

ensuing Parliament, not only to secure an act of incorporation for itself, but at the same time to abolish the acts which have given a legal status to the Homœopaths and the Thompsonians or Eclectics, as they arrogantly term themselves. Of one thing the profession in Upper Canada may be assured, that unless some steps are taken during the next Parliament to effect these objects, it will become the duty of the profession of the Lower Province to obtain the abolition of the act which entitles the Licentiates of the one province to practice in the other, or more technically the act 4 and 5 Vic. cap. 41. This will have to be done in self defence, and we feel assured that there is not a right-minded practitioner of the Upper Province who can raise an objection to such a proceeding.

 DR. CADWELL.

MALPRACTICE CASE IN CHICAGO—VERDICT OF \$10,000, AGAINST DR. CADWELL.

A case of considerable interest and importance has been before the Superior Court, Judge Goodrich presiding, for several days past, in which a Miss Julia Farrell was plaintiff, and Dr. Cadwell, an eye and ear doctor of this city, defendant. The suit was predicated upon the eye of the defendant. The facts in the case are substantially as follows: The plaintiff was a servant girl at the City Hotel, and averred in her declaration that, on the 13th of July 1860, she went to Dr. Cadwell to have a white spot upon her left eye removed. This spot was a scar caused by an ulcer in her early childhood. She averred that the defendant assured her that he could remove the spot and make the eye look as well as the right one; that the operation would not hurt her; that it would not impair the condition of the right eye; and that she could engage in her usual employment in six or seven days. She consented to the operation, and advanced the physician \$30. During the operation he transfixed the spot with a needle, drew it out and cut it off, thereby letting out the aqueous humours of the eye and destroying its sight. Subsequently she took cold, and her right eye became inflamed and painful, and he poured into it certain destructive and inflammable drops, thereby destroying its sight also. She averred that his treatment was unskilful, and that he did not use proper care and diligence, and that, for want of such she took cold and thereby lost her sight, and that in the operation upon the left eye, he knew that he could not remove the spot without the loss of the eye. The defendant, on the other hand, set forth that the plaintiff came to him for the express purpose of having the left eye so treated that an artificial eye might be inserted, and that her loss of sight was solely attributable to her own negligence. A critical examination of the injured organ was held before the jury, during the trial, in which several of our best and most experienced surgical professors took part, and it undoubtedly resulted unfavourably to the defendant's interests, otherwise the verdict would have been more to his liking. The case was given to the jury, after a long and ably conducted examination on Wednesday night, with directions to return a sealed verdict, which was done yesterday morning, fixing damages for Miss Farrell at \$10,000. A motion for a new trial and an arrest of judgment was immediately made by the counsel for the defendant.—*Chicago Times*.

Dr. Cadwell is well known in this city, which he left for reasons best known to himself. In fact we well remember that he gave himself out as having been connected with an Ophthalmic Hospital in New York, which had no existence save in his own imagination, a statement which we felt it our duty to expose in a number of the old series of this Journal.

The case above alluded to would appear to have been one of Albugo, or more probably Leucoma, for the latter of which Dieffenbach has recommended excision. This appears to have been the operation which he attempted to perform, and he