

he knows to be under the care of another doctor."

A further rule prescribes that no physician shall himself assume any special designation of therapeutic method, such as homœopath, electropath, hydropath, or countenance those who do so.

Again, "A physician shall have no interest in a secret medicine, and that he shall always, when called upon by the college, disclose every part of the composition of his medicines."

"If it shall at any time hereafter appear or be made known to the president or censors that any fellow or member of the college has obtained admission into the college, or that any licentiate of the college has obtained the license of the college by fraud, false statement, or imposition, or that any fellow, member or licentiate has been guilty of any great crime or public immorality, or has acted in any respect in a dishonorable or unprofessional manner, or has violated any statute, by-law, or regulation of the college, relating to fellows, members or licentiates as the case may be, the president and censors may call the fellow, member, or licentiate so offending before them, and having investigated the case, may admonish or reprimand, or inflict a fine; or if they deem the case of sufficient importance, may report the case to the college, and thereupon a majority of two-thirds may declare such fellow or member or licentiate to be no longer a fellow, member, or licentiate, as the case may be, and his name shall be expunged."

Let us consider now those restrictions which operate to forbid a medical practitioner to consult with "homœopaths," and of which the wisdom has been by some disputed. We do not believe, and we cannot appreciate the medical capacity or fitness to undertake the treatment of disease of those who hold that drugs which given internally will produce certain symptoms of disease are the appropriate remedies for those maladies. For instance, medicines which produce skin reddening for erysipelas, leucorrhine for leucorrhœa; syphiline for syphilis. We do not agree that all chronic maladies arise from syphilis, sycosis or itch, and that medicines act with an intensity proportionate to the infinite diminution of the dose; or that there is any utility in prescribing, in accordance with these

principles, say a decillionth of a grain, when we all know that a dose so small, if taken by every being on the globe once a minute would not finish the grain in a thousand years. Nor again, do we believe that the activity of medicine increases in the ratio of the number of shakes given to the vessel containing it. We hold that we have nothing in common with those who assume to base their practice and theory on this kind of therapeutics. Being well assured that these methods and this theory are absolutely delusive, the negation of reason and the acme of folly, it would be useless, deceptive, and contrary to good faith and the public interest that we should pretend to consult with those who profess them and who take a designation derived from them, and to cover with the respectability of logical science what they are pleased to term their system of treatment. Faith curing, it may be, but in that too we can take no part under false pretences.

But then it is said, What if the physician or surgeon of good standing is only called in by the homœopath to assist in diagnosing the nature, the stage, the complications, or name of the disease? Ought he not to give this help for the patient's sake? The answer is, the physician is a healer; not a reader of riddles nor a conner of conundrums. He is there not to give a name to symptoms or pathological conditions, but to heal the patient; and if he knows that his solution of the riddle is not to be followed by a method of treatment which he considers capable of attaining that result, he would be infamously wrong, and he is always wrong when he gives the cover of his accepted position, of his recognized ability, and of his professional sanction, to what becomes under such circumstances a dangerous farce or a deliberate fraud. The riddle is read, but the patient is none the better.

But it is said, May a regular medical practitioner not be called in to perform a difficult surgical operation? If a surgical operation meant only cutting, sawing, and sewing, it would be a plausible excuse for the surgeon accepting the responsibility of acting as sawbones to a quack. But there is no surgical operation which does not in its preliminary stages, and may not in its various phases and sequelæ, require concomitant medical consideration and treat-