

would be seriously considered. The enthusiasm was uproarious, and speaker after speaker thundered on the outrage of taking the meeting from Niagara Falls and the west, and giving it to a "Foreign City." It required a counted vote to decide the matter, Niagara Falls finally winning by a close vote. We accomplished a good deal this trip to Washington, and Montreal (we cannot say Canada, Toronto was not represented) was never so prominent in the eyes of Homœopathic America. A grateful tribute to Canada was the naming of Dr. A. R. Griffith as Chairman of the Bureau of Obstetrics, one of the highest honors the Institute bestows, and one worthily earned by the energetic and clever Montreal representative.

It would cost \$1200 to entertain the Institute in Montreal, and it lies with the friends of Homœopathy to say whether or not they would like this, the oldest and in some respects the most important medical body on the continent, to meet here in 1902. Backed by such assurance, we feel certain that a second presentation of Montreal's attractions would not be unfruitful. From the opposition speakers we learned the interesting fact that Montreal was 24 hours away from Niagara Falls.

If worked up in time Montreal will get the Institute in 1902. When we mention that there were 1500 delegates, each spending from \$15 to \$20 per day, the financial advantage to our city is manifest.

Meeting, affiliated with the Institute, are the large number of specialists connected with the Surgical, Gynecologic, Laryngological, Ophthalmological and Otalgological Societies, making in all about 2000 men. It would certainly open the eyes of our "Friends the Enemy."

The peculiar nature of this meeting made the social element predominate, and between Musicals, Receptions, Excursions to Mt. Vernon, Glen Echo, Cabin John and the sights of the Capital, the bodies of us were fairly tired out. Yet with all these things, the scientific aspect in the sectional meetings and discussions well repaid the trip.

H. M. PATTON.

Chandra Pal, a Hindoo, after visiting Chicago, said he was glad he was not a Christian. Whether this is a reflection on Chicago, or a compliment, is a question for debating societies.

SOME DEFINITIONS EMPHASIZED

To the Editor of The Record:

SIR,—The following is the *authorized definition* of a Homœopathic Physician of the American Institute of Homœopathy: "A Homœopathic Physician is one who adds to his knowledge of Medicine a special knowledge of Homœopathic Therapeutics. All that pertains to the great field of medical learning is his, by tradition, by inheritance, by right."

I would suggest that this definition should be published in the "Record" during the space of, say, one year, that they who run may read.

Were this definition more widely known there would be less misunderstanding.

I would also point out that at the 1899 meeting of the American Institute, it was resolved

"That the American Institute of Homœopathy reaffirms the Rule of Practice upon which Homœopathy is based, in substance and form as delivered by Hahnemann himself, namely, *Similia Similibus Curentur*, and that this form be employed in all official papers of the Institute.

"Resolved, that a general adoption of this rendering is earnestly recommended."

Similia Similibus Curantur is usually translated, though inaccurately,—likes are cured by likes— a dogmatic and unscientific assertion.

Similia Similibus Curentur translated signifies, Let likes be treated by likes, a phrase which merely advises a certain rule of practice.

As Dr. Hughes has said: "In the present state of our knowledge I think it wise to state our principles as a rule of Art rather than as a law of Science."

I am,

Yours very truly,

EDGAR A. GRAFTON, M.D.

6 Phillips Place, Montreal, July 1, 1900.

Prof. Blufal says: Discard the old and dirty poultice, a remnant of somber ages. Absorbent cotton gauze, soaked in hot water and covered with protective, is clean, will remain warm just as long, is more easily prepared, and more pleasant to the patient.—Jour. Surg.