

Dr. Babington, of Halifax, N.S., being present, was invited to take part in the discussions.

Dr. Ferguson, was then called on to read his paper on "The Local Origin of Cancer." *in which he* The object of the paper was to show that cancer arises as a local disease, and from some form of irritation or injury.

Dr. D. Clarke, in discussing this paper expressed the opinion that only the tendency to it, not cancer itself can be transmitted from parent to child. The same remark applies to all other diseases—no actual disease descends.

Dr. Cameron, asked if Dr. Clarke considered the statement just made correct in regard to syphilis.

Dr. Clarke replied in the affirmative.

Dr. Oldright, considered that the hereditary tendency to cancer and to syphilis could not be compared. While the essayist had held that cancer only comes by irritation, no one will pretend that syphilis is thus caused. He also referred to the fact that some authorities now hold peculiar ideas in regard to non-malignant tumors. Many now admit the possibility of secondary growths resulting from them. *A* case in point was given. If this view were admitted, one of the most important points of difference between malignant and non-malignant tumors was removed.

Dr. Cameron suggested that in a case such as mentioned, the tumor was sarcomatous.

Dr. McPhedran pointed out that the essayist had given the irritation of menstruation as a cause of uterine cancer. How did he account for cancer of the cervix, its mucous membrane not being shed at menstruation?

Dr. Ferguson considered that the irritation of engorgement was sufficient to account for it.

Dr. McPhedran could not agree with this explanation.

Dr. Cameron said that uterine cancers in virgins are found in the body, those of mar-

ried females in the cervix usually. In the main he agreed with the opinions expressed in the paper just read.

Dr. George Wright mentioned the case of an unmarried female, the hymen being perfect, in which the cancer was cervical. He could not agree with Dr. Ferguson's paper. ~~He still holds~~ the theory of a cancerous diathesis. ~~How can the fact of a blow~~ producing cancer in one and an equal injury resulting negatively in another, be accounted for, except by such a theory?

Dr. Ferguson.—Because there is greater power of resistance in one than in the other. But repeat the blow sufficiently often, and cancer will be the result.

Dr. Goverton could not agree with Dr. Ferguson's views.

Dr. Macfarlane remarked on the curious fact that a prominent citizen of Toronto had smoked for forty years without developing cancer, while that gentleman's father had never smoked, yet had been operated on for epithelioma.

Dr. Reeve held that sarcomata may be successfully removed. He would insist on the early removal of all doubtful growths. The notion held by some that the removal of a tumour causes secondary growths is entirely erroneous.

At the close of the discussion the chairman announced that next meeting would be devoted to cases in practice, pathological specimens, etc.—Adjourned.

Midwifery.

RUPTURE OF UTERUS.—While referring to the subject of obstetrics, it may be of interest to recall two cases of rupture of the uterus which have occurred in Braun's wards during the past three weeks. In both instances the patients were brought to the hospital in a state of collapse some time after the accident. In the first case (a neglected transverse presentation) the foetus had partially escaped into the abdominal cavity. Turning and extraction were promptly effected, and two large drainage tubes were introduced into the cavity.