

the determination to show the world what the American medical profession can do for science and humanity when united in collective effort.

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—SPECIAL RATES.

The Grand Trunk Railway System will sell reduced rate tickets to all physicians attending the British Medical Association meeting at Montreal, August 31 to September 5. Tickets will be sold August 28, 29 and 30, good returning three days after adjournment of the convention, at rate of one and a third fare for the round trip. Through Pullman palace vestibuled sleepers daily between Chicago and Montreal. For tickets and sleeping car accommodations apply to L. R. MORROW, G. P. & T. A., 103 Clark St., Chicago.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Treatment of Typhoid Fever.—An Answer.

DAVIS, W. VA., Aug. 3, 1897.

To the Editor:—In the JOURNAL of July 10 I notice an article on the "Treatment of Typhoid Fever," by Dr. Upshur of Richmond, Va., and his criticism of Dr. Woodbridge. His treatment especially attracted my attention. He says: "Dr. W. makes claims of such brilliant results that one is startled, and the question arises, have I been groping and blundering all these years?" In the outset he desires it understood that he has never used it, not because of any *spirit of prejudice or unfairness*, but because upon careful consideration the brilliant results *claimed*, to his mind, disproved the facts, and he did not feel willing to trifle with the lives of his patients by uncertain experiments. He has never tried it. How can we know of anything unless we try it? How does the Doctor do when he hears of a new drug, for instance, antitoxin in the treatment of diphtheria? Did he use it after reading what it did at the hands of others? Does he not use vaccine virus that was hooted at by many for years? Many wise and learned physicians laughed at it and cried it down, but what physician does not now use it, believing firmly in it? It was an experiment at first, but after it was perfected, tried and proven, it became a *fact*. How can he judge of a treatment (no matter what) if he does not give it a trial—a fair trial? Does he practice medicine and never try what others recommend? Does all his practice consist of what he knows most positively are *sure cures*? Can not others teach him? Have we to depend on foreign physicians entirely? Have we not just as wise, just as learned men in our own country as they have across the water? Is it not just as possible for the Woodbridge treatment to succeed as for antitoxin?

I have used Woodbridge treatment exclusively for two years, without the loss of a single case. If I should have typhoid fever I should feel safe, if I took it or had a physician give it who understood just how to use it. I lost from two to five cases every year before I used it. Does Dr. Upshur think the ability to diagnose typhoid fever is confined to himself and a certain few others? He says, "there *must* have been a mistake in diagnosis." I used for years iodine and carbolic acid and cold baths, and had good nurses. I had a case last year who had four hemorrhages from the bowels, temperature ranging from 104.5 to 105.5 degrees, and she got well in three weeks. I used the Woodbridge antiseptic tablets. Her husband was sick with the same disease this summer, between nine and ten weeks, and is really not well yet. He was on the old treatment and under a physician who does not believe in Woodbridge. Since I have been using the Woodbridge antiseptic

tablets I have not had a case sick over four weeks, and they rarely run more than three before being discharged. Only the one mentioned had hemorrhage from the bowels and four or five deliriums, which soon passed off. Several cases came to my office with temperature 105 to 105.5 degrees when I first saw them. Do I make mistakes sometimes in diagnosis? Yes, and so do all of us; Dr. Upshur included.

When I see physicians all around me using the old treatment and working and fighting with might and main with this dread disease, I am all the more ready to sound Dr. Woodbridge's praises for his wonderful discovery, and add my voice to the many in urging all physicians to try it and prove its efficacy. I saw one of our physicians lose four cases in one family on the old treatment. The Doctor was discharged and another one called in, who, although he did not use the formula of Woodbridge, used a part of it—thymol, guaiacol carbonate and hydr. chlor. mite, and brought the rest of them through.

Dr. Upshur seems to think that Dr. Woodbridge breaks a law of ethics. I can not see how he does, for if Dr. Upshur would recall how often he puts the make of drug he wants on his prescriptions, he would see in some measure while that is a sort of advertisement for the firm, his motive is to secure what he considers the best make for his patient. I often do this myself, for I have carefully watched and know whose preparations act best for me. Dr. Upshur speaks of the years of experience of the great men past and present, of the convincing truth of their writings, etc. It is true in most instances, but can not others come forward thinking and studying and find out new things and improve on what has already been found out and teach you and me? To sum up: What is our object in this great science of medicine? Is it not to relieve suffering, to cure disease, to get our sick ones strong again, and the sooner the better? I for one intend to read, to study, and to work, but use good common sense with it, and do my very best for my patients. I am heart and soul with Dr. Woodbridge, and firmly believe he has made a great discovery and advise all my brother physicians, who have not already studied and tried it, to do so. Watch it carefully and you can not fail to have your efforts crowned with success. Anyway, do not condemn before giving it a fair trial.

Fraternally, B. M. SMITH, M.D.

Criticism of a Critic.

CLYDE, N. Y., July 28, 1897.

To the Editor:—In the number for July 24, page 196, I notice under the title "The Jubilee Meeting," that among your exchanges there is one journal, *Buffalo Medical and Surgical*, which is deeply grieved that the representative of the anarchistic element of the profession of this State—"president of the Medical Society of the State of New York," was not allowed to participate in the proceedings," etc.

The writer also laments that "a great medical society" was thus ignored.

If the writer was not in his swaddling clothes at the time, does he fail to remember the insurrection in which he and his fellow-revolutionists were engaged—an insurrection the purpose of which those revolutionists boldly proclaimed was the expunging of the Code of Ethics from the Constitution of that "great medical society" by which, since 1807, it had been governed?

This mournful state of feeling, mingled with much pity, is so intense that he sorrows because Dr. Davis was not magnanimous enough to allow it, so long as it "would not have diminished the renown that is so justly accorded to the Father of the Association." Herein lies a great mistake of the writer. If he well knew of what he was writing, he knew that Dr. Davis had always protected the Code of Ethics from any and all invasions, and he ought to have known that had the repre-