle third, by being thrown from a raggon. The fractured arm was adjusted by Drs. Cross and Downey in the usual way, and the patient sent home, some distance from town, and was told to come in occasionally. This he did at

first in an irregular way, but soon ceased, and from want of care on the part of the plaintiff some displacement took place during the process of consolidation, and the result was a slight degree of angular deformity. He had very good use of the arm, pronation and supination being quite perfect, and he returned to his occupation (a boiler maker.) Some particular friend seeing the case told him that there was more deformity than there should have been and that there was good cause for action. He immediately discovered that he could not use the arm so well, and went about till the time of trial with a quasi helpless arm. At the trial the plaintiff gave his testimony by which he tried to make it appear that the Drs. were guilty of neglect and unskilful treatment. His wife and brother-in-law were also examined with a view to support the evidence of the plaintiff.

Dr. Lemon, also called by the plaintiff, said that Theal called upon him; did not examine the arm carefully, but said it was a poor job; had since examined it more carefully and still thought it a poor job; there was greater deformity than usual in a simple fracture of the forearm; the bones were not now in apposition; had lately measured the arm and found $\frac{3}{4}$ ths of an inch shortening; there had been imperfect treatment by somebody; the result showed this; had treated over a dozen fractures of these bones, mostly green-stick fractures (!) After fracture the arm is not always perfectly straight; but he had had no shortening in his own practice. If the bones are properly set they will remain so in this kind of fracture. In this case he believed that had the Drs. adopted the usual course there ought to be a better result.

Dr. Berryman, called—had seen a good deal of surgery at the Toronto hospital; would not put up a fracture immediately; when both bones of forearm are broken thinks it a good result when there is supination and pronation; thinks this a crooked little affair; the only point, he believed was, that it was said the arm was not examined for three weeks.

Dr. Mack was next called—plaintiff came to his office and said he had something to show him; he demanded his fee before he looked at it; then said he could not say whether the treatment had been proper or not; cannot say there was any want of skilfulness; but the result is unusually