

good which would result, if Homœopathy were adopted instead of Allopathy throughout the world, is almost incalculable. It is in the nature of such a power as Homœopathy to be encroaching, and it surely cannot be called "arrogance" to proclaim boldly what one can defend as being true. "Arrogance," I think, belongs to the proclamation of error, and "inflation" to the wind bag, which can be easily collapsed. I have

thus disposed of postulate No. 4. I hope I have sustained it to "Anti-Humbug's" satisfaction. I shall endeavour in my future communication to sustain the remaining postulates, *seriatim*, and then draw my deductions.

Yours truly,

JOHN WANLESS, M.D.

Montreal, July 14, 1864.

HOMŒOPATHY.

To the Editor of the MONTREAL TRANSCRIPT.

Sir,—With your permission I now proceed to prove, what "Anti-Humbug" has pronounced to be rather "postulates" than reasons. In my last communication the 4th postulate was disposed of, the others will be taken up *seriatim*.

The 1st reason given in favor of the establishment of a Homœopathic chair in the Medical Faculty of McGill University was "because Homœopathy possesses a universal law of cure, and therefore raises the practice of physic to a science." It is a well known circumstance that the medicines chosen by Homœopaths are chosen for the cure of diseases, because the same medicine when given in a large dose to a healthy individual will produce symptoms similar to the symptoms of the disease which is to be treated. The legal way of proving that Homœopaths select their remedies upon this law of cure, would be to swear a few Homœopaths and obtain their evidence from the witness box: "Anti-Humbug" need not put me to this trouble, I presume. Instead of performing this feat, however, I will give him a few more instances which prove that medicines do act curatively and according to this law. Hippocrates said: "give a draught from the root of mandrake, in a smaller dose than will induce mania, and it will act curatively on mania."

The symptoms which will follow the administration of a large dose of corrosive sublimate to a healthy person—(says Taylor in his Medical Jurisprudence)—will be like those of dysentery, viz: tenesmus and mucous discharges mixed with blood, &c. In fact inflammation of the stomach and bowels. "Anti-Humbug" does not think of doubting that these symptoms recorded against corrosive sublimate by Taylor are correct. Homœopaths are all just as well assured that the same kind of symptoms in disease will cease upon the administration of dynamised doses of corrosive sublimate. The way to prove either is to try. I have abundantly tried it, and have found it true. Why won't "Anti-Humbug" study the matter, or allow others the privilege of being taught the doctrine of Homœopathy.

Dr. Groenevelt in 1703 published a little work full of interesting cases of Stranguary—which were cured by Spanish flies, a medicine which is well known to produce Stranguary in a healthy individual when given in large doses. For the publication of this book, the Royal College of Physicians of London committed Dr. Groenevelt to Newgate, by the warrant of their own President. "Anti-Humbug" assumes a certain form of academical persecution too.—As there is a good deal of space to be occupied in proving the other postulates, let me be as brief as possible with each. These instances of the law of cure will be sufficient to prove that there is one, and if there can be one case proved that medicines which produce a complaint, if not there, will cure a similar complaint if it be there, then that is sufficient, for nature has never two laws for the accomplishment of the same object; all her laws are simple and of universal application for accomplishing the end in view.

"It therefore raises the practice of physic to a science" is the remaining portion of the "postulate." What is a science? "Science is knowledge built on principles." The practice of Homœopathy is based and built on the principle here enunciated, that medicines producing similar symptoms in health will cure similar symptoms in disease, the latin formula of which is "similia similibus curentur." "Let likes be treated by likes." The 1st postulate is thus established.

The 2nd postulate is "Because the administration of medicines, according to the Homœopathic law, does not injure any part of the healthy organism."

I have proof from "Anti-Humbug" himself to sustain this postulate, for he says "that nothing unfortunate issued" from the administration of the homœopathic treatment of his great hospital cases, and the public will know that "one drop of the St. Lawrence" will not injure any one. No, Anti-Humbug, "nothing unfortunate ever issues" from the homœopathic treatment to the living organs, their homœopathic powers do not lie in the direction of injuring organs,