

618
35
1115

THE
Chiropractic Criticism

OF

MR. JUSTICE HODGINS'
REPORT

ON

Medical Education
in Ontario

BY

E. DuVAL, D. C.,
President Canadian Chiropractic College,
Hamilton, Ont., Canada.



(Endorsed by the Chiropractors of Ontario.)

61 f

CRITICISM OF MR. JUSTICE HODGINS' REPORT

ON

MEDICAL EDUCATION IN ONTARIO

With Detailed Objections to its Adoption by the Ontario Legislature.

By E. DuVAL, D. C., on behalf of CHIROPRACTIC.

To His Honour,

Sir John Strathearn Hendrie, K. C. M. G.,
Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario.

May it please Your Honour:

In availing ourselves of the opportunity, so graciously granted, to study and if necessary, to criticise Mr. Justice Hodgins' report on "Medicine" in Ontario, we beg to state that our remarks will be confined only to such portions of the report as will appear to have relation to Chiropractic, as we are not concerned at all with any other method of healing, their method of education, or other requirements, as we claim that Chiropractic is in no way related to any other cult in its Principles, Practice, or Educational methods. We propose to substantiate abundantly, as we did to the Commission, that it can by no means be allied to any other cult, as they are all foreign if not antipodal to it, owing to its original, radical concept, requiring no artifice whatever in its practice, acting on the principle that the natural innate forces within the individual are fully adequate to resist and combat the untoward conditions called diseases, and remedy them.

Had the Commissioner investigated all he had been enjoined to investigate this may not have been written, and his report would have been quite different, more logical, consistent and just, than it is at present. We propose, furthermore, to prove that the report is not even consistent with what he did investigate and that he has apparently disregarded much of the evidence that was presented and refused to weigh much that was offered.

Merit Not Considered.

In the last clause (h) of Your Honour's Commission, he was charged to enquire into "**Any Matter**" arising out of the foregoing clauses, but he paid very scant attention to that admonition in so far as Chiropractic was concerned, because the very first thing that arose was the question of **Merit** of the individual cults, especially that of Chiropractic, which, owing to its uniqueness, could not be investigated according to old worn-out standards. We insisted that **Merit** alone was the determining factor in Chiropractic as to whether it should be practiced in Ontario or anywhere else, and not the quantity of so-called routine education irrelevant to it, nor by its lack of trappings, because it needs none. But the Commissioner positively refused to listen to or accept any evidence which would tend to show that Chiropractic was a valuable asset to the people of the Province as a means of restoring health to the sick. We offered abundant evidence that Chiropractic had done nothing but good and had not a single objectionable feature.

At the very inception of the investigation he emphatically stated that he did not want to "learn" Chiropractic, what it was, nor what it could do; that he only wanted to know how Chiropractors were educated. And it immediately became quite obvious that he was more interested in finding out how much Chiropractic education approximated the erroneous education of another obsolete cult, instead of appreciating what purported to be an improvement; which seem to us to be the aim of all Government enquiries.

Though many attempts were made to produce evidence which would establish the claim of Chiropractic to the right to practice **by right of merit**, he turned a deaf ear to our entreaties though he had been charged to investigate **"anything which might arise."** Merit arose, but it was not considered.

Unable to Find Harm.

His refusal to investigate **the good of Chiropractic** was not the worst feature, but in the fact that he made several attempts to discover if there was any verifiable evidence that Chiropractic had done any harm. With the result that he was unable to establish **one single case**, which, had he obtained any, would have figured prominently in his report, which it does not; a remarkable characteristic feature of the report, a feature which we beg of the Government to seriously consider when legislating on the question.

Having refused to ascertain the good of Chiropractic, and having vainly endeavoured to find any bad feature, he recommends that it be not permitted to be practised, as a "Safeguard" to the people, to which we would ask: What is it that he wants to protect the people against? Surely not the good that he did not wish to find and certainly not from the harm that does not exist. It would be well to ask the Commissioner to show to the Government what it is he wants the people protected against, and whether it is **the whole people** or only a particularly **small part** of the people he is desperately inclined to protect at almost any cost.

To criticize the Commissioner's report as a whole, would not be adequate to give a comprehensive view of the correct situation to the Government, therefore it is necessary to consider it from the beginning to the end, clause by clause, challenging every statement and showing that the whole is inconsistent, illogical, and in many instances, unjust and at variance with the evidence presented, and in some cases, obviously for the purpose of maintaining a condition which has nothing to recommend it except priority (age), characterized by a succession of failures. The Commissioner's only apparent foundation being that of "precedent" without logic (which he deprecates), a characteristic of some Judges who do not always try cases on their respective merits, but try them on precedent of law alone.

Facts Misrepresented.

In attempting to assign a reason why Chiropractors' desire for legislative recognition cannot be considered as seriously as that of the Osteopaths, he says, page 32, p. 7: **"As compared with the osteopaths, there is a more marked weakness in numbers, in training, and a want of real investment in educational facilities."** This statement is absolutely untrue and contrary to the evidence presented. There are more Chiropractors in practice and training on the Continent than there are Osteopaths, though Chiropractic is only half as old, and evidence to that effect has been produced, though he neglects mentioning it.

The reason why he makes this erroneous statement can better be told by himself, but it is evident that he had an object in view in making his report in such a way as to make it appear that there are only 48 Chiropractors in Ontario by enumerating only those who are affiliated with societies, clubs or frats., and, apparently, purposely omitting to mention the greater number of Chiropractors not members of these associations, which, if added to the number given in the report, would swell the number to approximately 200, a far greater number than there are Osteopaths. We do not point this out to depreciate Osteopathy in any way, but simply to show the Government that the Commissioner did not make his report according to facts, especially when he knew the facts.

In an endeavour to further substantiate the above he makes the following statement: "The equipment of the only school (in Ontario) is \$1,200....."

There is nowhere apparent any desire to approximate either to the regular medical standard or of those of the osteopaths." The very fact that there is at least **one Chiropractic School** (however small it may appear) in Ontario is contrary evidence to what he wishes to prove, viz., that Chiropractors are not as entitled to recognition as are Osteopaths, who have no school at all in Ontario, and 18 out of the 19 members of the "Toronto Osteopathic Association" did not get their education from a recognized College, and some from no school at all; in fact, some of these Colleges are now extinct. This does not place Chiropractors in an inferior position.

From the light in his possession the rest of his statement is simply ludicrous when he says that we evince "no desire to emulate 'regular' medical or osteopathic standards of education," because we have amply proved that such education would be absolutely unnecessary and worthless to the Chiropractor; that they would stand in the same relation to us as an anchor would if tied to a bird's neck to help him fly. He has admitted that Chiropractic is different to others; why then should we be blamed for having a different method of education, any more than a watch-maker can be blamed for having a different apprenticeship than a tailor. We have stated and reiterated to him that Chiropractic is unique, its methods of application entirely different, new, and practically a reversal of the others, and therefore, its education must be appropriate to its requirements, and that we alone **know** of what that should consist, and we alone should make it; and neither was it fair for him to preclude all test comparisons of merit.

Wishing to further reinforce his argument he states in a following paragraph, referring to the Canadian Chiropractic College:

"In accounting for his (Dr. DuVal) meagre equipment, he said that the essential apparatus necessary to teach chiropractic is brains, hands, knowledge and the ability to impart it to the students."

The first part of this statement is entirely uncalled for and irrelevant in as much as it is absolutely untrue. Dr. DuVal never tried to account or apologize "for his meagre (?) equipment," and he resents being represented as having done so. The equipment (faculty) of the Canadian Chiropractic College is second to none on the continent to teach Chiropractic and has been so proven to the Commissioner, and still stands unrefuted and irrefutable. When this question arose during the investigation, evidence was presented that a seven months' student of that so-called meagre college had in five weeks' time made one Thomas G. Campbell, of Campbellford, Ont., well of a long-standing illness which a number of Toronto's shining medical lights and the General Hospital had only succeeded in making worse after treating him for eleven years and at the cost of thousands of dollars. This being true, then why should Dr. DuVal wish to apologize for the equipment of the College that imparts such education? Should this statement be questioned then we will just refer you to another uncalled for statement made by the Commissioner on page 129.

"Dr. DuVal presented his case ably and well, and the literature submitted or collected by me bears out his utterances."

This is sufficient evidence that our statements were correct. The particular reference to this case has been presented among others and none of them have been refuted to date; and any previous or subsequent statements will be characterized the same way and stand the test of any further investigation, if it is the pleasure of the Government to appoint another Commission (which should be done) to investigate the failure of the previous one in producing a report consistent with the evidence and at the same time investigate **the real merits** of every cult, especially Chiropractic, as the only logical and practical recommendation to legislative recognition is the question of **worth**.

Lest there be misconceptions regarding equipments of a Chiropractic school we will restate that the previously detailed equipment is all that is

essential to teach Chiropractic efficiently, with, of course, a suitable building with all conveniences to accommodate a number of students, ample floor space, necessary seating accommodation, black-boards, charts, books, etc., with the addition of adjusting tables, there is nothing more than would be necessary in a college to teach theology and produce good clergymen.

Scientific Knowledge Not Repudiated.

The statement in which the Commissioner represents Chiropractic as repudiating "All modern scientific knowledge . . ." is so outrageously untrue and unwarranted by the evidence that it could have been made only to try to show to the Government and the public that Chiropractors were a danger and a menace to society which had to be "safeguarded." There is not a scrap of evidence to show that any such broad and iconoclastic statement has ever been made to the Commission. We cannot but imply that it is a purposeful misconception placed upon some other statement we may have made, or he went entirely out of his bearings to gather evidence, which was taken in "camera obscura" at a time and place where we were not present to contradict, which was not the only instance when such occurred, as the Commissioner sought and accepted evidence derogatory to Chiropractic, from a **Corn Doctor, who knew nothing** about it, and then permitted that evidence to be possessed by parties antagonistic to Chiropractic with which to assail the Chiropractors who knew not until then of such evidence having been presented.

It is not true that we repudiate "All modern scientific knowledge." Had he said that we repudiate some of the so-called "Medical scientific knowledge," modern, mediæval or ancient, he would have been nearer the truth, because some of this particular knowledge is not **scientific** in its proper interpretation, and this important fact of not being scientific makes it imperative for Chiropractic to repudiate it because Chiropractic **cannot incorporate** in its teaching that which is not **demonstrably scientific** and true, itself being based on nothing but what is proved to be a **scientific fact**. We do not deny, as imputed, that Astronomy, Geology, Chemistry, Base-ball, etc., are scientific propositions, but what we do repudiate is the imputation that they have a relation to Chiropractic education. Though these are sciences they form no part of Chiropractic education as such, having no more relation than have bacteriology and aviation. Therefore, the fact that we disclaim some of these sciences as forming an essential part of Chiropractic education creates no ground whatever for the Commissioner's overzealousness in wanting to safeguard the public, which is by no means threatened, as the danger is altogether imaginary. He would be far more consistent, and would have ample evidence to support his recommendation, if he were to recommend that Allopaths cease to repudiate Chiropractic, the latest "Modern Scientific Method" to restore health, and thereby "Safeguard" the people against malpractice which generally ends in more inmates for the Homes for Incurables, and too often the grave.

Among the enormous amount of evidence presented to the Commission, there is **not one iota of real evidence** to even hint that the public need safeguarding against the Chiropractors. If there is **we demand that it be produced**. The Commissioner's anxiety in this respect is purely imaginary, cannot be substantiated and is only due to his lack of proper investigation. Would it not be better to judge of the systems by their **worth** rather than by the kind of theoretical education each possesses?

Public to be Sacrificed for Benefit of Allopathy.

The report gives considerably more evidence of a foregone determination on the part of the Commissioner to "Safeguard" the Allopaths against competition than to safeguard the Dear Public; this is only secondary and incidental to the other, provided it does not interfere, as illustrated by the following.

Though we hold no brief to defend Osteopathy, neither do we propose doing so, yet it is necessary to quote the Commissioner—in reference to those

Osteopaths who by virtue of their age, to grant them the right to practice, notwithstanding the fact that they did not have the benefit of the latest Osteopathic education, and in preference to those who have had—in order to prove that it is the Allopaths whom the Commissioner wants to safeguard instead of the people as we contended above.

On page 31, p. 4, after recommending such Osteopaths to practice, he says:

"It is probably the best that can be got, and if the admission of these older men be somewhat of an indulgence, it will not HURT THE MEDICAL PROFESSION, and their numbers will prevent any GREAT HARM being done to the public."

To all of which we cannot but say that it is about the most consummate piece of gall and undeniable evidence that the precious Allopath must be protected at all costs, even at the risk of possible harm to the public, for whose benefit he is supposed to investigate and report, but is more intent upon safeguarding Allopathy.

The Commissioner seems to have a peculiar predilection for age, especially when it pertains to healing cults; he only condescends to refer to the "modern" when it does not conflict with the old medical regime. He seems to be imbued with the idea that they are like wine and improve with age, and therefore need to be well protected—Corked. The truth of the matter is that they are more like eggs, which age does not improve, especially Allopathy. There is only one thing which is neither improved nor marred by age, Truth; but a lie becomes venerable with age and is often made to substitute truth; but it needs much legislative protection to do that; hence the Commissioner's recommendation.

The report would read much more consistently if the reader were to substitute the word "Allopathy" for "The Public" when a recommendation is made for protection and safeguarding, then it would not be so incongruous and the Commissioner should see that the correction is made. He cannot produce any evidence that "the public" has been complaining and praying to be protected against the Chiropractor; but much evidence can be produced that the people need safeguarding against Allopathy. It is the Allopaths who are clamoring and whining for protection, and not the people, as was forcibly illustrated when the Commissioner asked Dr. McCullough as to what should be done with present practitioners of Chiropractic and others? The doctor's answer was very much like older Pharisees when they were asked a similar question, and cried "Crucify Him, Crucify Him." Dr. McCullough's cry was, "Put them out; they have no rights. They are interlopers here."

The portion of the general public who knows little or nothing of Chiropractic is passive and shows no interest in this matter, but those who know of Chiropractic are active and demand that they be permitted its benefits as British citizens entitled to their rights. But neither the one nor the other are clamoring for protection. This is only done by an interested cult which dreads investigation and fears competition, hence it must emulate the Pharisee.

Again referring to those Osteopaths to whom he wishes to appear indulgent, he says in the next paragraph:

"The license thus granted shall not permit its holder to use drugs, nor to perform surgery with the use of instruments, nor to sign death certificates, not to use the term "Doctor" either in full or otherwise indicated, and must be limited to osteopathic methods and practice." (Even after being compelled to learn all that.)

Under what other disability he could have placed these Osteopaths in order to safeguard the Allopaths is hard to suggest, as there would seem to be nothing left unless it be the emasculation of everything osteopathic, especially their schools, to prevent the propagation of anything which might threaten Allopathy. "Indulgence!" Indulgence indeed; this sounds more like the indulgence the Kaiser is meting out to his Belgian captives. We must thank the Commissioner for not having placed Chiropractic under such servile indulgences, because Chiropractors have very much the same sentiment as the

patriot who said: "Give me liberty or give me death." Better exile for Chiropractic than abject slavery.

In order to show how he proposes to safeguard the public he says:

Page 33, "Those who appeared before me saw no necessity for preparatory qualifications, ridiculed and repudiated diagnosis, bacteriology and chemistry; admitted that a Chiropractor acts in all cases upon his cardinal principle." It must be logically conceded that the public is better protected when one acts on a principle, when it is a good one, than on a bad one or none at all.

Preparatory Qualifications.

Since he prates so much of "preparatory qualifications" he should have applied that in the case of the Commission, and have realized at its inception, if not before, that one endowed with only a **judicial** knowledge had not sufficient qualifications to intelligently enquire into what he was charged to enquire, and that the task was far too vast and technical for one not conversant with the intricacies of the case, however able he might have been as a judge in civil or criminal cases. Even without that, as a judge he should not have ignored the evidence we presented that there were necessary qualifications to enter the study of Chiropractic, and very essential ones that are characteristic of Chiropractic alone, viz.:

- (a) It is first necessary that one should have **Brains** (common sense).
- (b) One must also have a natural or acquired mechanical ability.
- (c) One must also be able to read and write as correctly as the average lawyer and doctor.
- (d) One must be of good moral character.

(From our first address before the Commission.)

To emphasize this we may say that these qualifications may appear small in the eyes of a professional man (judge), but it must be remembered that the Canadian Chiropractic College does not pose as a simple ornament; it is for **teaching** purposes where students come to learn something useful.

We subsequently prove this and all other statements which is acknowledged on page 129 of the report. Then why represent to the Government that we see no necessity for preparatory qualifications? True, they are not the ordinary medical requirements, but it must be remembered that Chiropractic is not an **ordinary**, obsolete cult, requiring dead languages to camouflage its practice and palm it off on the public as super-education, as are doctors' prescriptions which are written in Latin to conceal the real nature of the dope, to deceive the patient in taking what otherwise he would throw in the sewer.

It is the ill-founded imputation that "diagnosis" is essential to the practice of Chiropractic that is ridiculed and repudiated, and it is owing to the ignorance of those who do not know what Chiropractic is, and suppose it to be some kind of drug, that the imputation is made. But to those who are informed, diagnosis would appear as irrelevant to Chiropractic as it would to shoe-making. The two have no relation.

We do not ridicule diagnosis for such cults as need it, to enable them in prescribing the right(?) medicine to avoid possible disaster, because the miserable lack of it in the medical world to-day is so serious that it is lamentable, if not worse, as it involves the administering of a fatal medicine. But there is never any danger of Chiropractic giving the wrong drug, as it never introduces anything artificial into a patient, neither does it remove useful organs relying on "Its Cardinal Principle" which is scientifically incontrovertible, viz., "That the individual contains within himself all that is necessary to maintain health, resist and combat disease when affected, and repair flesh and bones when injured. That he has a better chemical laboratory than has ever been invented by man to make remedies when needed and has a far superior know-

ledge of diagnosis capable of producing 100% results, whereas Allopathy is below 50%." So Chiropractic is scientifically 50% better off than any cult relying on diagnosis for practice, and 1000% better on chemical laboratory to prepare remedies which need no patent for protection. All of which the Commissioner has abundant and unquestioned evidence and evidently has reasons of his own for keeping out of his hearings and report.

Bacteriology therefore becomes superfluous to Chiropractic, inasmuch as the "Innate Intelligence" of the individual has a better knowledge of bacteria than the thousands of Bacteriologists we have and can differentiate more accurately which of the millions of microbes are scavengers (Saprophytes) and which are malignant (Parasites) and is better able to protect the first, who are life-savers, and resist the latter when invaded, than Allopathy can; because the Innate Intelligence uses the saprophytes to combat the parasites and thereby offers more and better resistance to disease than can Allopathy with its serums, which are nothing less than poisonous substances which are introduced into the patient for the purpose of destroying the parasites, but incidentally kills the saprophytes as well and thereby reduces the chances of recovery.

We are prepared to substantiate these statements, as we have all others, if we are given the opportunity; therefore we beg the Government to determine from which of the cults the public needs "Safeguarding."

Another senile argument is brought by the Commissioner to show that the public needs protection against the Chiropractor when he quotes Dr. Palmer at great length to prove how dangerous Chiropractic is by not caring a fig for the "previous history" of a case. Let us draw an analogy: On a watch-maker receiving a watch to repair, does he need to have a complete history of the watch? Does he need to know how long the watch has been stopped? What happened to it; did it "catch" cold by being wound at night between two open windows, and was it exposed to a draught of night air? Or what are the subjective symptoms? Is it worse before or after meals; and how old was its great-grandmother when she died? No, emphatically **No**, and why? Because this would only be gossip to him as he acts on his "cardinal" scientific principle—"mechanics," and not on a hodge plodge display of pedantic knowledge. Dr. Palmer is right because he knows that a Chiropractor knows better than the patient or anyone else "what is wrong" with the patient, and probably make it right without asking irrelevant "fool" questions.

Logic Sacrificed for Business.

An astonishing contradiction occurs when he states, Page 33, p. 5:

"The announcement of their colleges in the United States frankly appeals to the expected returns."

Compare this with Page 4, p. 8, which says:

"To deal with these problems as if they were matters of logic and debate, as was done by many that appeared before the Commission, would be to ignore the real existing conditions, and the human and BUSINESS relations involved."

If he finds it necessary to cast logic to the winds to favor business interests, how then can he make illegitimate reflections on the schools in the United States who "frankly appeal to the.....expected financial returns?" Are they not entitled to **business** or are they expected to be purely philanthropic institutions? There would be considerable grounds to expect that of them if they had an endowment from Messrs. Rockefeller or Carnegie, a bonus, a grant or any other emoluments from the Government; so much per student, for instance, the same as some Allopathic institutions we know of; but this cannot be expected from **self-supporting** institutions who command respect by giving 100% value for money received. We respectfully beg members of Parliament when legislating on this question to remember that Chiropractic seeks no monopoly, special privilege or other emolument; nor do Chiroprac-

tors ask for any tyrannical power to regulate, control, oppress or to impose any irrelevant course of instruction on any other cult. Chiropractic asks for nothing more than the God-given right of British men and women to conduct their own affairs under the just laws of the Province, without molestation from others less worthy, or who differ radically in principles or practice.

There is not much danger of the report being characterized by too much logic as it seems to have been working at cross-purposes with the Commissioner when he made his report which was woefully cheated of that precious thing. Of all the inconsistent statements of an investigator, this caps the climax. What is the meaning of an investigation if it is not to be based on logic? and if it is to be discarded or sacrificed at the shrine of **business**? Is not logic "the art of thinking and reasoning justly," and its purpose "to direct the intellectual powers, in the investigation of truth and to discriminate and **Judge** correctly?" Evidently this is exactly what the Commissioner did not want to do, but depreciated logic to satisfy the exigencies of **business**. And what business? Whose business? Deponent sayeth not. Had we known that the investigation was not for the purpose of sifting, deducing, reasoning, and discriminating correctly the arguments of the several cults, but for the "human and business" end of it, we would not have attended one session of the Commission. Because Chiropractic absolutely relies upon its **logical** basis, its practical value and usefulness to the people, and **not** essentially on the business end of it. Business is only a secondary consideration which will adjust itself proportionately to the value of the service rendered. Our plea for recognition is not as a business institution, but for the undoubted right to render services to the people if such are good. Therefore the only consistent ground for an investigation was merit, which could only be established by tangible evidence (which was refused) and **logical** arguments which are at least, deprecated if not rejected altogether. The slight innuendo of mercenariness imputed to U. S. Chiropractic schools who "frankly appeal to financial returns" is a weakling's argument; a mere begging of the question. These schools are all self-supporting (which is more than can be said of any medical college), and are not beneficiaries of the public directly or indirectly through endowments or Provincial taxation.

Chiropractic Students vs. Medical Students.

While we are on this subject of schools we wish to make a comparison and establish the great contrast which exists between those who have studied Chiropractic and medicine respectively; to show that the students who study Chiropractic have a stronger incentive and a greater zeal in learning than have those who study Medicine as a profession, without any greater objective than to become a mediocre, doubtful producer of good to himself or others.

Among those who have taken Chiropractic as a life's work, were a fair number who had been engaged in other professions, such as doctors, clergymen, lawyers, actors, writers and teachers, who had all received an education purporting to be preliminary to their objective. But the vast majority were men and women from the ordinary walks of life. Almost all of them having reached the age of acknowledged superior maturity of 30 to 35, and were not disposed to waste their energies in sports and dissipation. At any rate all of them were entering the study of Chiropractic as the result of a firm conviction of its worthiness from actual experience, as most of them had been made well from so-called incurable diseases or had seen health restored to relative or friend, and gave up previous avocations to take up the better one.

On the other hand the majority of Allopaths have been made so not out of choice and less from conviction of its efficacy, but because they were made to study medicine by parents who wanted one in the family to belong to one of the **three learned professions**. So the boy was made to pass through the grinding machine of special education, willy nilly, who would not likely study any

more than enough to pass routine examinations, and learn of a large number of prescriptions which are said to be good for this or that disease, to find after graduation that he must discard all but two, a stimulant and a depressant; and five years later to discard these for the last one—which is much better—a placebo.

The difference in object and incentive, with the additional qualification of the **better age of discretion**, makes the Chiropractors worthier of legislative recognition than those who have simply floated down the stream like dead fish.

Chiropractic Cannot Be Adjunct of Medicine.

On page 36, pgh. 6, the Commissioner says:

"The recommendation made by me as to Physical Therapy will in part answer a complaint made by Dr. DuVal, who, after stating that bogus schools had produced fake chiropractors in large numbers, put part of the blame for this upon the authorities in Canada and the United States, who did not, he said, owing to the investigation of the older professions, investigate and protect the science of Chiropractic, to keep it fine and unadulterated and defend it against its intrinsic enemies, the grafters."

After carefully reading the report on "Physical Therapy and Supporting Statement thereto, we are unable to find one line relating to Chiropractic or that could be made to answer the complaint made by Dr. DuVal unless the Commissioner wishes to dumbly imply that Chiropractic could be taken in as a part of what is now called "Physical Therapy," and wishes to fasten Chiropractic to Physical Therapy like a tin-can to a dog's tail, which generally proves a disastrous appendage to the dog, and would repeat itself in this case.

This allusion is probably due to his inference that Chiropractic is a **medicine, a drug or a dope, a "doin' somethin' "** in the treatment of the sick medically, which it is not. His inference is doubtless owing to the fact that he did not want to investigate and **know** what Chiropractic really is and jumped at conclusions he wished to arrive at quickly, viz., place it under the protective(?) wing of the American Medical Association for prompt execution, the same as happened to the Eclectics and is fast taking place with the Homeopaths and those Osteopaths who are under its control.

It is only after considerable teaching and a sincere desire to learn Chiropractic, that one can appreciate it fully. It takes considerably longer to show what it is fundamentally to those who are **not interested**, and still longer to show it to the Commissioner who did not even want to look for fear he would see the reality he intended not to see.

If the inference from the quotation is an implication that Chiropractic be classed as Physical Therapy—and it seems so—then we will only reply that **it is not and cannot be** and could only result in disaster to one or both, because the two would no more mate than a turtle and a canary. The principle upon which Chiropractic is based would preclude the possibility of amalgamation of any part or feature of Physical Therapy as an auxiliary or accessory. Neither can one serve as an adjunct to the other. They would be a misfit, in that the respective principles upon which they stand are at variance. Chiropractic standing and practicing on the indisputable scientific fact that living man **naturally** contains within himself, at a maximum possibility of efficiency, **all** that is necessary to maintain his health when well, to **resist** infections or any other condition which may assail him and make him sick, combat and cure him when he is diseased. That he possesses the **best** chemical laboratory possible to produce the necessary remedies out of simple food, air and water and is possessed of an Innate Intelligence which does not make costly mistakes in diagnosis, never prescribes wrongly nor ever gives an over-dose. He makes his own electricity without an engine, wind or water power, and resents as an insult and blasphemy any artificial, man-made appliance or remedy from the hands of quacks on the outside who want to make believe that they are assisting nature and are superior to it. Also that he adapts himself to

circumstances which affect him, and only in the modifications of these conditions rest the degree of assistance he requires—the art of Chiropractic, at the hands of the trained Chiropractor.

We have no brief to commend or condemn Physical Therapy, neither have we a desire to do so, but we must comment on the Commissioner's report relative to it, to draw comparisons and contrast the two to appreciate the unbridgable gulf existing between Chiropractic and Physical Therapy and show the impossibility of amalgamating the two without killing the one or the other, because their fundamental principles are at variance, and in some instance antagonistic.

The philosophy of Physical Therapy—if it has one—cannot but be that there is **something missing** in the sick which can and **must** be substituted from the outside, such as electricity, vibration, baths, tonicity, which may all be good in nursing for temporary relief, but unless these are produced naturally and normally **within** and by the patient's own resources, their effects cannot be permanent. Scratching, as a physio-therapeutical measure, may temporarily relieve itchiness in a case of pruritus, but will not remove the internally produced irritant and will therefore repeat itself ad infinitum. These are not curative, but palliative measures.

Therefore anything which acts on that principle cannot but be viewed by Chiropractic as an attempt, not only to assist, but to supersede and sometimes supplant Nature, a thing which cannot be done, and every attempt is an outrage and repugnant to Chiropractic. So philosophically, and scientifically the two are inimical and could not be made to work in the same harness. We might as well be placed on record right here that any attempt to tack Chiropractic as a tail to the medical Dog will be opposed and resisted, because the Dog could not wag the Tail, but rather the reverse—the tail would not only wag the dog, but kill him altogether.

Besides, there is an abundance of evidence in the report itself that Allopathy has already too many "irons in the fire" to attempt learning and practicing anything more. If the future student of medicine is to be asked to learn all the things recommended in the report, he may as well be handed over to the hangman as an old man for the sake of mercy. At the present he is not only being fed with education (?), but he is being **crammed** and **suffused** with it to suffocation. As a result of that over-feeding for years, medical indigestion has taken place and the profession is now undergoing segregation, splitting into a multitude of fragments under the classification of "Specialists," which is as it should, as no one can be proficient if he has to master every department he is supposed to study to-day; and if he attempted that, he could only succeed in becoming a medical "Jack Of All Trades" and **master** of none, having a little of everything in general and nothing of anything in particular, which cannot redound to the advancement of medicine, nor will the people profit by it. This is an age of specialization by experts.

If the recommendations of Mr. Justice Hodgins relative to Physical Therapy and other cults are acted upon, the result will be that "Specialization" will cease—a very regrettable thing—or the new law will be honoured more in the breach than the observance. Besides, requisitions were made to the Commission to increase the length of the course of a medical student to six years instead of five as necessary to the growth of medicine. We took no part in the discussion because it was no business of ours, but now it is, and we will say that if the Medical Council deems it expedient to lengthen the course of medical students it is because their experience has taught them that their short courses have not been sufficient to make them proficient, ergo, with the increased number of studies, it will take twice as long to meet the present curriculum which is possibly double that gone through by the twenty-year ago graduates which form part of the Medical Council to-day, with the evident hope that it will insure greater efficiency in the modern product. But is that

not a stigma on the efficiency of the old doctors who run the roost and are still permitted to experiment on the people whom they prate about safeguarding?

Though we have not the least objection to them raising their course we cannot refrain from making the remark that if the real(?) object is to produce greater efficiency of Allopaths, we would recommend that they be granted twenty years to digest what they now have; they'll need it all badly. If it is the intention of the Commissioner to place everything that is classed as Physical Therapy, with the possible addition of Osteopathy and Chiropractic, with Allopathic medicine, then it will be necessary to lengthen the course again and make the future student matriculate while he is in the embryo so as to graduate at least no later than his second childhood; as it will take all that time to learn it all.

These statements need no corroborative evidence as they are obvious, but if they need any we will just quote from the report, Page 85, last paragraph, quoting Dr. C. Thurston Holland, Pres. Roentgen Soc'y in England:

"And now I come to my final problem. This is the medical student. This UNFORTUNATE individual is already so overburdened with subjects, lectures and classes, all arranged for examination purposes, that it is said to be impossible to add any more to the curriculum."

If this is so now, all we can do is to add another petition to the Litany and say: "From this outrage, Good Lord deliver the medical student." Should those interested want any more proof let them ask the present medical students and they will get the best of all proofs, some of whom will tell you that if any more is added to their studies they will turn out intellectual imbeciles or educated fools.

It would be very inconsistent indeed to add Chiropractic to Allopathy, but it is not the most inconsistent portion of the report as the question of "Who shall teach Chiropractic to the medicos?" Certainly not a member of the medical profession in Ontario, as they do not know a thing about it; and if we are to believe Dr. Dixon who in answering a question to the Commissioner, said: "The medical profession in Ontario is forty years behind the times" (a very conservative estimate), because they would have to develop for seventeen years more before they would attain sufficient maturity to be able to conceive Chiropractic, and then twenty-three years more to catch up to its development to the present and be able to teach it.

It has taken twenty-three years to develop Chiropractic from its discovery to the present. So the task of teaching it would necessarily devolve on the present Chiropractor to instruct the Paragons of Science—the Allopaths. The very men who are declared by the Commissioner to be unsafe to let practice, and classed by the medicos as quacks, charlatans and ignoramuses; though it would not be the first case of the kind we have on record, as a splendid prototype is mentioned in sacred history when we read of a Twelve-year Old Boy, the Son of a carpenter, "Sat in the Temple" educating and astounding the Doctors of his day. In the latter case, they would certainly be astonished to learn that Chiropractic is not quackery. Would it not be strange that one would be dangerous to practice something, but would be safe enough to teach the thing to others who are less able to practice it?

Aside from this insurmountable difficulty of obtaining properly qualified teachers outside of present Chiropractors, another calamity would befall the Regulars in the imminent eventuality of the students hearing, listening and becoming convinced of the scientific exactitude of the new doctrine and becoming converted, as so many have done before, and would take Shakespeare's and Dr. Holmes' advice and "Throw Physies to the dogs (perhaps poison the brutes) to make room for Chiropractic.

After quoting numerous Chiropractic authors on pp. 126 and 127, the Commissioner says, "to indicate how impossible it is to assimilate Chiropractic with our present system of medical education and practice" (one of the few

consistent statements of the report), he further says in the body of the report: "The recommendation made by me as to Physical Therapy will in part answer a complaint made before me by Dr. DuVal" From which we assumed that no other construction could be placed than that it was intended to make Chiropractic form part of Physical Therapy; and the view entertained by part of the press that such would probably be the result of the investigation, is our reason for writing the above.

To prevent the attempt of such a lamentable eventuality we wish to adduce another unquestionable argument against the proposal, of placing Chiropractic under the aegis of the Medical Association, if the greater good to the people is sought, by pointing to the fate of other cults that have been placed under that body for protection (?).

The Eclectic and Homeopathic medical systems, and to a considerable extent, the Osteopaths in the United States, were "taken in" by Allopathic medicine for protection, greater development and a safeguard to the public. With what results? The present status of these cults is an irrefutable evidence that it was their extinction which was sought and is being accomplished, and not their protection. Eclecticism is dead and buried beneath the 6 foot thick sod of oblivion, as is many another case of mistaken diagnosis and overdose. Homeopathy is gasping its last breath and the ghost of the other is bending over the moribund cult listening to its "Death Rale," which is so loud that the Sphinx of Egypt could hear it. And wherever Osteopathy—a much more virile cult—has been taken in by Allopathy, "Rigor Mortis" has set in as a result of the pollution of its naturalness by being forced to adopt artifice which is producing a hybrid cult, which is a prostitution of the principle upon which A. T. Still based Osteopathy; but, on that very account, the Commission gives it some degree of recommendation.

In Ohio, Chiropractic is in the death throes of a bitter struggle for its existence in trying to extricate itself from the tentacles of the medical octopus, which is trying to throttle it. Why did not the Commissioner report on Eclecticism, and why did he not investigate the "League for medical freedom" and learn what its officers had to say in this matter? It would have prevented his report from being such a burlesque.

There are no other proofs necessary to establish the above, but if it is thought so we will just refer to the Supporting Statements of the respective cults in the report, except Eclecticism, as there is nothing left worth while to investigate and report upon except the obsequies.

Fakirs in Every Profession.

After quoting from Dr. DuVal's evidence to the effect that "Bogus schools had produced fake Chiropractors," the Commissioner makes this statement:

"The admission indicates how dangerous it would be to sanction the practice in Ontario to those who adopt the Chiropractic belief, unless it is possible to distinguish between fakirs and others. This seems impossible to do, if those who practice it are divided as to what is pure and what is adulterated."

A few things call for our criticism in this statement, the first is: "How dangerous it would be to sanction the practice on account of there being fakirs in the profession. In the first place we would ask: Where are the professions that are sanctioned and have not some "fakirs"? Is it the clerical, political, commercial or legal? No; Jesus said there was one **unjust judge**. Or would it be the Allopathic profession that has not its fakirs? Surely not. Had the Commissioner investigated as he ought to he would have found a larger percentage of quacks in Allopathy than in any other profession and altogether out of proportion when compared to Chiropractic. How did the Government protect the people against the multitude of quacks who entered legal respectability when Allopathy was first sanctioned and became the authors of what is now called "Medical Ethics"?

Since fakirism exists in every profession it is no wonder that Chiropractic, as a genuine science, should have its counterfeit also, and the Commissioner forgot that Dr. DuVal made that statement to support the request for the necessary power to protect Chiropractic against its quacks, and how he could wilfully twist it to show that it was a **dangerous** feature to the public, passeth all understanding.

On page 127 the Commissioner relates with gusto the history of a fake Chiropractor named Pickles, to illustrate the "sort of education which may be picked up at a Chiropractic College," which, if true, is not very creditable indeed, and we deplore it very much; but the story is characterized by the absence of a remarkable feature, viz., an absolute absence of mention that **he ever did any harm**. This is a thing that cannot be said of every drug doctor, as we have a very vivid picture of an elderly nurse who had been made a morphine fiend in the hospital and came to us as a patient, and incidentally was made well after having been a victim of medical education for many years. What about the thousands of morphine and cocaine fiends who are devising every means conceivable to cheat the authorities and are living a Hell on Earth? Are they the victims of "quack Chiropractors?" What strange bed-fellows some Commissioners make when they are investigating drug medicine! And do they not deserve the epithet of extremists when they search high and low to find the worst possible Chiropractic quack and represent that as the standard to judge all the profession by?

There is no danger in the fake Chiropractor injuring the public or anyone else, except the genuine Chiropractor, by discrediting the science, through his inability to do as much good as he would if he knew more of Chiropractic. The public and the Government have nothing to fear from the fakir, who can do no greater harm than discrediting the science and bringing disrepute upon himself and other Chiropractors. The only harm he can do to the public is in failing to produce "the goods" he pretends to have; because by practicing what he has of Chiropractic he can only do one of two things: do good or fail; but he can use nothing but what is natural, nothing that is artificial or dangerous, no instruments or poisonous drugs that damn mankind. This is so true that there is not one genuine Chiropractor who would not be ten times more willing to place himself into the hands of the meanest Chiropractor, if he were sick, than into the hands of any Allopath, because if the cheap Chiropractor did no good, he would do no harm; which is considerably more than can be said of an Allopath. That being the case, the panic stricken argument of the Commissioner falls to the ground unsupported by the facts.

Another thing demanding our attention is the tacit admission of the Commissioner that Chiropractic could be sanctioned if it were "possible to distinguish between fakirs and others," because he says: "**unless**" it is possible." We thank the Commissioner very much because this is what we have been trying to prove to him, notwithstanding his seeming incredulity of its **possibility** of accomplishment, owing to what appears to him as an **impossibility**, viz., a "distinction between fakirs and others." If Parliament would be willing to leave that question to be settled by the leaders in Chiropractic (recognized as such by the Commissioner), the impossible would again be easily accomplished by this simple definition of what is a Chiropractor eligible to practice in order to safeguard every one, and to be recognized as such by the Legislature at the initial formation of the recognized profession of Chiropractic.

"One is a Chiropractor who, by virtue of his Chiropractic education recognizes: (a) That the cause of multitudinous diseases is physical interference with nerves at their point of emergence at the spinal column. (b) That man is innately endowed with an intelligence fully more able to diagnose any of his ailments, and to prescribe the best and most adequate remedy. (c) That he has within himself a better equipped chemical laboratory to prepare all necessary medicines for his own ills than any man-made artificial compound. (d) That any such artifice is harmful and cannot be used in his practice as Chiropractor without detriment to his patient and that he

needs no other adjunct than his hands to assist his patient in recovering his health (co-ordination)."

It may be remarked that there is nothing in that definition which threatens the public from which it has to be safeguarded and that it does not condemn any other different idea which may be entertained by other cults, only that they form no part or portion of Chiropractic and that the two would be antagonistic and would neutralize each other if practiced in conjunction.

It may be contended by other cults that these premises are not scientifically true, but as this is a purely academic question it cannot enter as part of this discussion, as it is only pointed out to establish a line of demarkation between the standard and bogus Chiropractor for the purpose of possible legislative recognition, so that the legitimate Chiropractors will not be subjected to discredit and to insure better service to the public.

Whether this or any other acceptable definition be adopted would be no greater indulgence than was granted Allopaths or other cults at the time that such obtained recognition to permit better regulation afterwards, as it is admitted that physicians of thirty years ago cannot pass the examinations passed by University graduates of to-day; yet they, as members of the Medical Council, pose as judges on their fitness to practice.

By what manner of reasoning the Commissioner comes to the conclusion that the people need no **safeguarding** against the "Fake" Allopaths who were actually dangerous (owing to their ignorance of the poisonous drugs they were administering to the sick), but must be safeguarded against the inferior(?) Chiropractor **who cannot do harm**, passeth all understanding. One thing is certain, there is absolutely nothing in the "Supporting Statement" to make good that illogical recommendation; neither can any be adduced as it is absolutely preposterous.

The Commissioner's evident zeal to maintain the present, almost complete, monopoly of tending the sick, to one particular cult, has made him misconstrue Dr. DuVal's statement concerning fake Chiropractors and give it an altogether opposite application. Dr. DuVal made this statement to show the advisability of giving the leaders in Chiropractic a reasonable measure of power to discriminate and establish a standard that would accomplish what the Commissioner deems impossible, viz., the elimination of the incompetent; and applied Dr. DuVal's admission to an illegitimate purpose—that of safeguarding the people from a **made-to-order**, imaginary danger.

Radical Difference and Merit of Chiropractic Justify Recognition.

Page 33, p. 8, the Commissioner says:

"I have pointed out in 'Supporting Statement' (C) the position taken by those who are at present urging that this school of thought or unique science should be recognized, and what I think is the weakness of that position."

We have searched Supporting Statement (C) diligently but in vain for any argument or evidence that would support his assertion. There is nothing there which can be construed as supporting his statement, which was evidently made to make the reader take for granted that the question had been definitely settled, but the proof had to be looked for in some indefinite number of incongruous quotations and irrelevant statements. No one can find anything positive in there without the most arbitrary twisting imaginable, unless it is intended to give the impression that a marked **difference** of one thing from another, however good that difference may be, is indisputable evidence of its weakness, as compared to the other, however bad that may be, which is a stultification of logical principles.

If Chiropractic was not different—and markedly so—there would not be a single reason for asking sanction to its principle and practice. If there is to be an **improvement** in methods of tending the sick, it must necessarily be **different** from previous methods or else it is **not** an improvement. Chiropractic must be and **is** different to orthodox, regular medicine; otherwise there

would be no call for it in Ontario or anywhere else, and it would not exist now if drug medication had cured the sick, neither would Major Surgery be necessary if Allopathy had delivered the goods.

Major surgery is for the purpose of ameliorating the unfortunate victims of drug therapy and is an indisputable evidence of its failure, just as the "Homes for Incurables" are concrete monuments to the impotency of both. Major surgery never cures anything, it but postpones the inevitable into a protracted, miserable existence.

There is little else in Supporting Statement (C) but substantial corroboration that Chiropractic is different from all others; hence its superiority and request for sanction, based on the plea that it could not be better without being different. How in the face of the eternal fitness of things this can be made an argument proving its weakness and used as a recommendation that it be dealt with by the Government in a worse way than was meted out to sheep-killing dogs, is a conundrum that outrages and blasphemes against reason, by prostituting it at the shrine of precedent.

"Our(?) Legalized Medical Provision for the Sick."

There are a few other things in Supporting Statement (C) which will receive the favor of our criticism later on, but we must now devote our attention to the next paragraph of the report, which says:

"I cannot bring myself to the point of accepting, as part of our legalized medical provision for the sick, a system which denies the need of diagnosis, refers 95% of diseases to one and the same cause, and turns its back resolutely upon all modern medical scientific methods as being founded on nothing and unworthy even to be discussed."

We must ask the Commissioner to give the reason why Chiropractic must accept as Gospel Truths, a number of alleged "medical scientific methods" which are not true, have been weighed and found wanting, before being accepted as "part of our legalized method for the sick"? How much does he know about these "scientific methods," and how much does he avidly take for granted? Why does he not accept Chiropractic as a "scientific" proposition when the proofs of that have almost been thrust upon him?

"Our legalized medical provision for the sick" can by no means be interpreted as anything else than that which is represented by the "Medical Council for Ontario," the sole arbiter of the destinies of what is called Medicine and the controller of the provisions to take care of the health of the people from birth to the grave. Therefore in future speaking it will be consistent to refer to it as "The Medical Council" which is composed of the Allopath and what is left of the Homeopath cults of drug medicine.

Therefore it becomes necessary to give it a cursory investigation for the purpose of establishing a reason why the Commissioner sets it up as a standard or paragon of excellence to which all else must bow, emulate or endeavour to approximate, before being considered worthy of notice. This investigation should have been made by the Commissioner himself before enthroning it on the high pedestal he has. Though he has tried to find evidence of some flaw in Chiropractic practice and found none, had he done the same for drug medicine he would have found it in abundance and his report would not have lacked "Supporting" evidence that it was not all "Scientific" and that Chiropractic could well afford to repudiate the most and not be held in disrespect on that account.

A medical provision cannot be established as the standard by which all others must stand or fall, either by the Commissioner or the Government, until it has been thoroughly investigated and its value established and not taken for granted, like a fish takes the bait. There is abundant evidence that the Commissioner did not arrive but jumped at the conclusion on antiquated precedent. Therefore the Government cannot legislate on the recommendations of an investigator who did not investigate. A medical provision to be

legalized and maintain itself in that position must be asked and made to prove its ability to fill the bill and be set as a standard. This has not been done of the present one and we question its ability to make good if requested to do so.

The Government in establishing a standard measure for cloth has given the people the "Yard" measure, which is just to the buyer and to the seller. In so doing the Government injured no one, neither did it favor anyone, because it was just and equitable; and the people unanimously accepted it. But in establishing a standard "medical provision" for the sick it must also be of such a nature, just and impartial, so that it will command universal approval and acceptance, which is far from being the case in the one which the Commissioner now takes for granted; at least, it must have the essential prerequisite of being able to "deliver the goods," viz., to come up to the requirements of upkeeping the health of the people and make the sick well—a thing altogether lacking in our present "legalized method."

It is not meet to enter into an academic discussion here to prove this, it is only necessary for one to answer these questions:

"Are the people as a whole being cured of disease by drugs?"

If you cannot get an answer, visit the Asylums and Homes for Incurables and behold the millions of chronic individuals who are dragging out a miserable existence.

Is there less disease than heretofore?

Read "Vital Statistics" for one year and you will find that it is increasing alarmingly.

Is there less Cancer, Tuberculosis, Rheumatism, Venereal diseases, etc?

Ask the Governments (Federal, Provincial and Municipal) if they are not daily asked for more and more grants to provide accommodations for those suffering from these diseases.

Are there not as many incurable diseases to-day as there were one hundred years ago?

Read medical text-books such as Osler, Butler, Hughes, etc.

If a well person inadvertently takes medicine will it not make him sick?

If so, will it not make the sick more so—who are less able to resist the dope?

If a pig were to enter a drug-store and swallow the stuff intended to make the sick well, would he not die an unnatural death and his flesh not even be fit to feed a mongrel dog?

If a man goes to a Chiropractor and is sick, he will get well; if he is well he will be no worse after. But if he goes to a drug doctor, is sick, and takes what is given him, his disease will become chronic or worse, and if he was well before, **he will not be after.** Which of the two systems is better qualified to form part of "our medical provision for the sick?" The one which fails or the one which succeeds?

In every national department (except Medicine), such as Militia, Agriculture, Public Works, Fisheries, etc., the Government places men who are capable to produce results, and these can only maintain office as long as they deliver the goods, and they are all subject to dismissal on failure, except "our legalized provision for the sick," which must not be questioned, but are permitted to assume autocratic powers to dictate and control the people and Government itself in what is the people's greatest asset—its health; and though a failure it must be established as a standard for others. The Government should ask the medical council to deliver results or tell the reason why; and nothing will be more appreciated by the people than a thorough investigation into the merits of that department and at the same time investigate the previous Commission (which was "pour rire") because there has been considerable important evidence presented to the effect that the present method was not efficient, which seemingly has had no more effect on making the report than would a drop of water on a duck's back.

Medical Scientific Methods That Chiropractic Repudiates.

What are these "Medical Scientific Methods" that Chiropractic "resolutely turns its back upon?" The Commissioner may think that such a broad statement will pass muster by those who are not conversant, but it will not do when those who know are permitted to ask for a show-down. We regret the Commissioner did not specify as this would have prevented the possibility of those we will mention from being repudiated by the Commissioner or the Medical Council as not being "scientific," though this does not matter much as they are nearly all in the same class.

Some of the methods dignified by the terms scientific we are going to mention will not all be accepted as such by all the medical doctors, and will even be repudiated by the best of them; but they will all be accepted by the Medical Council as genuine.

VACCINATION is one of the most prominent, because it is made compulsory by law on the civilian, and on the army, reinforced by Martial Law, cannot but be said to be one of the so-called Scientific methods, but is denounced in the most emphatic manner by the best of the doctors in all countries. Will any man possessing some common sense (the Commissioner excepted) and a little knowledge, outside of the Medical profession, call the introduction of the rotten pus, taken from the scabs of a diseased cow, into the pure blood of children, a scientific method which must not be repudiated? A thing which may result in anything from a sore, a fever, an amputation, tuberculosis, cancer, tetanus and death? If so, then it must be as a new scientific method to replace the hangman, guillotine and the electric chair, as a more efficacious capital punishment.

SERUMIZATION is also classed as a scientific wonder. Laying aside the academic discussion of this, pro tem, and confining ourselves to its common sense aspect, we will just state that serumization can only be but for two objects, viz., "immunization or cure," all of which is based upon another fallacy, "the Germ theory of disease," another scientific(?) discovery that was invented to excuse the ignorance of disease and its cause. Chiropractic does not deny that germs exist by the million in the living animal, because it is scientifically true, but scientists also know that germs are not all enemies to the human economy as are the Germans to France; because many of them are like what the Canadians, English and Americans are to France and Belgium: most of these germs are allies and essential to the living organism of man. This is granted as a scientific proposition by everyone. This being a fact we would ask of any intelligent man or woman, even though he is not blessed by the super-education of the medicos; is it reasonable to believe that a poison can be introduced into the circulation to kill the Germ(ans) that are supposed to cause devastation there without also killing the Allies who are opposing the parasites, and by so doing reduce the effectiveness of the defense and increase the burden of the system in overthrowing an extra poison which is as injurious as the Germ?

"BACTERIO-TURTLE-SOUP"—At this juncture may we be permitted to ask what became of the "World Renowned and Famous Scientific Medical Discovery" for the cure of tuberculosis, Dr. Friedmann's "Bacterio-Turtle-Soup" serum, which he invented and with which he exploited the Omniscient scientists(?) of the American Continent to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars which is now being used to fight us? Should it be the pleasure of the Government to investigate, abundance of proof can be produced that the leaders in Chiropractic at that time offered to prove to the authorities that Dr. Friedmann and his turtle-soup were frauds, but were turned down as quacks because they "resolutely turned their backs" upon this scientific method.

Bacteriology is another pet pseudo-scientific plank in the platform of medicine in Ontario. The most essential because all the others are based on

it. Should that be investigated and exploded, as it ought to, medicine would be left like a cripple deprived of his last crutch. It would just wiggle in impotency.

The equipment for its study is also a medical scientific appanage which is most imposing and bewildering to the non-conversant only, as it fails to overawe those who know what it is worth, and partly consists of what is called "Germ Culture," which is nothing more than a miserable camouflage for its real nature "Germ-an Kultur." Nuf sed.

SALVARSAN (606) is another that can be mentioned in the one breath, being in the same class. That it cures Syphilis there is no proof whatever, only that it destroys Spirochaeta Pallida and incidentally many another Germ, since it is principally arsenic. M. Q. Clayton, a medico from Melbourne University, Australia, who spent most of the last five years in the best hospitals of his country and the United States, stated voluntarily before a class of students that his experience in the hospitals demonstrated that "606 kills more than it cures," and when it does not kill it causes other complications which render syphilis worse.

Apropos of this serumization we might inform the Government, to show how the investigations have been made, that while the Commissioner was investigating the conditions relative to venereal diseases, Dr. DuVal made bold to write to him suggesting that an advisable thing to do would be to investigate: "What relation, if any, had the wholesale serumization of soldiers to do with the transmission of venereal diseases." To which the Commissioner apparently paid no attention whatever as he did not even condescend to acknowledge the letter, evidently thinking that it was preposterous for one called a "quack" to offer a pertinent suggestion, having previously jumped at the conclusion that a Chiropractor was an ignoramus, "turning his back on scientific methods," it was not worth any consideration. But the aftermath of serumization will be better known after a few years when it will be timely to erect a tablet to the poor victims as "martyrs to medical science."

Rendered Physically Fit By Chiropractic.

Had the Commissioner investigated the good done by Chiropractic the same as he has done re "Physical Therapy," he would have found many more instances where incapacitated soldiers, suffering from "Shell Shock" especially, had been enabled to return to the front as sound men, and many who, during the voluntary enlistment, had offered themselves and were refused as unfit by the medical examiners, but subsequently were accepted as (A) men and are now on active service having subsequently been re-examined after having had Chiropractic service of which the medicos did not know.

This was not done, presumably owing to the fact that Chiropractic could not be grafted to medicine; therefore there was no use in establishing its merits, since it could not redound to the advantage of the favoured cult.

Academic Discussion Not Shunned.

It is not true that we refuse to discuss as unworthy, medical scientific methods; as we placed ourselves at the disposal of the Commissioner in the following language:

(Quoted from our last address before the Commission.)

"We will on request go to the Toronto University, or any other suitable place, and deliver daily lectures for the period of one month on Chiropractic, and subject ourselves to questions and criticisms of the medical faculties, representatives of the divers medical associations or of any other learned profession; and give answers to all the questions asked by Dr. Ferguson relative to the numerous diseases in which he questions and ridicules the application of Chiropractic thereto. . . . The meetings to be presided over by Your Lordship, having control of all other rules and regulations. This to be absolutely free of cost and devoid of any obligation. Correct reports to be published in the public press. The only remuneration we would ask is that the medical student body be present at the lectures."

Does this look as if we shunned the discussion of what is purported to be "Scientific methods?" We are still willing to do that and all that is necessary for the medicos is to whistle the tune and we will dance to their music.

This criticism of the report must be so made as to be intelligible to the average intelligent reader, so that he may appreciate the force of the arguments, which must be on the common sense basis, and not on the academic basis, as they would lose their value. But that does not mean that we are not willing to discuss academically any or all these questions, if necessary. So it is not fair for the Commissioner to insinuate that we shun them. Controversy of "medical scientific methods" is comparatively easy in view of the statement made by Prof. Gregory, Edinburgh Medical College, who said, speaking to his medical class: "Gentlemen, ninety-nine out of every hundred medical facts are medical lies, and medical doctrines are, for the most part, stark, staring nonsense."

Medical Diagnosis vs. Chiropractic Analysis.

Since Justice Hodgins makes our denial of the **need** of diagnosis to the practice of Chiropractic one of the principal reasons why it cannot be recommended, it becomes necessary to place clearly before the Government, in a non-academic way, what diagnosis means to Medicine and Chiropractic respectively, and what application can be made of it.

It is imperative for medicine to ascertain what particular disease a patient has, so that the physician can administer the appropriate remedy to that disease. He having thousands of remedies for hundreds of diseases from which he is to choose one which will benefit the patient instead of administering one which might injure him. He must, therefore, **know how to diagnose correctly**; for if he diagnoses wrongly he will prescribe the wrong remedy (due to his mistaken diagnosis), because out of his thousands of remedies many might be antagonistic to the real condition of the patient and terminate fatally, owing to having received the wrong medicine. So practising medicine involves much danger to the people.

To Chiropractic, exactly the reverse is the case, Chiropractic having only one remedy, and admittedly the best, the all but omnipotent natural powers within the patient, there is no possibility of giving the wrong one, therefore it becomes self evident that diagnosis (as understood) is irrelevant to Chiropractic. But a thorough knowledge of diagnosis becomes imperative to he who has a specific remedy for a specific disease, a mistake in either would become dangerous and fatal if not criminal; ergo, which of the two systems threaten the people the most? Chiropractic which cannot make mistakes, or medicine which makes many? The Government should think of that when legislating to protect the people.

To emphasize this more clearly let us compare a sick person with a house having a leaky roof and in consequence of which much damage is done to the inside. The rain after passing through the attic descends to a bed-room below and there causes the bureau to swell, one drawer being open cannot close; others being closed, cannot open; the carpet is wet and discolored; the water passes through the floor and the ceiling of the room below, getting saturated, detaches itself and falls; then the water, following the wall, moistens and loosens the wall-paper, permitting it to sag and hang down; then proceeding down into the kitchen, dampens and rusts the ironware, etc, etc.

Considering this house as being diseased, a doctor is called, he begins to diagnose the case at the nearest available point, the kitchen.

Producing his thermometer, takes the temperature which he registers as sub-normal; listening to the tick of the clock, murmurs, slow pulse; looking at the iron-ware and observing the rust says: "erythema, scarlatina

or measles;" observing the wall-paper in the room above says "prolapsus of the mucous membrane with deterioration;" a look at the bulging in ceiling, says: "introversion"; then the carpet of the room above, observing the green mould says: "gangrene and necrosis"; then the immovable bureau drawers and exclaims: "fibroid hypertrophy." Then reviewing the whole list discovers that it is unlike anything else and says: "cause and name unknown" call it "Spanish Flu"; treatment, "no specific, treat symptomatically, (every symptom by itself), whether it kills or cures." "No subjective symptoms, patient dumb." For low temperature, Bottle of Whiskey, \$2.00 for Prescription. For the stove: Stove polish, brush and plenty of elbow-grease. For the wall-paper: "Adhesive plaster." For the bulging in ceiling: "abdominal support and Tinct. iodine to strengthen ligaments." For the necrosis in the carpet: "The undertaker." For the swollen drawers. "no cure for that, immediate operation"; orders draw-knife and jack-plane.

Though this may appear foolish it is exactly the mode of procedure taken by a physician with a diseased human. The one is ridiculously absurd when applied to a house because we know the cause of all the symptoms; but through the faulty education of the laity it does not know that the conditions of a patient are identical to those of the house and one but needs to know **what and where** is the cause of the trouble, which is the only real diagnosis. The thing the Chiropractor knows with every patient.

Should a Chiropractor be called to attend the sick house he would pay but scant attention to the state of the rooms and furniture, but at once look for the cause; finding the displaced shingle, he would proceed to adjust it back in relation with its fellows and leave the repairs to those whose business it is; the servants within.

When called to a patient, the Chiropractor does exactly the same; for courtesy's sake he might listen to the patient's "tale of woe," after which he would carefully examine the patient's spine (a thing a physician never does), notwithstanding the protestations of the patient, who would probably disclaim having anything wrong with his back, saying that the trouble and pain is in the furniture inside, etc, etc. The Chiropractor would continue his search for the "displaced shingle"—The Subluxated Vertebra—which is the leak, the cause of all his internal trouble, and proceed to adjust that back in relation with its fellows; and leave the internal repairs to be made by those whose business it is; She, who makes **no mistakes** in diagnosis, nor gives the wrong medicine—"Inmate Intelligence."

This common-place argument may be thought frivolous by those whose training makes it possible to discuss the question of diagnosis academically, but one cannot get away from the fact that the two are identical in principle. Should the Government require the academic, scientific controversy relative to the subject, it will only be necessary to request the Commissioner to produce the evidence presented by Dr. DuVal at the special meeting appointed by the Commissioner to consider the necessary education for the purpose of obtaining "Correct Diagnosis," when it was elaborately discussed before representatives of the various professions who claim diagnosis as a necessity to the practice of their respective Arts.

Medical Diagnosis Mere Guessing at Best.

Though we took the same antagonistic stand and placed ourselves on record that "Correct Diagnosis" was only a medical dream and impossible to realize on account of the very nature of the thing, no matter how many ologies were devoted to its study. Though this took place over a year ago, no one has ever yet attempted to controvert, contradict or even question our statements which were made on the Scientific, academic basis. Therefore we take the right to assume that they are unanswerable, based on the tacit admission

by silence. And it is more than strange that no mention or use of that important feature of the investigation was used as a factor in producing the report, which would have elucidated much better the relations of the two principal cults in reference to diagnosis and would have established the claim of superiority of Chiropractic.

Moreover it was pointed out that diagnosis as it is known to-day by the best diagnosticians in the land and under the most favorable circumstances, is only 50% correct, the mere toss of a penny in the game of chance of "Head or Tail." Incontrovertible evidence was presented that at the Massachusetts Hospital over which Dr. R. C. Cabot presides, autopsies were made on one thousand subjects to ascertain the number of correct diagnoses in that number of living patients, and it was found that only about fifty per cent. had been diagnosed rightly. At the New York Bellevue Hospital a similar number had been so tested, where it was found that 523 had been diagnosed rightly and 477 had been diagnosed wrongly.

Lamentable as this state of affairs is, it is not nearly so remarkable as the fact that the Commissioner sets as a paragon of medical orthodoxy the very cult responsible for this failure with their pet foundation of diagnosis, when he already knew of these facts. Notwithstanding that it was pointed out that while it was not to be wondered at that the 477 who were diagnosed wrongly, and subsequently received the wrong medicine, should die as a result of the double error; but what about the 523 who were diagnosed rightly and supposedly received the right (?) treatment? Is it not surprising that they should die also, everything having been scientifically (?) correct. The former were no doubt buried and listed as "martyrs to Science," but the latter cannot but be classed as "Victims of Super-Educated Medical Ignorance." Could the Commissioner have found but one tittle of this against Chiropractic, we believe he would have hired a brass-band and heralded it to the Government at the sound of tymbals.

Though we feel that we proved that correct diagnosis upon which medicine absolutely depends could not possibly be obtained for more than 50% of cases on account of all the symptoms not being available, we were deprived of our rights to place all our evidence before the Commission in regard to our position relative to diagnosis, by the Commissioner making it impossible for our principal witness, Dr. Palmer, to speak before the Commission and retain his dignity as a gentleman, the Commissioner refusing to give a reason for his action; thus depriving us of presenting our views of what constitutes diagnosis to Chiropractic. It had been previously recommended by the Commissioner that if more than one person was to speak on the one issue, the subject was to be divided between them, each taking a portion of the subject to prevent overlapping and thereby save time, a thing which we thought very reasonable and acted accordingly. Dr. DuVal taking the first half of the subject and Dr. Palmer the other, which would have been carried out but for the unwarranted interference of the Commissioner; Dr. DuVal refusing to enter the part reserved to Dr. Palmer.

Two Ways of Determining "What Is the Trouble?"

Quoting from Mr. Abraham Flexner's report to the Carnegie Foundation, Page 147, pgh 1, the Commissioner says:

"All physicians, summoned to the sick, are confronted precisely by the same crisis: A BODY OUT OF ORDER. No matter to what remedial procedure they incline—medical, surgical, or manipulative—THEY MUST FIRST ASCERTAIN WHAT IS THE TROUBLE. There is only one way to do that."

To all of which we agree and say amen; but it is absurdly illogical for Mr. Flexner and Justice Hodgins to assume that there is **only one way** of finding out "what is the trouble." Chiropractic has a way of its own that is characteristic and exclusive which, though radical, is a thousand times more

practical and effective, as the Chiropractor devotes his time, energy and knowledge to the **substance** (cause) and does not go wandering looking after the **shadows** (effects) like our predecessors. It is that portion of our evidence which Dr. Palmer was deprived of presenting, and therefore the Commissioner has no right to pass on the subject, not being qualified by education in the first place and far less as a Commissioner as he did not get the evidence which would have made him better informed, due to his unwarranted, absurd, if not designing, interference.

Commissioner Grieved That Chiropractic Is Not Medicine.

One of the most remarkable inconsistencies of the report is discovered by comparing his statement that he "Cannot accept Chiropractic as any part of medicine whatever," with what he proposes as a definition of medicine. Declaring consistently in one breath that Chiropractic is nothing like medicine and in the other very inconsistently making the **practice** of Chiropractic the **practice of medicine**; by making that definition so elastic, and stretching it so that it studiously includes everything that is in the heavens above, the earth beneath and the waters under the earth. It is the same as saying that a bird is not a fish, but if a bird goes flying in the air, it must be construed as swimming like a fish in the water. O, consistency, thou art a jewel, but thou dost not add any glory by shining in the intellectual crown of the Commissioner.

Commissioner Refuses to Visit Chiropractic Institutions.

Presumably to make it appear that Chiropractic shuns and avoids investigation he says that Dr. Matson, Secretary of the Ohio Medical Board, said to him that the "Palmer School of Chiropractic refused their Board admission to inspect the school in any official way." The Commissioner does not say whether he enquired the reason why; but we will venture to say that he did not, or else he would never have quoted Dr. Matson; or if he did he only enquired from Dr. Matson and only got the brand of truth that is retailed at the Ohio State Medical Board and not as he would have obtained from Dr. Palmer or Dr. DuVal.

Anticipating the question, and without going into details, we will answer briefly and comprehensively for the Government. Dr. Palmer refused such permission for exactly the same reason that Mr. Lloyd George or President Wilson would refuse the Kaiser permission to inspect our military institutions, knowing very well that it is not prudent to let the wolf in the fold even under a sheep's clothing. Had the Commissioner known Dr. Matson, and what he represents, as well as does Dr. Palmer, it would have altered his judgment considerably. But to know too much is not one of the characteristics of the Commissioner, even after his investigation, which was evidently to obtain one-sided information.

Should this last statement be questioned or thought too severe, or perhaps ill-founded, contrast the refusal of Dr. Matson to visit the Palmer School of Chiropractic with these two invitations: one to the Commission directly, and one to the Ontario Parliament through Dr. DuVal:

In a letter to the secretary of the Commission, Dr. Palmer writes:

"I now take pleasure in extending an invitation to your Commission to visit us at any time that such will be convenient. We do not ask for advance notice except not to come during the holidays. Any week-day you will be welcome to not only inspect our school, its equipment, its faculty, but also our student body. If you wish to call unexpectedly, well and good; but if the Commissioner will wire me in advance, I wish to extend a personal invitation to have both the Commission and yourself as our guest at our home, one of the finest in the city. Deciding to be our guests will not obligate the Commission in any way and it shall not be felt as such."

(Signed) B. J. PALMER,

Davenport, Ia., 12/15/18.

And to Dr. DuVal in answer to a query as to whether Mr. Abraham Flexner had ever investigated the Palmer School of Chiropractic, Dr. Palmer after emphatically saying that the Carnegie Commission had never knowingly been near the place adds:

"There are no words strong enough to express my contempt against a person who will, knowingly, write an adverse report upon an investigation he has never made, reports on interviews he never had, or goes to an institution fictitiously and surreptitiously and hand out a report without thorough and due investigation.

"Nothing would give me more pleasure than to entertain any committee that your Ontario Parliament would care to send. . . . The pleasure would all be mine."

B. J. PALMER,

5/27/14. Davenport, Ia.

Note the difference in the two cases: One is a request from an enemy to be permitted to spy on an institution which he wishes to destroy or misrepresent, as others have done; a thing which cannot be considered any less than a Hunnish scheme, hence the refusal. The other is a candid invitation to the Canadian Authorities, through the Commission, to obtain the most reliable information concerning a vital problem.

As Dr. Palmer practically tendered the Freedom of his institution to the Commissioner, his reference to the Matson incident is senile and falls to the ground. It would be interesting indeed to ask the Commissioner to give his reason why he did not accept Dr. Palmer's invitation and visit the Mother School of Chiropractic, though he was within a stone's throw of the place inspecting other schools; and considering the fact that he spent a day investigating the newest and smallest school of Chiropractic. Especially after he had been invited to go in and go out as he pleased: Look, Listen and Learn; was he in the same predicament as those he complains of; afraid to look lest he might see something he did not wish to see; dreading to listen lest he heard something he did not want to ear; and fearing to learn anything he did not wish to know and would have to make his report in a different way than that he was planning; or, was he questioning whether any good could "Come Out of Nazareth?"

At any rate he did not investigate as he should to do justice to all concerned. Therefore, we say that any legislation adverse to Chiropractic based upon the recommendations of this report, will be resented as a gross injustice to a new science which demands nothing but Fair Play, and one whose institutions stand wide open to any legitimate investigation.

Another instance of the obvious purpose of the Commissioner to discredit and "minify" Chiropractic by every means possible is the fact that the whole chapter, from page 32 to 37, is devoted to discussing Chiropractic and nothing else; though it is under the caption of "Chiropractic and Mano-Therapy," and devoting only two lines to the latter which he defines as a thing having "no distinctive feature," as though he wished to make it appear that Chiropractic was in the same class and of no consequence.

Medical Goal "Correct Diagnosis"—Chiropractic Objective "Health"

In dealing with the portion of the report, P. 34, it will not be expedient to do so in extenso as the labor involved in studying it and the criticism would be altogether disproportionate to the value, inasmuch as the four pages are nothing more than a mass of illogical arguments, obviously destined to substantiate that which has no foundation in fact, most of which have been dealt with in preceding pages. Nevertheless, we must deal with this chapter in sequence, making quotations and briefly criticize and comment upon them as we think necessary to let the light in for the non-conversant reader, who, otherwise, might take for granted the false position taken by the Commissioner.

Though there is not one line in the whole of this chapter which should

escape criticism, and sometimes condemnation, we will refrain from doing so in order to make the work more practical.

We note with no surprise that the first three paragraphs are devoted to emphasize the need of "Correct Diagnosis," to the "Treatment of Disease" and nothing at all to the **Curing of the Patient**; he and his welfare are only secondary considerations, indeed, if at all. The **disease** must be considered as a guest and well **treated** according to rank (diagnosis), which is emphasized when the Commissioner says:

"This is only another way of saying that correct and intelligent diagnosis is the foundation and prerequisite of all successful **treatment**."

The diagnosis, the disease and its treatment are the medical trinity aimed at to make up the great "Medical Science" but nothing about the cure; indeed, this is so remote as to be negligible if ever thought of at all, as proved by the following quotation and comments:

"If diagnosis is faulty or careless the methods employed necessarily lack precision and suitability and **fail in their effects**."

Which is doubly true of medical science, as has been shown at Bellevue Hospital where out of one thousand patients, half of whom having been diagnosed and treated wrongly, necessarily died; but the other half having been diagnosed and treated **rightly**, died notwithstanding; which is sufficient to show that it is not the patient and his welfare that is sought, but the disease which must be correctly appraised and entertained accordingly while he is the patient's guest; if not, he will depart taking the patient with him, evidently disgusted at the treatment received.

"Ability to make a correct diagnosis is therefore the primary end of all good medical education," says the Commissioner. Contrast this with the following: "Ability to **make the sick well** is the primary and sole object and end of all Chiropractic education." We humbly beg the Government to note the difference before legislating on this recommendation.

What is it that the sick of the Province need the most? Is it diagnosis and guess treatment, or do they want to get **well**? If so, which of the two systems is the better; the one which studies how to guess, or the one that learns how to do?

To which we would answer: In a scientific medical test 1,000 out of 1,000 died, whether they were diagnosed and treated right or wrong. On the other hand we beg the Government to send the Commissioner in and out, throughout the land of Chiropractic and see if the deaf hear, the blind see and the lame walk. A thing which we repeatedly begged the Commissioner to do but he positively refused. Was he investigating for the good of the people or for the good of medicos?

What is the real objective when a patient calls a doctor? Is it to have his pulse felt, his temperature ascertained, his blood tested, his urine analyzed and a Greek or Latin name out of a thousand given to his disease, and have given him a few pills, tablets, powders or a bottle of liquid dope, which will make him more sick than well. **No**, ten thousand times **No**. His only object is to **get well**. That should be the alpha and omega of all good medical education, but is not since it is diagnosis. But how is a patient, ignorant of medical science, to know which doctor to go to unless it be to one of "Our Legalized Method" which teaches that the vast majority of diseases are incurable (see medical text-books). Does one go to a barber who says he cannot cut hair? Does one go to a tailor who says he cannot make clothes but can diagnose a suit when made and tell whether it is black, white or grey? No, the poor unfortunate patient is left to the doubtful "Hobson's choice" of our legalized method who will say they cannot do him any good; but can diagnose his case scientifically and charge him well for it.

Practically all of page 34 is devoted to proving that the burden of medi-

cal education is diagnosis with nothing at all for healing. Is it not an insult to the intelligence of the age to ask the Government to believe that one may be sick (no health), but that he may carry health and happiness done up in little pills or tablets in his vest pocket, as if the Almighty had forgotten to place good health in man, but put it in pills and bottles and place them on the shelves of drug-stores to be retailed at so much per, and that one must have six years of education in a University to be able to tell which is which; and be prepared to administer a fresh pill to neutralize the evil effect of the previous one, according to diagnosis. All of which is admitted by the Commissioner when he says, P. 34, pgh. 3:

"Diagnosis is as vital in realizing the effect of the treatment, in detecting each manifestation of what are called complications, and in recognizing improvement or the reverse calling for a continuance or modification of the particular treatment."

(What a splendid doctor the Commissioner has become suddenly. He knows practically as much as those who have prompted him.)

All of which is likely true of medical cults, but is simply **not true** of Chiropractic as is implied. Because there are no complications with Chiropractic and the only sequelae are from sick to better.

The whole of page 34 smacks so much of politico-medicine that we must beg the Commissioner to express our belief that the Commissioner did not write this epistle himself, or that it was prepared for him by a medico literateur far above the average doctor as we know him, and one versed in the political game. Should that be the case it must be taken as presumptive evidence that the Commissioner was disposed to favor a particular cult, because we Chiropractors) were not asked to prepare a special page like this one, to brain-fuddle the average reader who could not see this subtle trick.

"The progress of medical science . . . is continuous," says the Commissioner; but it must be admitted that it has not arrived at anything definite yet after its thousands of years of experimenting on little monkeys to find a grub for Infantile Paralysis and Spanish Flu. Are there not as many and more diseases to-day than ever was? If there was less diagnosis and more real healing one might call it progress. The progress has been in this phase of diagnosis; it has divided, subdivided and multiplied and given more names to the same old diseases we had from time immemorial, but it has not one single specific for a single disease, as they are continually progressing(?) in finding diseases but no real remedies. This progress "is most striking and impressive," says the Commissioner; true, most imposing as a camouflage to disguise the ignorance of real conditions. . . But where is the **efficacy**?

To parade all this impressiveness before the Legislators, may enthrall them pro tem, or at least until they ask what it is all for; what good is it?

Disease Prevention.

On page 35 the Commissioner directs "particular attention to the very important considerations suggested by the medical practitioners in their statements made before me on the third and fifth days of November, 1915, as to the practical and striking results of these studies in combatting and in some cases entirely preventing fatal diseases."

Another "striking" proof that there is nothing said about curing but much about **combatting** and **preventing**. How does one ever know that one would have had a disease if Niagara had not turned out of its course? How does Jack know he would of caught the rabbit if the dog had not got tired and quit?

It is really to be regretted that some of these, at least the most striking ones, could not have been reproduced in the report to edify some of us who need it the most. It is too bad that this great light should be kept under a bushel and keep us in everlasting ignorance of it, as our prayer is that of Ajar, asking for more light. Honest, we do not recollect anything very strik-

ing happening on these days; neither have we any record of any such thing occurring; but we are thankful in having a hint that something was presented to the effect of **entirely preventing** certain fatal diseases, which sounds very well as a piece of rhetoric but shows mighty little judgment and discrimination from one whose training should enable him to discern at least the palpable incongruity of such a proposition. How does he know; how do the doctors or anyone know that **certain fatal** diseases have been prevented? How is it known that such diseases would have taken place. Does this not remind one of the old lady who went to visit a friend, but anticipating rain took an umbrella with her; went and returned without rain, and on arriving home said that the fact of her taking an umbrella with her **prevented** the storm from coming.

Compare this old lady with modern medicine anticipating (sometimes desiring) an epidemic of Typhoid, which in all probability will not come, prepare by inventing a serum which will immunize anyone from a disease he may never have, anyhow. If the disease does not manifest itself, Hurrah, it is a **striking** result of preventive medicine, taking for granted that it would have occurred otherwise. But if Typhoid presents itself notwithstanding, it is declared not to be Typhoid, but "Para-typhoid," a distinction without a difference, to which no one can demur, does not "The Doctor" say so? Great is diagnosis.

The general public cannot, knowing nothing of diagnosis; and if an irregular attempts to undecieve the people; our "legalized method" stands on its self-assumed dignity and attempts to pooh-pooh by rushing to and fro and calling out "Quack, Quack," like so many frightened ducks (does) at what they think is their Nemesis. "Ah, but the statistics," some judge would say, "What about the statistics?" Well, what about them? Who makes the statistics? The Doctors, of course, who alone have the legal right to say what disease affects a patient. Who dare contradict those who study diagnosis? And does anyone think they will be foolish enough to make statistics that will contradict the present pet theory of preventive medicine? Not by a long shot unless their enthusiasm makes them over-step prudent caution, or it is done by some real scientist independent enough to tell the truth such as: Cabot, Osler, Prof. Gregory, Magendie, etc.

Imaginary Proposal Troubles Commissioner.

The Commissioner finishes by saying: "And I have not been able to find any escape from the impression which these results force upon one's mind (his mind) in weighing the advantages of the present system against what is now proposed."

It is self evident that he did not try very hard to escape from his impression and that he was a very willing captive and delighted at a chance of crying out "Kammarad"; because had he investigated as he ought to he might have found many escapes; we could have assisted him considerably had he asked, and granted us an opportunity when we were ready to do so.

This is irrelevant only that it is used as a prelude to draw attention to the broad innuendo contained in these words: "in weighing the advantages of the present system against what is now proposed." Which is evidently said with the view to prejudice the Legislature against some imaginary drastic proposal by someone that he indicates without naming, that the "present system" be done away with, the same as he proposes with others. It sounds more like a weak plaint of one on the defensive against a nebulous enemy that does not exist, than an argument based on the strength of logical conviction.

What is it that is being proposed which he wants to safeguard against. Has he had, during the three years of investigation, any proposal that "Medicine," as presently understood, be forcibly eliminated by Legislative enact-

ment? If he has we know nothing of it and it is up to him to make it known and stop insinuating. Throughout the breadth and length of the investigation there has never been any request to eliminate, control, curtail or prohibit any system by the advocates of Chiropractic. This was all in the hands of the medical gentlemen who wish to control the whole orchestra from first fiddle to base drum and have been crying "Crucify Him" every time a reference was made to some irregular cult. We are sure that it was not done by Chiropractic whose representatives expressly placed themselves on record and recommended that every meritorious cult be clearly defined and given their birth-right, a place in the Sun-light of British Fair Play, and permit each to give its quota of good to the sick of the province, without being subject to the arbitrary control of any other cult which knows naught of the other's business.

This was done specifically at a special meeting to consider among other things the question of "Should 'Medicine' be defined by Act of Parliament, and if so, in what terms." To which we offered a definition the fairness of which has never been questioned, and one that was equally just to all without being unfair to anyone. The Commissioner recommended a definition of his own in the report, which we would be willing to accept in its entirety if he had only recommended the previous provisoes we had recommended, which cannot be questioned as giving the most equitable solution to the situation, which would have characterized the report by a sense of justice, foreign to it, and remove from the Commissioner the stigma of patronage. Therefore it would be well to ask the Commissioner to produce that evidence, as it would alter his recommendations considerably.

We are well aware that a Commissioner has the right to his own opinion and to make whatever recommendations he pleases, but that is provided they are consistent with the evidence. But we positively deny that he has a license to misrepresent anything, even that which he wishes to destroy; because that is a prostitution of authority at the shrine of prejudice as he seems to be attempting in the present instance.

Medical Liberty As Well As Religious Liberty.

No, it is not true that Chiropractic proposes to destroy anything which holds the promise of some good in the eyes of the Government. Why cannot "Medicine" in Ontario be placed on the same basis of liberty as is "Religion," instead of being on the arbitrary, autoeratic principle which creates a monopoly for one cult.

Should Mr. Justice Hodgins be appointed as a Commission to investigate religion and finished by making a similar recommendation to that he made in reference to Medicine, there would be an insurrection in Ontario the next day and every man would be toting a gun with his Bible. If the principle of liberty is good for the Spiritual, why is it not as good for the Physical welfare of the community? Had the Commissioner placed Chiropractic in the same position as he places Allopathy, the writer of this criticism would be the first to shoulder a rifle to oppose it, because absolute power is the precursor of degeneration and decay.

The Commissioner represents us as being "Ishmaelish"; if he means by that term that we are bellicose we will not deny it, but at once ask the question: Is it surprising that we should resist and fight when we are hounded down by a cult which cannot find any other railing accusation than the Hunnish cry of "Quacks" as the American Medical Association is yelling at the present time through the United States Press? If the Government will appoint a REAL Commission to find out "who are quacks," we are willing to be classed as such now, and we will be delighted at the opportunity of proving the contrary, and point out where quacks are to be found.

"Political" Modern Medicine.

As if to corroborate his previous statements, the Commissioner quotes a definition of "Modern Medicine" by Dr. L. F. Barker, of Baltimore, which is again another evidence of his lack of logic and discrimination, as the definition is fatal to the medicine which he wishes to boost in Ontario; as the definition is that of "Modern Medicine" as viewed by Dr. Barker, who is giving a political definition of medicine for the purpose of eliminating sectarianism, and not of "Medicine" as it is in Ontario, as the Judge knows very well. We have no "Modern Medicine" in Ontario. Was he not told by Dr. Dixon, a venerable relic of the old school, but one who has progressed some, that "Medicine in Ontario was **forty years behind the times.**" Surely that is not modern; that is fossil medicine, embalmed and wrapped up as a mummy. The medicine that Dr. Barker speaks of and would like to establish is "The medicine of 'To-day,' to which nothing is acceptable that will not stand the scientific test rigidly applied." Ask the Commissioner to rigidly apply the scientific test to the medicine we have in Ontario and show it to us after he gets through. It will be so full of holes that it will look like a sieve and serve a good purpose in sifting the errors in his report. Ask him to produce the evidence that we have that kind of medicine in Ontario, and if he does it will be the stultification of what he says in the last paragraph of P. 35. "The universities grant degrees in medicine, while the College of Physicians and Surgeons possesses the right to fix the curriculum of study and to grant licenses" The universities would possibly teach that kind of medicine but they can't, they are compelled to teach fossilized medicine dictated by the fossils. Dr. Barker's medicine exists nowhere on the continent except in his own concept, viz: that there should be no sects in medicine. "That 'medicine' which is willing to make use of facts no matter how or where they may be found."

But where on earth is there such a medicine? Surely not in Ontario and is not likely to ever be, as the Commissioner found a medicine in Ontario that he characterizes as one

"in which NON-PROGRESSION is almost a negation of its principles, are the product of a school which, as of old, cry, 'Can any good come of Nazareth?' but take no sort of pains to find out the true answer to that enquiry. They are not willing to look the thing in the face for fear that they might see something. At all events, their attitude is that of KNOWING NOTHING and wanting to KNOW NOTHING pp. 36."

Which is exactly the result of our experience during the whole of the investigation in which we found that medicine stood in a complacent ignorance, being fully convinced that where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise.

One of the worst features in Dr. Barker's definition, and one that is being used by the Commissioner to support his arguments, is that in which it is sought to represent what is called "Modern Medicine" to be that which is called "Our Medical Provision" for the sick, and that it is IT; a thing which is par excellence over everything else, the highest tribunal in all methods of caring for the sick, the alpha and omega in brains, logic and knowledge and that it is like the Kaiser, divinely appointed to rule the roost and arbitrarily decide as to what is what in "Medicine." This is not the case, as they are no more qualified to judge than a bull would be in a jeweller's shop; as proven by Dr. Eli G. Jones in his report, after his investigation of drugless methods. In his report, as published in the **Wisconsin Medical Journal**, May, 1909, in which he says:

"I believe the profession does not fully realize the rapid growth of drugless healing in this country. To prepare a paper of this kind I have been to considerable labor, time and expense to get at the real facts, and to get reliable statistics that could be depended upon. **In every instance I have gone to headquarters.** The attempt is to show that whenever anything that an irregular has built up and proves,

even against opposition, is good, that it is time for the UNEDUCATED MEDICAL MAN to assume all rights to the same, gobble it in, and then annihilate it under the pretense of being the only man capable of demonstrating its scientific value.

"Physicians are no more fit to jump into that line than a carpenter would be to professional work. Special study along antipodal lines does not make proficiency in this."

Dr. Jones' statement necessarily bears more weight than that of Dr. Barker's, because it is the expression of one who knows, having investigated to find the truth and not to pull the wool over the eyes of the unwary, while Dr. Barker is not known to have ever gone a step out of his way to learn anything concerning Chiropractic or anything else. And the Commissioner is not justified, and certainly manifests favoritism in quoting Dr. Barker and studiously avoiding this evidence of Dr. Jones' which he has had presented to him and emphasized, as it should have more force than that of Mr. Abraham Flexner's (which the Commissioner quotes to excess) who held an investigation at the same time as Dr. Jones, though with a different object in view, which was of directing the Carnegie millions to the benefit of medicine, while that of Dr. Jones' was to find the truth, and nothing but the truth.

Be that as it may, we cannot refrain from pointing out the weakness of Dr. Barker's argument as he sums it up at the finish. He says:

"There is only one great science of medicine, just as there is one science of chemistry, one science of physics, and one science of biology. We hear nothing of sects in physics, or of sects in chemistry. Nor should we, in my opinion, hear anything any longer of sects in medicine."

All of which is an over-anxious attempt to comfort himself with his Utopian medicine which has only an existence as a political "serap of paper" which he wants to run in before the public as an exact science as is Chemistry and Physics, which is absolutely untrue and a mere chimera, as is proven by the following lights in medicine:

Dr. Evans, F. R. C. P., London: "Medicine has neither philosophy nor common sense to commend it to confidence."

John Mason Good, M. D., F. R. S., London: "The science of medicine is a barbarous jargon."

Dr. Jacob Bigelow, Pres. Mass. Med. Soc.: "Medicine is still an ineffectual speculation."

Sir Astley Cooper: "The science of medicine is founded on conjecture and improved by murder."

Sir Wm. Knighton: "Medicine seems one of those ill-fated arts whose improvements bear no proportion to its antiquity."

Prof. J. Rhodes Buchanan, M. D.: "Of all known sciences none have been more unstable, confused and contradictory than practical medicine."

Prof. E. H. Davis, N. Y., Med. Col.: "Medicine is a term employed to cover ignorance."

Dr. R. C. Fowler: "Medicine is not a science. No doctor of any standing will say that it is a science."

Dr. Benjamin Rush: "Medicine is like an unroofed temple, uncovered at the top and cracked at the bottom. We have assisted in multiplying diseases; we have done more, we have increased their fatality."

Dr. Magendie, Col. De France, speaking to the assembled students: "Gentlemen, medicine is a humbug. I know it is called a science. Science, indeed, it is nothing like science."

Prof. Gregory, Edinburgh Med. Col.: "Ninety-nine out of every hundred medical facts are medical lies, and medical doctrines are, for the most part, stark, staring nonsense."

(Imagine, if you please, a doctor confronting the sick with a complete assortment of "stark, staring nonsense" with which to treat them.)

In view of what these eminent men say, is it not the height of mendacity to try and represent medicine as "One Great Science" equal in exactness to Chemistry and Physics in which there are no sects, but there are sects in medicine because it is not a science, and there will always be as long as it is based on wrong foundations. If Dr. Barker wishes to remain a medico he must take things as they are, get off his perch and accept sectarianism in

medicine. Were it a science there would be no sects in it as is the case in Chemistry, Physics and Chiropractic, because these are Sciences, not pseudos.

Chiropractors Not Dependent on Hospitals For Experience.

Evidently with a view of pointing out what appears to be an irremediable deficiency in Chiropractic education, the Commissioner says that "Such students (chiropractic) are entitled to take any course offered at the University and benefit thereby, they cannot 'take advantage of practical hospital study and experience,'" because this is controlled by the College of Physicians and Surgeons who will not permit any intrusion. Which is quite true, but we must say that all the misfortune does not fall on the student of Chiropractic who is by no means the object of pity that the Commissioner represents, because it does not affect him very materially; it affects the public much more, and all we can say is: so much the worse for the hospital patients; because the Chiropractic students have other ample means to obtain clinical experience at the school-clinics that are everywhere provided for the purpose, without being at the public expense, but greatly to the public's benefit.

"In addition to this," says the Commissioner, "all public medical appointments in the province must, by statute, be filled by registered physicians.

As if he wanted to point out an unbridgable gulf. To which we would ask: Who made the statute? because we feel that he has no right to place all blame on the shoulders of the Legislature and make it bear the brunt of our criticism which is: So much the worse for the Province as it curtails the field of candidates very materially and deprives it of much valuable service at the expense of incapacity. But in doing this the blame must not be placed altogether on the Legislature, who evidently passed such statutes (which can all be repealed) only at the recommendation of those who were interested deeply, such as the doctors and their agents, at a time when there was no one to say nay and give a reason why; but this time we intend to have something to say if permitted, and so suggest to the Leg'slators that they will at least be fully conversant with the matter, to know the conditions as they are and not simply as the Commissioner makes them appear.

The rest of the Commissioner's argument relative to hospitals with permission for Chiropractors to practise in them is all irrelevant, as at no time during the investigation has there been a request made by Chiropractic to use such as a training camp for Chiropractic students. They do not need them; this is already provided and is fully efficient everywhere. But our request for permission to enter public supported institutions has been emphasized by the fact that this was only desired for the purpose of giving Chiropractic professional service to the unfortunate victims within who were deprived of the best method of recovering health—Chiropractic—and not to use the patients as experimental stool-pigeons for students; because patients are not always willing to be so used, but have to submit willy-nilly.

The Commissioner's statement that there are no clinical facilities "even in the most limited way" where Chiropractic instruction can be given, is simply outrageously untrue. How he could say this, having before him sworn statements that such facilities were provided, were ample and proportionate to the student body, besides having had a tangible demonstration when he visited the school at Hamilton, is incomprehensible and places a question mark on his motive; especially when he reinforces it by his other statement that "Those practising in Ontario who appeared before me recognized this as true" is another misrepresentation or purposeful misconstruction, because those who appeared before him knew better and if they lamented the fact of being prevented from entering hospitals, it was not because they were wanted as training places but to give to the inmates that which they needed the most—their health—which they could not obtain otherwise, since they were de-

clared incurable by those who held the keys to the "Homes for Incurables," and others whose inmates are kept for experimental purposes by medical students. Chiropractic has all the clinical facilities needed and is kept proportionate to its students.

Medical Curriculum Not Adaptable to Chiropractic.

On page 36, pgh. 5, the Commissioner quotes from Mr. Abraham Flexner's report to the "Carnegie Foundation" the following: "The logical position of medical sectarians is self contradictory." Taking for granted that Chiropractic is included in this (medical sectarian), we will simply say that it is not true and that the author (Mr. Flexner) did not know what he was talking about, as he did not know anything of Chiropractic, not having investigated; had he been conversant with the matter he would not have made the next statement: "They have practically accepted the curriculum as it has been worked out on the scientific basis," because he would have known that Chiropractic accepts no "ready made" pseudo scientific curriculum, especially not the medical one, because it is not scientific as we have shown, and the fact that Chiropractic accepts what is scientific does not make it compulsory nor does it give it a license to adulterate science with what Prof. Gregory calls "Stark, staring nonsense." The whole gist of the author's arguments would almost be acceptable if they did not include Chiropractic among "medical sectarians" and did not rest on the word "accepted" as it depends considerably upon who is the "acceptor." Not the Commissioner surely, as he is not qualified; neither is Mr. Flexner from whom he quotes, as he is less so, being only a mouth-piece for the American Medical Association, though he was supposed to be an investigator, but did not endorse anything that was not Allopathy; and all he knows of Osteopathy and Chiropractic is what he observed from the bottom of an exceedingly high mountain (prejudice) looking at the external of these cults through a smoked glass during a fog.

This gives neither of the Commissioners the license to express themselves with the apparent authority they assume in summing up the arguments contained in pages 36 and 147, which we have already discussed but must refer to again, viz: "No matter to what remedial procedure doctors incline . . . they must first ascertain what is the trouble. **There is only one way to do that,**" without telling us **what way** that is. This is an assumption that neither of the Commissioners can substantiate (nor those who inspired them, for that matter), simply because they do not know, not having investigated **the other way—the Chiropractic WAY.** In this respect we have no diffidence in asserting that both Commissioners are simply the "mouth-piece" of others who know less; and that they are no better than phonograph records which, after being wound up, repeat nothing more than what has been whispered into them and in the same way that a parrot does. It is nothing short of presumption for these two men to tell the Government that "there is only one way" of telling what is the matter with the sick. The Ontario Commissioner having made it impossible for one of the leaders in Chiropractic to tell him of a far better way of **knowing** what is the matter with the sick. Had he obtained that evidence he could have been convinced unless he was positively determined "of knowing nothing and wanting to know nothing" except balderdash. Neither do we hesitate in saying that much of Mr. Justice Hodgins' report, purporting to be his opinions, is nothing more than the stereotyped medical jargon coming through him as a speaking tube.

Commissioner Laments That His Position Is Not Stronger.

What he does say, however, in the last paragraph of page 36 to the end of the chapter, is undoubtedly his opinion based upon that which he has observed through the investigation, which by no means redounds to the credit

of Allopathy as it is in Ontario, but is a lament over the fact that through his recommendations a great loss to the province may be incurred, and admits the weakness of his position by saying, page 37, 2nd paragraph: "I am not at all persuaded that, as to the purely therapeutic side of these systems, the position I have mentioned is either **wise or right.**"

There can be no question whatever that if his recommendations are not **right**, they are surely not **wise**. Wrong is not the basis of wisdom; and to prove that his recommendations are wrong and palpably unjust we will just ask a few questions in addition to what we have already said.

We are not violating any principle when we say that the report unmistakably recommends the elimination of Chiropractic as a distinct profession and that if it possesses any therapeutic values that they be enquired into with the view of absorbing them by making them part of the Allopathic system which is not noted for protecting and developing anything that "Came out of Nazareth," and far less if the thing is antagonistic to its teachings. Of this there can be no question, as the report is permeated with that idea from cover to cover. If that is admitted we insist on getting a rational answer to the following questions.

Leaving out the consideration of wisdom, as this answers itself. Will it be just, or **right**, for the Government, without legitimate reason, to **confiscate** a profession which has nothing but good to characterize it, and hand it over to another as a despised gift to be exterminated?

Will it be right to ruthlessly despoil those who for twenty-three years have been learning and developing a science heretofore unknown, which is unique, has nothing in common and despoils no other?

Will it be consistent with the principles upon which Our Good Government is based, to ruthlessly deprive those who have struggled against tremendous odds, fought and suffered opprobrium, contumely, ridicule, prosecution and persecution, from the very profession to whom it is proposed to hand them over without money and without price.

Will it be **British Fair Play**, a slogan and boast of all Canadians, to say to them: "Get out of the province ye medical heretics; ye are a band of interlopers. The money you have spent, the discovery you have made, the work you have done, both in developing your science and in making the sick well from their ailments, the groans you have uttered, the tears you have shed and the blood you have sweat, count you for naught. By your good works you have blasphemed against the antique mummy of 'Modern Medicine'; depart from here into 'Outer Darkness' prepared for the Huns?"

Will this be British Fair Play or will it not be more in keeping with another autocratic Power that considers International Treaties as "Mere Scraps of Paper"?

If this is not right, neither is it wise. Will the good Government of Ontario commit itself to such recommendations? We trow not, as that would be a stultification of Justice and all other principles upon which it is based. Would that not be "ignoring the human and business relations involved?"

ERNST DuVAL, D. C.,

President, CANADIAN CHIROPRACTIC COLLEGE,

On behalf of Chiropractic.

Hamilton, Ont, Oct., 1918

(Edited by Ernest Woodworth)