

I find that one gentleman, a very "Daniel come to judgment, has broadly accused me of dogmatism, while he himself was writing in the most dogmatic style, rushing wildly against all theories, believing he was demolishing all opinions by misrepresentation, boldly assuming the position, "I have spoken, let no dog bark," sweeping out low temperature, and ophthalmoscopic observations with one stroke of his pen.

The generous and hearty call made upon me, at the suggestion of my friend, Dr. Hingston, by the President and members of the Society at our last meeting, for a paper, encouraged me to write this one, which, for want of a better name, I have given the title of: Remarks on Division of Labor and the Etiology of Disease. Gentlemen, time works wonders, or, more properly speaking, nature, even though she takes time, works wonders by her laws, and in nothing is this more remarkable than the wonderful changes she produces in public opinion by the law of evolution. Nature is all in motion, she moves, and we, as an integral part of nature, must move with her,—we cannot help ourselves, onward we must go.

I remember well the time when, in this good city of Montreal, a medical man could not adopt a more certain course to get his professional brethren in arms against him than by selecting some specialty to which he would devote his time, and whatever talents he possessed. But what have we now? We have the profession recognizing the great natural law, division of labor, so that nine out of every ten of our medical men, no matter how clever they may be as general practitioners, take up some particular specialty, and upon this specialty the profession and the public look upon them as an authority. Now this division of labor it is that accounts for the rapid strides made in medical knowledge within the last quarter of a century, and this division of labor, I am happy to say, is not confined to our profession. Its necessity has been recognized by the agricultural, the mechanical, the commercial and trading classes,—and see the wonderful effects it has produced upon one, and all of these classes, and, consequently, upon our whole social system. Division of labor has given men time to think and reason, and a social evolution has been the result. I suppose that in the present day there are to be found but few intelligent men in the medical profession who do not recognise as a fact that, for all physical phenomena there must be physical cause.

We may not yet know what is substance, and perhaps we never will. We may not be even able to define matter in the abstract, and only know matter in the concrete by their properties and qualities, and from these to learn that all the worlds are matter; that the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms are matter; that matter is one, only differing in degree, and not in kind; and that matter, though changeable, is indestructible. By the properties and qualities of these concretes we know that all the phenomena we take cognisance of are physical phenomena, or are known to us only through material sources. We know that life in all its degrees, from potentiality in the germ to the biotic life in man, is only known to us as a physical phenomena; even what we call death is a physical phenomena—mind, thought, desire, emotions, impulses, and will, we only know as physical phenomena. All of nature's forces, whether recognised as chemical, mechanical, or physical motion, we only know as the phenomena of matter. In fact, all we know, or can treat of, is of the natural order, and materialistic. Guided by these facts the physical scientist has learned wherever he finds physical phenomena to look for the physical cause which has produced the physical effect; and he has found that all physical phenomena are dependent for their characteristics upon the physiology of the matter from whence the phenomena proceeds. Take the science of psychology, for an example, where we find, that all psychological phenomena is what the physiology of the mental organization makes it. If the phenomena be bad the physical organization is bad, it is either teratological or pathological, which affects its physiology; on the other hand, if the psychical phenomena be good it is because the mental organism is physiologically good, normal not abnormal,—so when we speak of a sane man we speak of a man with a normal physiological psychosis, and of an insane man we speak of a man with an abnormal physiological psychosis. Moreover we find that morphological analogies implies physiological analogies.

Now, by similar observations and the same mode of reasoning, we come to diagnose all diseases of the human frame. We find certain physical symptoms or phenomena, and we look for physical cause,—we look for abnormal physiology of parts, that is, we look for pathological defect to account for the physical symptoms or phenomena that present themselves. The pheno-