every surgeon favored supra-pubic cystotomy rather than the perineal operation for stone in the bladder. The only objection raised against supra-pubic cystotomy was the difficulty of drainage. The objections against the perineal operation for stone in the bladder are shock to the system from cutting the bladder where the nerve supply is the greatest, of danger of cutting important structures, and of dangerous immediate and subsequent hæmorrhage.

The effect of abdominal section on the action of the kidney was freely discussed. I can remember that, years ago, the celebrated Fothergill called the attention of the profession to the fact that men should be careful to observe the real function of the kidney before surgical procedures were applied, and he noted cases in which the kidneys were not working right in which he advised that no operation should be performed, but in those very cases his advice was neglected and operation occurred, followed by death. As gynecologists we have learned to day that Fothergill was right, but also we think that operations on the *peritoneum* have special dangers in relation to the kidney. I am thoroughly convinced that surgical procedures on the peritoneum are more efficacious in morbidly disturbing the kidney secretion than on almost any other bodily organ. Whether the effect lies in the wounding of the rich and even luxuriant peripheral nerve apparatus which lies thickly scattered in the wall of the peritoneum, I am not prepared to say.

Dr. Foxwell said that he had studied the matter from two points. He said that he had finally satisfied himself that albumen was not a very reliable standard to go by, and especially a single examination of the urine was useless to indicate when the operations could be performed safely. He thought that the best standard to indicate whether abdominal section should be performed was the amount of *urea* secreted daily. He said that abdominal section should not be performed with less urea secreted than 200 to 160 grains daily.

Mr. Bennett May observed that it was especially necessary to observe the rules of the secretion of urea in kidney extirpation, as one might remove the very kidney which contained about all the secreting substance that the patient possessed.

Mr. Tait thought that the rules relative to albumen and urea were more important in kidney extirpation than other abdominal sections, but he was quite anxious to secure definite laws with regard to the amount of substances secreted by the kidney that would indicate abdominal sections with safety.

Mr. Langley Browne showed several large stones removed by perineal operation from the bladder, and some kidneys which were largely filled in the pelvis with numerous and large calculi.

Dr. Christopher Martin, assistant to Mr. Lawson Tait, demonstrated some specimens of abdominal tumors which had been rotated on their pedicle. Dr. Martin showed one that was gangrenous from the twist in the pedicle, and which was successfully removed by Mr. Tait. He showed another tumor which had a pedicle twisted like an umbilical cord, but which was not strangulated. The rotation had not progressed far enough to mechanically occlude the vein or artery. This tumor was also successfully removed by Mr. Tait. The tumor which was strangulated had occurred in Dr. Martin's practice. Dr. Martin examined the woman and found a tumor in the abdomen, and he was called to see her three days after, when he found the tumor had increased to double the size. She was then very sick. The sudden increase of the tumor induced the diagnosis of axial rotation of a tumor with hæmorrhage into it. Mr. Tait was called in consultation with Dr. Martin, when it was decided to remove the tumor. The above named gentlemen operated, and found the tumor twisted on its pedicle and gangrenous. The woman made an easy recovery.

Birmingham, Eng., Feb. 2, 1891.

DOMESTIC CORRESPONDENCE.

Did a Majority of the Board of Trustees Vote for the Removal of the Journal to Washington?

To the Editor:—The general impression seems to have gone abroad that the *majority* of the Board of Trustees were in favor of the removal of THE JOURNAL to Washington. If I am not mistaken this is not in accordance with the facts. If I am mistaken I desire to be corrected.

As I understand, Dr. Garcelon, of Maine, was not present at the Washington meeting of the Trustees, and was not represented by proxy. Dr. Moore was represented by proxy directed to Dr. Hooper, the President of the Board, but without an expression of preference. The same of Dr. Dawson, of Ohio. Of the six members present I understand that Dr. Hamilton, of D.C., Dr. Love, of Missouri, and Dr. Shoemaker, of Pennsylvania, were *in favor of immediate removal*; that Dr. Hollister of Illinois, was opposed to removal; that Dr. Nelson, of Tennessee, was in favor of submitting the question to the Association, and that the President, Dr. Hooper, of Arkansas, would favor the removal to Washington provided it was the expressed wish of the majority of the members of the Association.

If my information is correct it certainly cannot be affirmed that a majority of the Board are in favor of removal!

H. MARTYN SCUDDER, M.D.

Chicago, Ill.