

practice upon his own surgical injuries from a fall. He concluded with an eloquent appeal for freedom and progress.

Prof. Buchanan being present at the lecture, was at once called out by the meeting and briefly responded, illustrating the progress of humanity to a higher condition in which by the intuitive or psychometric power of the physician a perfect diagnosis shall be made, and his superior physical development will give him a healing power independent of drugs which has been in ages exercised by those who were highly developed and must in time by the law of evolution become a common attribute of humanity. The existence of these intuitive powers, ignored by allopathy, he had investigated to place the subject in a scientific form, and give its benefit to the medical profession, which he had no doubt would in time result in the revolution and elevation of the healing art.

The views of the lecturer were ably sustained by Prof. Atkinson, Prof. Gunn, and Mr. Wm. Wilson, and were opposed by a gentleman whose extravagant and half insane assertion of the superior liberality and progressiveness of the old school party in medicine, excited so much contempt and were so thoroughly overwhelmed by fact and ridicule that in mercy we omit his name.

Prof. Gunn exhibited in a very clear light from his own observation and experience the intolerance of the allopathic party which made a social war upon liberal physicians by whom nearly all the important improvements in medicine were made, all of which were carefully excluded from old school colleges and text books until they were forced into admission by the tide of progress, when a few were admitted in a sly and furtive manner, actually plagiarized or stolen after they had been enjoyed or used by medical liberals for thirty, forty, or fifty years. The eclectic movement abolished bleeding and introduced a hundred other important reforms. But as the subject was too extensive for a ten minutes' discussion, Prof. Gunn has promised to give a dissertation this winter on the war of the "pathies," which we are sure will be highly interesting.

It is probable that Col. Dawson's lecture will be repeated before a larger audience.

Meat versus Vegetable Diet.

The most plausible argument we have seen offered against the vegetarians for some time is contained in a recent number of *The Boston Journal of Chemistry*. It relates experiments of Prof. Hoffmann which tend to show that a far greater proportion of a meat diet is assimilated than of vegetable diet. It is said "we must consider not merely how much nutriment each puts into the body, but how much of it remains there and how much goes to waste." Prof. Hoffmann fed a servant on vegetable diet and found that not one half of the albuminous matter had been digested. The same man was next fed on beef, fat and flour, and only one-fifth of the albuminous substance passed off as waste.

Experiments of other physiologists are quoted that gave similar results. The writer then concludes that

"the results of these experiments by independent investigators evidently agree in proving that a much larger fraction of nutriment is utilized in the case of animal than in that of vegetable food. They go far toward knocking away the very foundations of vegetarianism by showing that our digestive apparatus is better adapted to deal with the former than the latter."

We are not rated vegetarians and do not take offense when arguments are presented to refute their tenets. But we would like to know what constitutes the true and proper food for man, and we have inclined to the belief that his normal diet in the perfect state would be vegetarian.

The experiments referred to by the *Boston Journal of Chemistry* are not logically conclusive. There is a flaw in the premises—or lots of room for one. The men experimented upon had in all probability been raised upon a miscellaneous diet, and their digestive powers are an unknown quantity, and so the experiments cannot prove much until they are repeated upon a healthy person who has been raised as a vegetarian. As people are now, doubtless meats are digested with less waste than vegetables, and possibly it remains true for everybody; but to determine just how much advantage of this kind is to be credited to meat diet it will be necessary to make a large number of careful experiments upon fair specimens of meat eaters and vegetarians, trying each on the different kinds of diet and comparing the results. The animal kingdom furnishes abundant material for such investigation in different classes of carnivorous and herbivorous domesticated animals, which field invites the attention of practical physiologists who desire to settle the question.

In talking recently with a gentleman who purchased a mare in Canada he remarked that there was a good deal of red tape necessary to be gone through with in getting a horse across the line. He said he had to sign some three or four different papers. One of them related to the pedigree of the animal. He said that no one was allowed to bring an animal across the line into the United States that could propagate if it possessed any physical faults or bad pedigree. We do not know how true this statement is, but if it be true it will be worth while to institute an inquiry whether it will not be well to make these same investigations in respect to human beings brought from Canada or elsewhere. Remembering that the fast trotter will bring perhaps \$50,000, it is questionable whether any human being will bring as much. But may this not be owing to the fact that we have given more attention to the breeding of horses than we have to the breeding of men? May it not be possible that a man may sometime be worth as much as a horse if we pay as much regard to the laws of heredity in human as in domestic animal reproduction?

We have a monkey, and it having become a member of the family since Science in Story was written, he seems to have fallen heir to the name of "Sponsie." This animal teaches us a lesson in the way of careful eating which ought to be given to the readers of the *HEALTH MONTHLY*.