

that little is given to the unostentatious progress that medicine has made—a progress, let me say, with all due respect to the surgeon, greater than that made by surgery in the last thirty years.

Now, a comparison of the advances in physiology and pathology for the last thirty-five years shows that in both there has been an immense acquisition of knowledge, and that in each decade the increase has been made in arithmetical, if not in geometrical, proportion to that of the preceding ten years. Bacteriology has also since 1880 in its expansion exhibited the same rate of progress. This advance is one element upon which we must rely in the forecast of the future.

The other element is the appreciation of medical science which obtains at the present day. By this do not understand me to mean popular appreciation, but that enthusiasm which is shown in investigation in all departments of medical science. The additions that are made annually to our stock of knowledge in this line indicate that a host of scientific workers are constantly experimenting, observing, and recording, and that every year the number in the rank and file of investigators is increased by the accession of fresh recruits. That is an appreciation that is certain to continue whether the state countenances it or not.

It is interesting to inquire why medical science is under so little obligation to constituted authority. Why is it that when the state gives endowments for the advancement of learning in languages, mathematics, metaphysics, and the natural and physical sciences, it neglects, as a rule, to give assistance to medical research or medical education? Several reasons are to be urged in answer to this question, and for one of these we must examine the condition of medicine during the first half of this century, when it could not press any such claims to be considered a science as it now presents. While it consisted of much that was valuable, the greater part of it was pure empiricism. This was not all. There arose in the medical world a discussion on questions of a purely dogmatic character that should never have been introduced into medicine at all. Whether like cures like, or whether a disease is cured by a drug which produces the very opposite symptoms, were the questions of the day. There were others on which the very opposite answers were given. Is the therapeutical action of a drug increased the more if it is diluted or shaken, or the more finely it is divided? This discussion first arose in Germany, which gave, at the same time, origin to some other fantastic and absurd creeds in medicine, like Rademacherism, Isopathy, Ideal Pathology, etc., and it spread to England, France, and to this continent. These questions were even taken up by the lay world, and discussed, in some instances, with all the partisanship that characterizes party politics. Then some strove to adopt a position between the two camps, and this added to the confusion. What