EDITORIAL

OSTEOPATHY AND RIGHT TO PERFORM SURGICAL OPERATIONS.

The following judgment is of the utmost value at this moment, coming as it does from the highest court in the United States. It makes it clear that if any one chooses to style himself an osteopath, he must remain such, and cannot administer an anæsthetic and perform an operation. Osteopathy was founded to be and do certain things, and its members cannot at will be and do something else. We give the judgment as follows:

The Washington Supreme Court holds that the State Medical Act, Rem. & Bal. Code, Sections 8386-8407, regulating the practice of medicine, is constitutional, although Section 8391 provides that in order to practise medicine the applicant must be a graduate of a technical school whose requirements are not less than those prescribed by the Association of American Colleges for that year; its provisions not granting legislative functions to the association. The wisdom of a legislative restriction on the right to procure a certificate to practise medicine and surgery is a question for the Legislature and not for the court. Under these sections it is held that a graduate of a college of osteopathy authorized to practise osteopathy was not authorized to administer anesthetic and cut out a patient's tonsils with a knife. When tested by the definitions of osteopathy given by its founder, Dr. Still, about 1871, in the catalogues of colleges of osteopathy, and in standard dictionaries, which the court quoted at length, it was manifest that the practice of osteopathy as it was originally understood, and as it was understood at the time of the enactment of the Washington Medical Act (1909), did not sanction the internal administration of medicines or the surgical use of the knife as a means for curing diseases. "As founded, its principal tenet was the abandonment of these means of cure. A perusal of the successive catalogues of its schools will show that their teachings are