

Here we find that, while homeopathy saved nearly 79 out of every 100 attacked, nature saved 33, and allopathy about 30, making a difference of 3 per cent. in favor of nature. Nature is, therefore, a little better than allopathy, or allopathy a little worse than nature—our calomel-giving friends are at liberty to read it as suits themselves.

Again, when fever and dysentery were devastating Ireland in 1847, Mr. Kidd, a homeopath, treated one hundred and ninety-two cases in their own homes, amidst all the wretchedness of that most wretched time, and the results of his treatment were as follows:—

Mortality from Fever.....	2 per cent.
" Dysentery.....	14 "

At the same time, and in the same neighborhood (Bantry), Dr. Abraham Tucky, an allopathic physician, treated a number of cases in the Bantry Union Hospital, with every possible advantage of cleanliness, ventilation, diet, &c., and here the results were:—

Mortality from Fever.....	13 per cent.
" Dysentery.....	36 "

At the same time an hospital was opened in England for the reception of the sick Irish emigrants, and here the physician abstained from giving any medicine whatever, and contented himself with watching the cases, taking proper care of the diet, ventilation, &c. As a result of this treatment the mortality from fever was only 10 per cent.

Here we find that, while the mortality, under homeopathic treatment was 2 per cent., the mortality under allopathic treatment was 13 per cent., while the loss under "no medicine at all," was only 10 per cent.

In Dr. Routh's famous book, "The Fallacies of Homeopathy," I find the following passage:—"Dr. Dietl, the al-

lopathic physician of the Wieden Hospital, in Vienna, anxious to test the efficacy of dietetic regimen in pneumonia (inflammation of the lungs), instituted a series of experiments. In the course of three years that gentleman treated 380 cases of pneumonia. Eighty-five of these cases were treated by repeated bleeding; of this number 17 died, or 20 per cent.; the remaining 38 recovered. One hundred and six were treated with tartar emetic; the mortality was now 20·7 per cent., 22 dying, and 84 only recovering. The remaining 189 were treated by simple dietetic means; the deaths amounted to 14, or 7·4 per cent., 175 recovering.—The above data have been given upon the evidence of Dr. Roth (Homeopathic Times, No. 49), an eminent homeopathic writer"—p. 55.

Here we find that, when Dr. Dietl treated inflammation of the lungs with bleeding and large doses of powerful drugs, he lost 20 out of every hundred; and when he contented himself with simple dietetic management, he only lost 7 out of every hundred.

In a former number I stated that Dr. Fleischmann, of the Gumpendorf Homeopathic Hospital, treated 538 cases of pneumonia with 28 deaths—a mortality of 5 per cent. Compare this with the results of Dr. Dietl's varied treatment:

PNEUMONIA.

Under Allo. treat., the mortality was	20 per cent
" No medicine at all " " "	7 "
" Hom. treatment " " "	5 "

It will thus be seen that, while both the homeopath and the allopath give medicines, the former *gains* by it, and the latter *loses* by it.

T. N.

London, June, 1856.

[TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.]

What has become of some of our friends who promised articles for the