

of toads, the blood of frogs and rats, fibres of the hangman's rope, and ointment made from the body of gibbeted criminals." For myself I would prefer the simpler methods of the British Columbia Medicine-man. Cures effected by relics, by pilgrimages and sacred observances obscured the horizon, while even the Divine Right of Kings gave the world the blessings of the Royal touch for King's Evil. All these practices were injurious to the development of medical science, for "why should men seek to build up scientific medicine and surgery when relics, pilgrimages and sacred observances, according to an overwhelming mass of concurrent testimony, had cured hosts of sick folk in all parts of Europe?" But finally the tide turns. The discoveries of Galileo, Kepler and Newton had their reflex on the sister science of medicine, and investigators made bold to pry into the secrets of life and learn her vital processes, to seek the true causes of disease and endeavor to find the cure. Relapses have occurred. As fanatics opposed the introduction of the fanning-mill because it infringed on the divine prerogative, which furnished the wind to winnow the wheat from the chaff, similarly, opposition arose to the introduction of inoculation, vaccination and the use of anesthetics. And as supernatural agencies were invoked to cure diseases supposed to be of supernatural origin, so to-day we have the various sects of faith-healers, magnetic healers and what not.

But, as Carlyle says, "Only what is true will persist. Out of the merciless fire of modern criticism truth, like asbestos, will come forth purified; but vain theories, gaseous, will be dissipated among the waste winds forever."

But where do we stand to-day? Have the fogs all lifted and do we now see clearly? Unfortunately not. Investigators to-day are not numbered by tens but by hundreds, pursuing many diverse threads of thought, and giving to the world their conclusions, fully formed or immature, probable or fantastic, relevant or irrelevant.

The search for the causes of disease still continues as actively as ever, but disappointments are far more numerous than successes. Concerning sarcomata, Stimson, in this month's *Annals of Surgery*, says: "We are absolutely in the dark as to etiology, and no further advanced in prognosis and treatment than were our colleagues a quarter of a century ago."

Dr. Snow, Chief of the London Cancer Research Committee, has come to almost identical conclusions regarding carcinoma. As regards these two classes of diseases, we are, therefore, forced to be content, at present, with increased ability to diagnose them,