

operation, it appears by the evidence of that eminent surgeon, Dr. March, that he had been uniformly successful. But taking the results of operations by other surgeons, so far as reported, one fourth are *not* successful. It would not do, therefore, to hold up the responsibility of every surgeon in the land equal with that of one of the most eminent.

As to the manner in which the operation was performed, you have the evidence of the defendants, together with that of Mr. Birchfield. If the delay in the operation was caused by the plaintiff, and therefore the time was protracted, the plaintiff cannot recover for any injury caused by such acts of his own.

As to the care and attention after the operation, as I understand, no complaint was made; but, on the contrary, the care and attention were constant, and such as might be expected of a kind and careful surgeon.

I have already observed that, from the evidence, it appears that one fourth of such operations are not successful. The want of success is not necessarily want of skill.

Three fourths of the cases are successful; and if the plaintiff had been among the successful number, if his limb had been entirely restored, he might, like the lame man healed by the Apostle, have "ran and leaped with joy." That it was not successful, is undoubtedly a great misfortune to him. Whether it was the fault of the defendants, is for you to say by your verdict.

You must take this case, and determine it according to the evidence under your oaths.

In the case of Dr. Smith, it is claimed that he had nothing to do with the operation; that he was merely a looker-on, invited by Dr. Squire, as a simple act of courtesy; and that in point of fact he was not present until the operation was nearly completed, and when the chloroform was sent for. If you believe the evidence of the defendants on this point, of course you should render a verdict in his favor.

Then, if you find that this operation was not performed by Dr. Squire and Dr. Wey with ordinary skill, care and diligence, you should find a verdict for the plaintiff.

On the other hand, if you find that they did perform the operation with ordinary skill and care, and such as would be required of surgeons holding a responsible position in their profession, then your verdict should be in favor of the defendants.—*Boston Med. Jour.*

TORONTO MEDICO-CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY.

The Society held a meeting at the *Temperance Hall*, on Wednesday 23rd January, 1861, for the purpose of discussing the constitution. There were present: Drs. Hodder, Wright, Thorburn, Aikin, Lizars, Hall, Ogden, Bull, O'Dea, Lawlor, Agnew, Canniff, Emery, Howson, Augusta, &c.

Dr. Hodder took the chair. Dr. Bull acted as Secretary. After some discussion, the constitution submitted was adopted with few modifications.

At the first ordinary meeting of the Society held at the *Temperance Hall* on the evening of the 12th February, the election of Officers for the ensuing year was completed.

The following is a list of the Society's Officers for 1861:—

DR. HODDER,.....	<i>President.</i>
DR. WRIGHT,.....1st	<i>Vice-President.</i>
DR. THORBURN,.....2nd	<i>Vice-President.</i>
DR. CANNIFF,.....	<i>Treasurer.</i>
DR. BULL,.....	<i>Secretary.</i>
DR. O'DEA,.....	<i>Cor. Secretary.</i>

When the business of the evening was concluded, the President rose and delivered a very able inaugural address, in which he clearly described the duties and importance of Medical Societies in general, as well as the method by which the present growing one may be made of use both to the profession and the public. After the completion of the address, which was repeatedly and