

the morbid change? A speaker at a late Ohio State medical society thus speaks of the position of bacteriology. He says, "We have a pathology of the zymotic diseases which is scientific and conformable to the true spirit of induction. But it falls in my way to-day to say that it is not at all to the credit of our craft that the old credulity breaks out anew with every announcement of bacteriology. Greedy gulping acceptance of improved or half proved facts in bacteriology is the disgrace of the day. Most of us have been obliged to change front three times on the bacteriology of diphtheria, and it is as certain as death and taxes that we shall play the jumping-jack through future years if we do not, after the manner of scientific men, receive valuable hypotheses as hypotheses."

Now, we are here as an association of scientific men and only too anxious to avail ourselves of the researches of others, and far be it from me to appear to make little of what has been done in this field; but I do wonder if the good results reported from agents, that I will mention hereafter, are not in a great measure due to other, even if allied causes. Have not better hygienic conditions as much or more to do with the general improvement in health and eradication of disease as these new agents used and vaunted? However, that the profession think these substances play no little part in curing ills of the flesh may be gathered from this one fact. I pick up half a dozen copies of a New York medical paper lying before me and note the remedies used that are formed from animal tissues or secretions. Verily, it is astonishing; they are as follows: Anti-cholera serum, ovarine and ovarian juice in the treatment of chlorosis; splenic extract in therapeutics; the antitoxine treatment of diphtheria; the injection of erysipelas toxins in malignant growths; the use of anti-streptococcus serum in hæmorrhagic septicæmia; injections of serum in cholera infantum; the thyroid treatment in the idiopathic tetany of children; medicinal hæmoglobin. Is that not enough? These subjects are taken out of exactly half a dozen numbers of one journal. Does it not look as if we were about to revert, if not to cannibals, at least to being able to supply our medical wants, if not from our fellows, at least from animals on which we feed? What is the superior virtue of thyroid extract to that of a well cooked sweet bread? Why will not liver and bacon supply that hepatic substance—'tis not yet called hepatine. Gentlemen, is it not a scientific joke, or are we really coming to the time when we can go to the butcher instead of the apothecary or doctor for our medicine?

The *Presse Medical* for August 15th, publishes a paper presented by MM. Spellman and Etienne, on the subject of "Ovarine and Ovarian Juice in Chlorosis." Their reasoning is interesting and results fortunate. They said, "If chlorosis is a disease of the ovaries, their function was changed or abolished, and with the suppression of menstruation, chlorosis appeared, and, on the other hand, a defective general condition interfered with and impeded recovery of the ovarian gland. If, however, the internal ovarian secretion was restored to the organism in any way, it was possible, perhaps, to stop the intoxication, to influence the organism in general, and to afford a means of