

semblances between the animal and vegetable world, and in very unsuspected directions. It has long been known that cholesterin, lecithin, nuclein, etc., occur in plants as well as animals; and Darwin's investigations of the sensitive plant seemed to indicate that it had the power of digesting animal bodies (insects); but what is of startling interest is the fact that very recently an English investigator has shown beyond doubt that in the papaw plant there is a ferment capable of acting in almost all respects like the *trypsin* of the pancreatic juice—*i.e.*, capable of changing albumen into peptone, leucin and tyrosin.

Thus more and more is being fulfilled the prediction (uttered in his public address of two years ago) of that great master, Hcppe-Seyler, that it would be found that animals and plants were, in their vital processes, more alike, fundamentally, than had been hitherto supposed.

Communication.

THE INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONGRESS.

To the Editors of THE CANADA MEDICAL & SURGICAL JOURNAL.

SIRS,—In the February number of the CANADA MEDICAL & SURGICAL JOURNAL I read an editorial reply to my letter as published in its January number in reference to the International Medical Congress of 1887, to be held in Washington, United States of America. To my sorrow, it breathes the same spirit as the article which called forth my letter. For some reason or other, your JOURNAL and other Canadian ones seem to have taken their cue from the defunct *Medical Times and Gazette* of London and some journals of the United States whose editors are not members of the American Medical Association, and some of whom have ignored its ethical requirements, and, consequently, cannot join in its consultations. Why you have adopted this course towards the action of so large an association as the A.M.A. I know not, and can only surmise. In fact, it is the largest representative society in the world, so far as figures show. I well know the strong affinity that exists between the Canadian profession and that of Great Britain, and I am not surprised that the London meeting of the International Medical Congress should be considered by you as the perfection of excellence, but, strange to say, no allusion to the Copenhagen Congress or its precedents, and the illustrious men who composed these congresses. Can you show me, in any instance, where the American medical journals used their influence to make them failures, even if their friends did not "roost on the highest pole" or any one of the American profession.

If I am correctly informed, there were jealousies and internal bickerings in the English profession in the organization of the London Congress, in which "science" had no part, and many men as illustrious as those who were made prominent were left in the cold and took back seats. Did the American medical profession try to make the chasm wider, and to dictate who were right and who were wrong? You say