

the two circulatory systems was quite free. Doubtless the peritoneal pouches referred to contained, when in the foetal condition, true liver tissue, which, in process of growth, diminished and retracted, so as to leave the pouches empty.

The physical condition of the twins was contrasted. Eng was well nourished, while Chang was emaciated. It was the opinion of Dr. Allan that Chang died of cerebral clot, and Eng probably of fright.

The band itself was composed of interlacing muscular and aponeurotic fibres passing across the median line and inserted into the ensiform cartilage of the opposite twin.

Such is a brief description of the nature of the connecting band of the twins. It shows that while a separation in life would not have been necessarily fatal, it would have been extremely perilous, and they did wisely in refusing to submit to it.

Should any further details of interest appear in our exchanges, we will duly inform our readers, but what we have given above, covers it seems to us, the most interesting point of their organization.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Letters have been received from:—Dr. Grange, Petrolia; Dr. Brownlow, Ogdensburg; Dr. Bower, Waddington, N. Y.; Dr. Malloch, Moose Factory; Dr. Bogart, Campbellford; Dr. Addison, Farmersville; Dr. Beith, Bowmanville; Dr. Flock, London; Dr. Woodruff, London; Dr. Aylwin, Quio; Dr. Holden, Belleville; Dr. Baxter, Cayuga; Dr. Clarke, Thurso; Dr. Gaboury, Rochester; Dr. Lapouette, Gentilly; Dr. Dann, North Augusta; Dr. Harkness, Matilda; Dr. Comfort, Campden; Dr. Brown, Winchester; Dr. Wickwire, Halifax; Dr. Anderson, Ormstown; Dr. McLaren, Ormstown; The Senate, Ottawa; Dr. Stevens, Dunham Flats; Dr. Bingham, Warsaw; Dr. Cluness, Sacramento, California; Dr. Morse, Amherst, Nova Scotia; Dr. Reed, Inverness; Dr. Bell, Dr. G. W. Campbell, Dr. Bowker, Dr. Godfrey, Dr. Barnes, Dr. Roddick, Montreal; Dr. Howard, St. Johns; Dr. Marsden, Quebec; Dr. Gilbert, Sherbrooke; Dr. Jones, Sherbrooke; Dr. McNiece, Robinson; Dr.——Levis; Dr. D. C. McCallum, Dr. Bull, Montreal; Dr. Duplessis, L'Avenir; Dr. Halliday, Grafton; Dr. Montizambert, Quebec; Dr. Fowler, Fergus; Dr. MacEwan, Carleton Place Junction; Dr. Dickson, Kingston; Dr. Aikins, Burnhamthorpe; Dr. Hingston, Dr. Angus McDonnell, Dr. Ricard, Montreal; Hon. Dr. McNeill Parker, Halifax; Dr. P. W.

Smith, Digby, N.S.; Dr. Alexander, Fergus; Dr. Law, Bond Head; Laval University, Quebec; Dr. Webber, Richmond; Dr. Abbott, Hochelaga; Dr. Danth, Coteau Landing; Dr. Battersby, Port Dover, O.

CHLOROFORM IN HEART DISEASE.

Dr. J. W. Poole has recently discussed whether the presence of heart disease, even when strongly marked, is necessarily a contra-indication to the administration of an anæsthetic. He believes that it is not. He has searched all the authorities at his disposal on this point, but does not find anything very definite on the subject. Without citing any of them, however, he says that most of those who take notice of it at all agree with the opinion he has expressed. If any anæsthetic be administered, which should it be, chloroform or ether? He answers, chloroform, for the following reasons: It is more quickly administered, and more manageable; it requires less to be given; it produces a less violent and protracted stage of excitement. He has seen chloroform administered for the dyspnoea of heart, disease, both by the stomach and by inhalation, with decided benefit, and without the least bad effect.

NEWSPAPER PUFFERY.

The repeated examples we receive of the publication of startling "operations" by or with the knowledge of the physician in attendance, seems to show that the insidious form of advertising is on the increase. Otherwise reputable practitioners favor it, and seek its benefits. It is every whit as objectionable as the most fulsome handbills or market crying. Its tendency is the same, to deceive the public and injure the general standing of physicians before the public.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We thank those who have responded so well to the accounts which were sent to all subscribers enclosed in our last number. Those who have not yet done so, will please remit at once. We have received a letter dated Levis, enclosing two dollars, for volume one, and requesting that the *Record* might be sent in future to that place, as the writer had moved thither. We have been unable to make out the signature, so cannot comply with the request, and do not know whom to credit with the amount. Write again, and make the signature plain.