

**THE LEGAL LIABILITY OF HOSPITALS.**—On the 16th May the Court of Common Pleas of New York added another decision to the interesting question of the legal liability of hospitals. The question, in brief, is: Is a hospital corporation legally responsible for injury to a patient? In one case the suit was brought against the Manhattan Eye and Ear Hospital. The plaintiff's eye was operated upon at this institution, and he showed that the after-treatment was not of a proper character. As a result there was entire loss of sight from the eye. The first trial resulted in favor of the plaintiff; but the General Term of the Supreme Court reversed this decision, holding that no cause of action had been made out. The position of the court was this: Inasmuch as the corporation had exercised all proper care in the selection and appointment of the physicians of the institution, it, being a public charity, was not liable. To recover against the hospital it must be proved that there was an omission to exercise due care in the selection of the persons in its employment. In the case just decided the plaintiff's son was treated for an injury to his thigh, and owing to the alleged negligence of the surgeons of the institution, the Society of the New York Hospital, there was not a good recovery. The hospital authorities simply showed that they were a public charity, and that they had used all possible care to select competent physicians and surgeons. Upon this showing alone the court dismissed the complaint.—*New Orleans Med. and Surg. Journal.*

**RECOVERY AFTER TAKING A LARGE QUANTITY OF VERATRUM VIRIDE.**—Mr. A. was attacked on February 5th with severe epididymitis and orchitis. That night his brother came to me, saying that his fever was very high and that he was suffering a great deal of pain. I prescribed for him "tr. verat. virid. (Norwood's), fʒiv. Sig.: Two drops every half hour until perspiration is well established." The patient read the directions *two teaspoonfuls* every half hour, and took the first dose accordingly at 8.30 p.m. This he retained without any appreciable effect until 9.05 p.m., when he took the second dose of two teaspoonfuls. In about half an hour he "began to vomit, and became very weak," as he described himself. On the following morning I was called to see him, and having heard his story of how

he took the medicine, was more surprised to find him alive than that he was exceedingly weak and very pale. The heart was feeble but regular, and the respiration very nearly normal. A small quantity of whisky and infusion of digitalis were given, and the patient recovered without any unusual symptoms. The prescription was compounded by a reputable pharmacist, who assured me that he had dispensed the stronger tincture. The interest in the case centres in the remarkable fact of the patient's having retained so large a quantity of the drug for nearly an hour without any disastrous effects.—*James P. Tuttle, M.D., in New York Med. Journal.*

**ON THE DANGERS OF WASHING OUT THE STOMACH.**—In the current number of the London *Practitioner* there is a valuable and timely article by Dr. Soltan Fenwick, of London, on the dangers of washing out the stomach. After pointing out the usefulness of this therapeutic measure in suitable cases he deals with the dangers attending it, and the harmfulness arising from its employment in unsuitable cases. Twenty-five cases of convulsive seizures in chronic diseases of the stomach are collected, and in six of these the attacks were apparently brought on by the use of the stomach tube. Both general convulsive seizures and tetany may be brought about by any irritation other than by mechanical means of the gastro-intestinal canal, but in some cases reported by Dr. Fenwick it is impossible to eliminate the stomach tube as being the active factor. Tetany arising from gastric disturbance is very fatal, upwards of 60 per cent. proving fatal. A case of perforation of a gastric ulcer occurring immediately after the use of the stomach tube is reported. Hemorrhage from the use of the stomach pump is not uncommon in cases where there is at the time ulceration of the mucous membrane, as in carcinoma and chronic ulcer. *Montreal Medical Journal.*

**TRICHINOSIS OF THE TONGUE.**—A curious and interesting case, albeit somewhat difficult to understand, is recorded by Dr. Oitiz of Toire. The patient was a man, æt. 50, a robust countryman, with no history of syphilis nor of tuberculosis, who came for advice with an ulcerated growth of his tongue. The disease had been in