

man is never vexed to find that after all he has been in the wrong. It is an old story that a man may practice medicine successfully with a very few drugs. Locke had noticed this, probably in the hands of his friend Sydenham, since he says: "You cannot imagine how far a little observation carefully made by a man not tied up to the four humors would carry a man in the curing of diseases, though very stubborn and dangerous, and that with very little and common things and almost no medicine at all." Boerhaave commented upon this truth in a remark of Sydenham that "a person well skilled in cases seldom needs remedies." The study of the action of drugs, always beset with difficulties, is rapidly passing from the empirical stage and this generation may expect to see the results of studies which have already been most promising. It is very important that our young men should get oriented early in this matter of drug treatment. Our teachers used to send us to the works of Forbes' (*Nature and Art in the Treatment of Diseases*), and to Jacob Bigelow (*Nature and Disease*), for clear views on the subject. A book has been written by Dr. Harrington Sainsbury—the well-known London physician and teacher—(*Principia Therapeutica*, Methuen), which deals with these problems in the same philosophical manner. It opens with a delightful dialogue between the pathologist and the physician. He lays his finger on the weak point of the pure morbid anatomist who thinks of the lesion only and not enough of the function, which even a seriously damaged organ may be able to carry on. The book should be in the hands of every practitioner and senior student. Some of you may have heard of the lecture-room motto of that distinguished pathologist and surgeon, and the first systematic writer on morbid anatomy in the United States, S. D. Gross, who used to say: "Principles, gentlemen, principles! principles!!" And it is upon these fundamental aspects that Dr. Sainsbury dwells in his most suggestive work, which I would like to see adopted as a text-book in every medical school in the land.

And we are yet far too credulous and supine in another very important matter. Each generation has its therapeutic vagaries, the outcome, as a rule, of attempts to put prematurely into practice theoretical conceptions of disease. As members of a free profession we are expected to do our own thinking. And yet the literature that comes to us daily indicates a thralldom not less dangerous than the polypharmacy from which we are escaping. I allude to the specious and seductive pamphlets and reports sent out by the pharmaceutical houses, large and small. We owe a deep debt to the modern manufacturing pharmacist who has given us pleasant and potent medicines in the place of the nauseous and weak mixtures; and such firms as Parke, Davis and Company, of the United States, and Burroughs and Wellcome, of England, have been pioneers in the science of pharmacology. But even the best are not guiltless of