

"The *odium theologicum* may be strong, but the bitterness of medical differences is even stronger; and it is vain to imagine that allopathist and homeopathist could be brought to sit at the same board and pass the same examination. In the very nature of things it is impossible. Now let us ask what is to be done under such circumstances? Is the allopathic system, which is dominant at the board, to have a monopoly of provincial practice? Has medical science arrived at such a point that the legislature can say that one system is right and all the rest are wrong? Who will be so absurd as to say so? There is no science on which so much diversity of opinion exists as that of medicine. One uses drugs, and another renounces them entirely; one gives large doses of mercury and another calls them poison; one gives infinitesimal quantities, and another ridicules them as utterly inoperative and childish. Is the Legislature to step in and decide when doctors differ, to say to the homeopathist, you shall not practice under pain of imprisonment; and to the allopathist, you may charge two dollars a visit and poison with morphia and calomel as many as you choose? Yet this is the result of the law put in force in Tumblety's case. If Dr. Grant is successful in his first suit, there is no reason in the world why he should not arrest one of the many respectable homeopathic physicians residing in this city or Hamilton, have his property seized by the Police, and himself committed to gaol. There is no difference between the two parties in the eye of the law. Both parties have given medicine without license, and are equally answerable. Now, we would like to be informed why a man who believes in small doses should be refused the aid of a physician who will give them to him; why he should be compelled by Act of Parliament to call in a man that he believes will poison him. Are we going back to the sixteenth century, that such a law as this should be put in force in Canada?

The present attempt on the part of Dr. Grant and his supporters to get rid of all rivals, is the practical carrying into effect of ideas ventilated at a meeting of the medical profession, held in Toronto some time ago. The *medicos* who assembled on that occasion contended that Parliament should allow them to form an association which would have the power to exclude from practice all who did not come up to the formula which it might select. The same demand, in effect, is now made through the courts. All who will not go before a Board composed of old school physicians, and submit to the views propounded there, must be punished by fine and imprisonment if they give advice and take a fee. We feel convinced that by making this demand, the regular profession will incur much unpopularity, and will gain nothing. It is quite impossible to put bonds on a sick man and say, this person only you must consult, and no one else. The patient must be allowed to go to whom he pleases, to whoever will give him relief. If the regular profession sustain their reputation in public estimation, they will sustain the largest share of practice; but if new discoveries are made, and they are left behind, the people must be allowed to follow the new lights, if they so will."