

answers the above question. Allopathy taught it. Hence, as Dr. Bayard asserts that the child died in consequence of the use of the sulphur ointment, Allopathy is guilty of at least one murder.

At page 23, Dr. Bayard arrives at his mathematical bravado, and, no doubt, when he quoted from Simpson and presented to his admirers in St. John the tremendous array of figures and cyphers, he expected to behold Homœopathy come tumbling down with all its "spiritualities and globule-ism" and Allopathy, as before, would have the field to itself. But, alas! the system stands, the able pen of a noted disputant could not produce a tremble, and, no doubt, it will continue to stand, and Dr. Bayard will be gathered to his fathers without having the satisfaction of beholding the death of this charlatan delusion. After attentively investigating the "Delusions" remarks upon the Homœopathic dose, we have concluded that the Doctor has an utter disbelief in their utility.

Now, how much does the author know of the efficacy of the infinitesimal dose? Has he ever prescribed it in a case of disease, and watched its effects? Or, in fact, has he the amount of knowledge requisite to make a Homœopathic prescription? We take the liberty to answer nay, to both queries. Therefore, he is totally ignorant of what he is writing about. Had he tested the small dose and found it inert, he would have made it known; and as he made no such statements, the conclusion is, that he never gave it a trial, but allows Simpson, Routh, etc., etc., to do the thinking, while he, in a manner quite unphilosophical, retails the falsity as facts. We have for seven years given the infinitesimal dose, and it has always answered our expectations. Now, we appeal to any candid man, and ask him whose statement is to be credited, Dr. Bayard's or ours? He never prescribed the homœopathic dose, and we have always prescribed it. Which of us, according to the usual nature of things, is most capable of answering the question—"Is the small dose efficient?"