The best treatment was the proto-ioduret of mercury. The stomach bore this well in general. Sometimes it gave rise to a little diarrhœa, which was an easy thing to moderate; but when the stomach was not tolerant of the remedy, one capital treatment was that which Mr. Acton had told them he had confidence in—namely, rubbing-in. If this were not an unpleasant and disagreable operation, certainly it would be in general about the best; he himself should prefer it. In rubbing-in, the action of the remedy was powerful and quick, and the stomach was not at all troubled with it. If it were not so disagreable, and were a thing that could be done without being noticed, he should give it the preference. However, there were cases in which the skin was otherwise affected, in which there was a skin disease, and then friction could not be used. In a case of complication of syphilis and herpes rubbing-in could not be resorted to. In general, patients bore the iodide of potassium well, and in large doses. For his own part he frequently employed forty, sixty, eighty, even a hundred grains a day, and more. They must bear in mind that if they gave too small doses to some patients they would have no result; it was a remedy that passed through the body with great rapidity. He had great experience of it, and he had found that in half an hour it had passed away in the urine. Iodide of potassium was a sort of broom of the blood. So they saw that the methodical treatment was this: mercury, iodide of potassium. But only one for the first stage, and only the other for the later stage of syphilis? No, the rule was absolute that as long as there were secondary symptoms well marked, mercury must be given; when there was a mixture of secondary and tertiary symptoms, mercury and iodide; for tertiary symptoms, iodide. To treat some patients with iodide would not advance them in any way. Why? Because there was frequently in the constitution, in the blood, something of the second stage, something that required the mercurial treatment. This might not show itself, but when iodide of potassium ceased to do good, the disease remaining stationary, let them go back to mercury again. and they would have a splendid result where they had thought there was no further possibility of curing the patient. This was what Mr. Acton had said, and he was completely and absolutely of Mr. Acton's opinion. But there was another thing. When syphilis had lasted for a long time, and had a great effect on the constitution, it in some way disappeared, and left the patient with a complication existing that was not existing before. Sometimes a long course of treatment brought on a new disease—wasting of the constitution, poorness of blood. They must then stop all the specific treatment, and applying themselves to the principal symptom, restore the constitution by preparations of iron, bark, tonics, and proper food, so bringing the patient to the possibility of undergoing anew a regular methodical treatment, either by mercury or iodide, or a combination of these two remedies. In former times, when a person was thought to be syphilitic, physicians seemed unable to entertain any other idea than that of syphilis, and acted exclusively against a specific disease, neglected everything else, and in that way they experienced all the bad effects and accidental symptoms which a bad administration of the symptoms would produce. Mr. Acton had spoken of the use of bromide of potassium. His views were exactly the same as Mr. Acton's with respect to the use of the remedies at different stages, the necessity of having regard to the complications that might exist, and of dropping the treatment for a while till the constitution was restored. This was regular and methodical, and his own manner of practice. But now, was bromide of potassium an anti-philitic remedy? He did not believe that it was. He might be mistaken; but he had experimented with it in syphilitic symptoms, and without any apparent result. But it was a splendid remedy in complications of syphilis. In some cases of symptoms referable to the nervous centres, bromide of potassium was an adjunct, and came to the help of mercury or the treatment by iodine. In some cases of brain disease with syphilis, and of disease of the spine or epilepsy, bromide of potassium did wonders. So that they would see it was a remedy to be applied in nervous complications that might occur, but they must not depend on it as an anti-syphilitic remedy. Now, there were symptoms following syphilis which were not syphilitic, and these must not be treated with mercury or iodide of potassium. For instance, there might be necrosis. Well, they could not bring a dead bone back to life, no matter what quantity of mercury or iodide of potassium they might give. A physician must know these things, and he (Mr. Ricord) ought almost to apologise for bringing them forward. It should be observed that specific remedies did not always act specifically. Certainly, there was no specific effect without a specific cause, but specific causes did not always act specifically. So there were some effects of syphilis, such as disease of the bones, that would afterwards act as a common irritant. In syphilis there might be an ulcerated bone in the nose or mouth, bringing on suppuration; mercury or potassium would not remove that, but let the diseased bone be removed, and the patient was frequently cured. They must take note of all these conditions—the nature of syphilis, the manner in which it conducted itself, its action on the constitution. Let them particularly take note that the general law of syphilis was the same as the general law of small-pox, vaccine, and measles. If they were sure of this from what he had said and from their own experience, then they might be sure that syphilis could be perfectly, radically cured. They could tell their patients that, and give them courage and hope. If the patient had courage to go through with the treatment, and the physician had courage enough to stick to it, the patient might be radically cured. He thanked them for the reception they had given him; it reminded him a little of his hospital in Paris.

A question was asked whether Dr. Ricord was a believer in salivation.

Dr. Ricard replied—No, surely not. Salivation was an accident following the treatment, and it must be avoided as much as possible. There was but one case in which he approved of salivation, and that