

physician was called to consider—the health and life of the people—and if the cultivation of the intellect was necessary when men were content to observe and base practice on observation, how much more necessary was it now when the most acute logical minds are sorely puzzled between what are scientific truths and bold and reckless assumptions? Here he remarked that this is unquestionably the age of bold, reckless—he had almost said impudent—assumption in matters of science. While it was generally conceded that “our ideas of the intrinsic elements that constitute beings in the physical as well as in the moral order are very limited and imperfect,” they boldly assume the mutual dependence of things upon each other when we could logically establish nothing more than co-existence or succession, as if co-existence or succession necessarily implies connection or relation. He quoted the writings of Huxley and Spencer in proof of his statement. Speaking of synthesis in medicine, he quoted past events and writings of Schenck, of Vienna, and later our own Erasmus Wilson, in support of it, saying that “the tyro in medicine has, or thinks he has, a half dozen remedies for every disease; but as experience is gained, he learns, and with advantage to his patients, to make a fewer number of remedies to suit a much greater number of disorders.” He had always thought and the belief was strengthened with his years, that the work of grouping diseases for therapeutic purposes was yet to be done. He treated on the importance of state medicine which should investigate the air breathed, the water drunk and all that pertains to our habits as communities—to protect the public health was the duty of state medicine. There could be no more important work than this. The work of educating communities, and States was to be done through the people, and to the physician fell the philanthropic though perhaps somewhat thankless task. The conviction was gaining ground that a Board of Health should be established for the Dominion, for the Provinces, and for the Municipalities,—one to each. He went into this question at considerable length, enforcing earnestly upon his hearers their duty and that of their successors in the education of public opinion to a better knowledge of the principles of health as the means for achieving a proper position for state medicine, and passing on, touched upon the union with the American Medical Association, quoted the original resolution passed at Niagara in 1875, alluding to the joint resolution of 1876, in Philadelphia, “That a union of the two Associations into one is desirable,” &c., and praising the admirable manner in which Dr. Bowditch, of Boston, had performed his duty at Chicago in June of the present year, and his arguments pro and con, along with his final deduction against the union as inexpedient because of the impossibility in working machinery so

unwieldy as that organization would necessarily be. He explained, however, that Canada never asked for union of the two bodies, that the proposition came from the Americans themselves in the first place. What the Canadians did ask for, was “a conference at some central point,” so as to become “more intimately acquainted and discuss medical and surgical questions on a common basis.” If the Canadian representatives at Philadelphia asked for a “union” of the Associations, they expressed their own views, and did not speak for the Canada Medical Association, which at Niagara in 1875 asked merely for a “medical conference,” without either Association losing its identity. Here the questions connected with the birth-rate of countries was taken up. Before concluding his address, by special request he referred to the evil which was prevalent—more particularly in certain states of the adjoining Republic—amongst some classes of the community—the crime of feticide. He dwelt upon it in its social, moral, legal, religious and scientific aspects, and condemned it in the most unmeasured terms.

The address occupied upwards of an hour in delivery, and was listened to with marked attention. A vote of thanks was moved by Hon. Dr. Parker, seconded by Dr. G. W. Campbell, and tendered to the president for his very able and interesting address.

Dr. Ross, chairman of the committee on “Medicine,” read his annual address, and Dr. Howard, chairman of the committee of “Medical Education and Literature,” also presented his report.

Dr. HOWARD, seconded by Dr. Bell, moved that the Convention resolve itself into two sections—Medicine and Surgery—to meet for business at two o'clock. Carried.

The President named Hon. Dr. Parker, and Dr. Canniff as chairmen of the respective sections.

Dr. GRANT moved, seconded by Dr. Gibson, that the following gentlemen be named a Committee on Nominations: Drs. Parker, Botsford, Canniff, Workman, Fulton, Sweetland, Fenwick, Osler, F. W. Campbell, Worthington, and Rottot. The meeting then adjourned for an hour.

The members met again at two o'clock, and divided into two sections—medical and surgical.

The following papers were read in the medical section:

Tricuspid Stenosis, by Dr. R. P. Howard, Montreal; treatment of empyema, by Dr. J. Fulton, Toronto; plea of insanity, by Dr. Hornibrook, Mitchell, O.; economical aspects of public sanitation, by Dr. Playter, Toronto.

The following papers were read in the surgical section:

Epithelioma of the eye, by Dr. Alt, Toronto; gastrotomy and ovariectomy, by Dr. Robillard, Montreal; nasal polypus, by Dr. Reeve, Toronto.

Discussion was had upon all the papers, but