

period of our writing is said to be unusually large, a class approximating to, if not exceeding, that of last season is anticipated. We have understood that the the classes in the several medical schools of Upper Canada are this year unusually large. These open early in the month of October.

ALLEGED MAL-PRACTICE—JURY TRIAL—DAMAGES £200.

An important case has just been tried at Brantford, before Mr. Justice Richards, an action having been brought against Dr. E. T. Bown for alleged mal-practice in setting a fractured thigh. The damages were laid at \$4,000. A verdict for \$800 was obtained. As developed by the evidence, the facts of the case are these: On the 8th of March last a boy named Craig broke his thigh. After ten o'clock at night, Dr. Bown was sent for and immediately attended. Upon examination he found an oblique fracture of the thigh bone. Splints were applied, and an inclined plane to rest the limb upon was made. At the end of four weeks, less one day, he removed the splints, and took away the inclined plane, considering that, as Craig was a strong, healthy lad, sufficient time had elapsed to allow the fracture to mend. Upon this occasion, it does not appear from the evidence that anything was said about the thigh being "crooked." On the following morning, Dr. Bown again visited the patient, and found that the provisional "callous" had given way. The bandages were re-applied, and at the end of a month, the fracture having healed, they were taken off. It was then found, as the friends of the boy alleged, that the injured limb was crooked, and two inches and a half shorter than the other. Hence the action. A good deal of medical evidence was given—contradictory, of course. Dr. Scott, of Toronto, said the injured limb was two and a quarter inches short, Dr. Billings, of Hamilton, said it would require a boot one and a half inch thick to compensate the defect. Dr. Thomas Aikins of this city explained that the method of measuring adopted by the surgeons who had been called for the defence, was fallacious, that the extent of the contraction was really not more than an inch, and not less than three quarters of an inch. Dr. Lizars—a gentleman who for three years was demonstrator of anatomy in Edinburgh University—agreed in all particulars with Dr. Aikins. Upon the medical evidence the case rested, and so far as we are able to judge from the report, it is somewhat surprising, that in the face of the clear reasoning of Drs. Lizars and Aikins, the jury could have given in the verdict they did. The Doctor's case seems a hard one. Fortunately for him, his reputation is too well established to be injured by it.—*Toronto Globe*.

We quote the foregoing epitome of an extremely important trial from the *Toronto Globe*, as it exemplifies in a striking manner the readiness with which Juries mulct the unfortunate surgeons who may fall into their hands. We think we are not wrong in stating, that shortening of the leg, after fracture of the thigh bone, is an invariable concomitant of the accident, and that such a result will, almost as a matter of course, attend the practice, in such cases, of even the best surgeons of the day; and this is scarcely to be wondered at when the action of the powerful muscles of the thigh bone is brought into remembrance. We can see, in the above short narration, nothing for which Dr. Bown's treatment should be condemned, certainly nothing for which he should be made to suffer such heavy damages. We trust that his counsel has advised an appeal to a higher tribunal, whose decisions are less influenced by private feeling and a greater sense of justice. In England such a verdict, if circumstances enforced an acquiescence in it, would be met by a subscription of the profession generally in the sufferer's favour.