

If the reader takes pains to study Dr. Flint's commentaries on the Code, published by D. Appleton & Co., of New York, he will find an ample refutation of each and every objection stated in the letter to THE JOURNAL of April 22. The Code, based as it is on the maxims of many sages, was written for all time, and the teachings it inculcates can be condemned only by evil-doers. Its admirably pure and exact language gives it a particular charm which delights the scholar, and serves as a model of excellence for the rising generation of medical writers. Therefore, let the misguided members who are striving to destroy this monument of the wisdom of good and true men pause and reflect before taking final action; let them examine the Code diligently, maxim by maxim, section by section, sentence by sentence, word by word, and let them frankly and honestly say if they find an expression which can justly be condemned; if not, let them cease their unbecoming agitation, and employ their best thoughts to further the interests of science and of the Association whose laws they are pledged to obey as a condition of membership.

A CONSERVATIVE MEMBER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:

Dear Sir:—We are glad to hear a nineteenth century voice from California. I, for one, can honestly concur in what he has written, living as I do near a medical center of some importance. What can we lesser lights do when the president of one of the best (if not the best) colleges in the State can trephine a case for a homœopath? Another who is a professor in the same school, and has had the honor of being chairman of one of the Sections of the American Medical Association, sending a nice little note to the dean of the homœopathic department of the University of Michigan, "who is a good friend of his," concurring in his opinion and advising him to follow the plan he recommended.

Another professor holding an important position on last year's committee of the American Medical Association, having a peculiar case with Dr.—whose sign reads Dr.—eclectic, physician, etc.

Now the point I wish to make is this: Is it not unjust to keep the younger members to the Code, so that professors and presidents can get all the regular graduates' patients needing special treatment, and scoop in the irregulars also?

These instances are but as a drop in the bucket as regards the respect to the Code in this State.

FAIR PLAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:

Dear Sir:—The "Code" question is admirably epitomized in two letters published in THE JOURNAL of April 22.

A correspondent writing from San José, Cal., with evident sincerity advances in effect the following argument: "The Code is daily violated by men apparently respectable; therefore, the Code should be repealed."

In this benighted commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Mr. Editor, when, not long ago, men high in political station and prominent in the church were found to be guilty of forgery and embezzlement, we did not either strike out the eighth commandment from our copies of the decalogue, or repeal the criminal code of the State. We sent the highly respectable criminals to the penitentiary.

While among those opposed to certain provisions of the Code or to any code, are many who are actuated by the highest motives, I fear that all who shelter themselves behind these pure-minded men are not equally unselfish. As to these latter, "A Kentucky Member" hits the nail squarely on the head. Even if the Code should be repealed, he intimates honorable physicians "intend to keep it in spirit and letter. If it does not suit others, we pity their

depravity and hope they will leave us alone, and 'roost' with their own kind." That sums up the situation.

One other point seems pertinent. Many members are under the impression that the reports of the committees on Revision of Constitution and Revision of Code, are to be finally acted upon at Milwaukee. Article VII of the Constitution of the American Medical Association, however, provides that propositions to amend or alter shall be made at an annual meeting and be acted upon at the following annual meeting, a three-fourths vote being necessary for adoption. A recommendation to revise is not such a specific proposition to amend as is contemplated by that article; and hence, the reports of the committees will have merely the same parliamentary status, as a proposition to amend made by an individual member. They can be submitted at Milwaukee but cannot be legally acted upon until the following meeting.

Most respectfully,

SOLOMON SOLIS COHEN.

Philadelphia, April 24, 1893.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:

I presume that much valuable space in your JOURNAL will be wasted in discussing the revision of the Code. Allow me to waste a little in commenting upon Dr. A. C. Simonton's article in the April 22 number of THE JOURNAL.

The Doctor says twice in his communication that the *old Code is harmless*. Now, this is saying more for it than can be said of any article you have published condemning the Code (your editorial on Professional Unity to the contrary notwithstanding). The Doctor objects to flagrant violations of the Code. Especially to the *free dispensaries*, medical colleges and hospitals, and intimates that if the "old dilapidated, antiquated, ancient relic of ignorance and superstition" Code was enforced it would *save the profession thousands and millions of dollars annually*. If this is true, and I do not doubt it, why should the profession be in any hurry about changing the Code, much less to give it up entirely? A harmless code that will save the profession thousands and millions of dollars annually, it seems to me is just the kind of a code we need.

The Doctor would like a code which would allow specialists special rights, forgetting that knowledge acquired in any special branch does not alter the relations that physicians sustain to each other; because A or B is more expert in the use of instruments, or better posted in the treatment of cancer, or has a position higher than C, he is not privileged to herald this superior qualification to the world through the columns of newspapers. According to the Code, this would be quackery, and I think, yes, I know that the "respectable specialist" who does this is a quack, however respectable he may be. "Equal rights to all and exclusive privileges to none," may not be a medical axiom, but it is a very good rule to apply to the profession. Respectable specialists and those who violate the Code can not be put in the same class; letting both into the same organization would not change their characters. The violator would keep up his evil practices, and a code that tries to unite quacks and physicians will be a dead code. Now, a word or two in regard to the proprietary man. The old Code men have no use for him (earthly). The true physician does not allow the charlatan to do the diagnosing and prescribing while he plays nurse. It is possibly an easy way to practice, but the sticklers for the old Code do not see fit to adopt this plan. We look upon the proprietary man as using borrowed glory; all his knowledge is borrowed except that which he uses to mislead the profession. Now does he know anything about the etiology of disease and when his nostrum is indicated? He has seen several medicines recommended