

one of pneumonia for which such treatment would be most injurious. Or, take another case. A person is seized with a severe pain in the abdomen and sends for a chiropractor, who may proceed to treat some displacement of the spinal column. The case is one of acute appendicitis. Time is lost and there is grave risk that a life may also be lost under such a method of treatment, carried out on such an erroneous diagnosis. Or, again, take a case of Diphtheria, Scarlet Fever, or Smallpox, where it is so important that a correct diagnosis in the interest of other people be made at once. Here the value of diagnosis is supreme. But to put this matter beyond all doubt, turn to page 34 of Mr. Justice Hodgins' Report, and read what he says on the question of diagnosis:

"Ability to make a correct diagnosis is therefore the primary end of all good medical education. Diagnosis does not necessarily end when a decision has been reached as to the particular disease to be combated, for it continues during the treatment to operate with regard to each successive phase of the case. It is as vital in realizing the effect of the treatment, in detecting each manifestation of what are called complications, and in recognizing progressive improvement or the reverse, calling for a continuance or a modification of the particular treatment. In this aspect it becomes part of and is partially merged in the method of healing employed."

To be able to make a correct diagnosis one must have received a thorough training in anatomy, physiology, pathology, and bacteriology; and this must be followed up by long and intensive training at the bedside of the sick. On this point, note the words of Dr. L. F. Barker, Professor of Medicine in Johns Hopkins Medical Faculty, Baltimore. Here they are:

"Even the representatives of the medical sects admit that the work of the first two years of the Medical School in the pre-clinical sciences should be the same for all medical students. But why should there be any departure from the scientific method when the work of the clinical subjects of diagnosis and therapy are approached at the middle of the medical student's course? There is only one great science of medicine, just as there is one science of chemistry, one science of physics, and one science of biology. We hear nothing of sects in physics or of sects in chemistry. Nor should we, in my opinion, hear anything any longer of sects in medicine." (See page 35, Justice Hodgins' Report.)

These weighty opinions from Justice Hodgins and Professor Baker, opinions that could be multiplied many times over, should finally set at rest the claims of Osteopaths, Chiropractors, and all such sects to legislative recognition. On the subject of creating further divisions among those entitled to treat people, Justice Hodgins, on pages 34 and 35, remarks thus: