

until about the fourth or fifth day of treatment, from a trifling space at the upper part of the right lung, it had invaded nearly the whole of it. Dr. Hall now took the case in his own hands, and by the adoption of energetic measure the poor man's life was saved, but not before serious fears of it were entertained.

Shortly after this unfavourable result of Homœopathic treatment, there presented themselves for admission into the Hospital no less than three cases of fever and ague. The cases were all well marked; one case by a liver complication, the second by a complication of disease of the liver and spleen, while the third was an uncomplicated case. Dr. Rosenstein was again sent for, and was offered the selection of the cases. Much to the astonishment of every one he chose the simplest case of the three, viz: the uncomplicated case who was at once placed under his charge. The hospital books will record the fact that in the course of about a fortnight the two complicated cases were discharged, while after a protracted treatment of nearly six weeks the patient under homœopathic management implored Dr. Hall to assume the treatment of his case. I remember well that one day elapsed without that young man having had a shake (I forget the technical term), when Dr. R. exclaimed, "now he is cured—the disease is checked, and will never return, while your cases, addressing Dr. Hall, may have the disease return at any minute."—But the following day witnessed another shake, thus shaking to their foundations all the Homœopath's predictions. By way of exhibiting to the students then in attendance, of whom I was one, the efficacy of mere diet in modifying the progress of disease, Dr. Hall placed a case of the same disease, subsequently admitted, on plain milk and water, without a particle of medicine, and this man got on equally as well as did the case entrusted to the professional charge of Dr. Rosenstein.

Now, Sir, the foregoing is a truthful narrative, or it is not. That it is the former, there is abundant evidence even now in this city for its substantiation. I have freely used Dr. Hall's name, a liberty for which I am sure he will forgive me, although I question much if I have a right to ask it, as, at the time he was a public officer, discharging an official duty, and whose acts were open to all kinds of criticism.—Fairer cases for testing the value of Homœopathic treatment could not by any possibility have been selected, and yet that mode of treatment most signally failed.

Now, Sir, how far the foregoing facts can go to prove "that the doctrines and teach-

ings 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 Allopathy, as taught by the Professor of the Practice of Physic in the University at present," is what I will leave for the consideration and digestion of "Homœopathy." That person will doubtless get out of the difficulty by the observation that Dr. Rosenstein did not know his profession;—that his practice was not a true example of Homœopathic practice—in short, that in comparison with others who dote out their physic in infinitesimal doses, and yet upon the principle of "similia similibus," he was a nincompoop; it must still not be forgotten that *he wrote a book*.

I will probably trouble you with a third letter, and in the meanwhile beg to subscribe myself, yours truly,

ANTI HUMBBUG.

June 8, 1854.

—*Transcript*, June 27, 1864.

To the Editor of the MONTREAL TRANSCRIPT.

SIR,—In your issue of the 12th of May last, you were kind enough to give me space in your valuable columns for the insertion of an article regarding the establishment of a Homœopathic Chair in the Medical Faculty of McGill University. That article was replied to, by "Anti-Humbbug," in two letters, with promise of a third one. My attention was directed to "Anti-Humbbug's" rejoinder on the 27th of June last, and I have patiently waited a fortnight for "Anti-Humbbug's" No. 3 epistle. As his No. 3 does not appear to be forthcoming, with your permission I will endeavour to reply now to his No. 1 and 2.

I never have admired anonymous letters. It looks to me like a soldier firing at his enemy from behind a hedge: therefore, however imperfectly and feebly I may use the pen, I acknowledge myself not at all ashamed of Homœopathy as the only principle of cure, of which there is abundant proof. It is to be hoped that "Anti-Humbbug" will disclose himself.

WHAT IS HOMŒOPATHY?

In replying to "Anti-Humbbug," it will be necessary, first, to define what is meant by Homœopathy, since "Anti-Humbbug" has refused to define it. Homœopathy then is a principle established in nature for the cure of dynamic diseases, and, practically, it is as follows:—Medicinal substances have certain properties which manifest themselves, on being administered to persons in health, by pro-