

showing the disease to exist in most of the domesticated animals, in many of the wild, and in several of the fish tribe; the second dealing with the "Transmissibility of Cancer," establishing without a doubt—at least in the case of mice—that carcinoma can be transmitted from animal to animal; the third taking exception to the view that cancer consists of a change from normal tissue to malignant, or, as stated by Campbell, "that cancerous growth is caused by the degenerative reversion of epithelial cells to a germinal type, in association with a local irritant, and in the presence of an abundant blood supply."

In other parts of Great Britain private charity comes to the aid of a local research fund. Thus, in Liverpool, for instance, one person leads off with a subscription of \$50,000. The Liverpool Royal Infirmary furnishes a ward for facility of observation and experiment, and its University has placed five large rooms at the disposal of the research fund for the same purpose.

It is quite beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the nature of cancer. That aspect of the question is as yet incomplete. One writer expresses the view that the disease is due to a pathogenetic organism belonging to the numerous yeast family; another, that it is an animal organism; a third, that it is in any case a parasite; a fourth, that it arises from some (not always recognizable) disturbed action of the natural component parts of the body. At the present time the tendency of thought is towards the theory that the origin of cancer is extrinsic—that there is, as Meyer observes, an extrinsic cause, and that it remains only to discover it.

If cancer has a parasitic origin, has it a micro-organism of its own? If it has, so soon as the nature of that organism is understood we may indulge the belief that a specific cure of cancer may ultimately be found. So far, however, there has not been successful cultivation, outside the body, of those micro-organisms which have been supposed to be of malignant growth, and this notwithstanding what the French style "Cancer deux," an accident so extremely rare as scarcely to deserve mention. But where attempts have been deliberately made, as by Alibert upon himself, his medical friends and students, the result has been invariably negative.

So far, therefore, it may be said, the origin of cancer remains an enigmatic secret. For my part the conviction is forced in upon me from bedside observation, that the cause of cancer is perverted action, possibly inflammatory, without, at first, the usual evidences of inflammation; or, in other words, that it is perverted nutrition. This view I have held for many years.

But while every diligence is being exerted to unravel the causes and nature of cancer, something less problematical, something less doubtful, is forced upon our notice—its increase.