

In a case of perforating appendicitis at Long Branch, two years ago, morphia administered by an able colleague was discontinued, chloroform substituted for twelve hours with intervals, until Dr. Wyeth arrived. The patient was not aware of his arrival, nor of the laparotomy performed on her until an hour afterwards. She made a good recovery. Ten years ago the belief had become all but unanimous that the only direction in which therapeutic effort was conducive to the patient's benefit lay in following the tendency of nature in each disease. *Vis medicatrix nature* is an old rallying cry of the profession, but one which did not gather many steadfast defenders. At one time a complete therapeutic Nihilism, emanating from the Vienna school, threatened to become its expression. But when the chemist evolved those potent therapeutic sledge-hammers which could beat down symptoms, the gentle hand-maiden Nature was thrust aside, and the patient was beaten down with the symptoms. To-day a reaction is happily setting in. Once more are heard warning voices that bid us follow Nature's prompting. To join these and to re-echo them in these halls, is the purport of my paper to-night. For instance, rest is the first prompting of nature in diseased conditions. What can be more simple and obvious than rest in inflammatory conditions? The surgeon puts an inflamed joint into a splint and trusts to nature, i.e., the restorative powers of the system to heal the disease. May not an acutely inflamed kidney be treated in a similar way? Its functions must go on, in this respect it differs from the inflamed point. But the intelligent physician, knowing that the chief function of the kidney is to eliminate urea, so arranges the patient's diet that this work is reduced to a minimum; knowing that other functions of the kidney may be vicariously taken up by the skin and bowels, he endeavors to utilise these vicarious eliminants for the purpose of relieving the inflamed organ from labor. And yet we find the contrary so often that I may be pardoned for emphasizing here the necessity, nay the duty, of doing in internal diseases what is so obvious and so successfully done in external diseases. Only recently I saw a case of acute nephritis with a well informed physician of ten years' graduation from a most exacting school, a hospital physician too, who treated the case with digitalis and acetate of potassium as diuretics, because the secretion was reduced to nineteen and a half ounces, paying no attention to the physiological aids which nature points out.

In acute conditions rest must be provided; in chronic conditions rest, judiciously alternated with gentle exercise of the functions of the diseased organs, is indicated, and will prove far more useful than medication. Let me not be understood, however, as despising the latter. There are few to whom I should be willing to yield independence

upon our well-tryed medicinal agents. But I spurn them if their action is based on empirical observation alone, the *ipse dixit* of one or more men.

Those medicines alone which evince their presence in the system by certain definite signs, have my confidence. When quinine is administered in sufficient doses to cinchonize the patient, I know, without fear of contradiction, that whatsoever effect is produced on the paroxysm may be attributed to it; when it is used in small doses three times a day, for so-called malaria, I spurn the remedy as I do the disease. True malaria will as surely yield to cinchonization before the paroxysm, as spurious malaria (the so-called civic or international malaria) will fail to yield to it. This much I may say positively, from a long experience on the banks of Southern rivers.

(To be continued.)

SHOULD EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS BE PROHIBITED BY LAW?

Under the above title, Dr. Armand Ruffer has published an article in the current number of the *Liberty Review*, in which he again discusses, "as dispassionately as possible, the morality and utility of experimentation on (living) animals." He thinks that "the storm of the last Church Congress has blown over," and that a time is therefore come for a calm survey of the results.

There were many physiologists who regarded the prospect of the debate at Folkestone with grave apprehension, and were disposed to think that experimentalists like Mr. Victor Horsley would be ill-advised if they threw down the glove in such an arena. It was feared that there would be no fitting tribunal to judge of the matter, perhaps not even a just moderator to ensure fair play; and that ill words might be spoken on both sides with little or no good result. In such a temper as this some eminent physiologists declined to be present, among them one whose experiments upon dead animals had been held up to execration as vivisection of the worst kind, and who to this day has not thought it worth while to publish any correction of the blunder. But they will have changed their minds; we now see that fierce words are not always mischievous, and that violent disputation does not always darken counsel. We confess that in the earlier years of the antivivisection crusade the physiologists had not carefully avoided all cause of offence in word; we thought some harm had been done at first by too polemical a tone on their part, and we still think so; but our opinions are modified. Their indifferent attitude towards the antivivisection party in later years we see was misinterpreted, not by thoughtful opponents, who were beginning to see in this