

poerates there is the following, "By similar things disease is produced, and by similar things, administered to the sick, they are healed of their diseases. Thus the same thing which will produce stranguary, when it does not exist will remove it when it does," that was a fact, at the time of Hippocrates. The Homœopathic law of cure existed then, it does so now, and ever will do, independently of the belief of "Anti-Humbug" or any other man.

Shakespeare was not ignorant of the principle. He says: In poison there is physic; and these news, having been well, that would have made me sick, being sick, have in some measure made me well. Henry IV., Part 2, Act 1; Sec. 1.

HOMŒOPATHY NOT QUACKERY.

Neither is Homœopathy quackery. Quackery pretends to the possession of some valuable nostrum, some unexplained "energetic treatment" sold for private gain but which is not disclosed for the public good. Whoever may have secrets in his "energetic treatments" Homœopathy has none, no nostrum, it courts enquiry, and asks all to make a thorough investigation of its claims. It is a recognised law of healing and will be the means of driving away from the Profession all quacks to whatever class of medical practitioners they belong.

HOMŒOPATHY MORE SUCCESSFUL THAN ALLOPATHY.

"Anti-Humbug" says, in his first epistle "that the writer of this letter brings to his assistance no less than fourteen reasons in support of his position; but, logically speaking, they are not reasons, but rather *postulates*, which, if granted, the truly eclectic practice of the present day would tumble and totter to the ground." I take "Anti-Humbug" at his word, and will endeavour to prove those "*postulates*," and as "Anti-Humbug" has only attempted a disproval of my 4th postulate, I will, let of all, attend to it, viz. :—

"That the doctrines and teachings of Homœopathy have been and can be amply proved to be attended with more recoveries in all kinds of acute and chronic diseases when fairly tested than the method of practice called Allopa'hy as taught by the Professor of the Practice of Physic in the University at present." Now, Mr. Editor, let us examine the mode by which "Anti-Humbug" disposes of this "*postulate*" of mine. He cites first, a most important case of Pneumonia, which occurred in the Montreal General Hospital, about the year 1845, which case was then under the care of Dr. Hall, and observed by Dr. Gibb and "Anti-Humbug" himself, while he was a

Student of Medicine. To this important case of pneumonia, one Dr. Rosensteln, then resident in Montreal, was sent for. He it was who did battle for Homœopathy, but "Anti-Humbug" would seem himself to sneer at the powers of Dr. Rosensteln—(with whom I was unacquainted, and who I believe is now dead and not able to defend himself)—because he says in Italics that Dr. Rosensteln "*wrote a Book on Homœopathy.*" Now as to writing books, I have read many worthless allopathic Books, and even some which were considered valuable in my younger days, and looked up to as the climax of proficiency twenty-five or thirty years ago when I was a student in Edinburgh, are now thrown aside as useless as far as the Practice they inculcate is concerned. Dr. McIntosh's Book, for instance, which advises so valiantly "Bleeding in the cold stages of Fever and Ague," and bleeding in almost every thing else to syncope, is never opened, yet we Students admired McIntosh, and looked upon him as the first Physician and the most acute, of the day—"Wrote a Book." I have never seen Dr. Rosensteln's book, it may be good. But Burns said "that some Books were lees frae end to end, and some greet lees were never panned; even Ministers they has been kenned, a rousing whid at times to vend, and naill we Scripture."—The writing or copying of a Book in itself may or may not be a measure of a man's ability or acquirement.

So that the mere matter of proclaiming oneself the author of a book does not argue in favor of a man's competence to conduct the treatment of a case of pneumonia or any other case.

Regarding the length of time required before recovery takes place in cases of Pneumonia or Inflammation of the Lungs, Dr. Hughes Bonnet, Professor of Clinical Medicine in the University of Edinburgh, an Allopathic author of acknowledged ability says "The majority of cases of Pneumonia of medium intensity recover between the seventh and fourteenth days," and he names the periods of recovery as between the 7th, 14th, and 21st days, and that "the real tests of successful practice are not to be sought for in the relief of symptoms, but in the removal of the disease when it has been established, and that treatment will be the best, which "*ceteris paribus*" causes fewest deaths and recovery in the shortest time."

Now, it is remarkable that "Anti-Humbug" in his description of the progress and treatment of his great case of pneumonia, does not give us the rational and physical signs which it must have presented, when at first it was "an important case of pure inflammation of the lungs;" nor those signs, when it