

kind exertions which you used in my behalf in the matter of —, I can very sincerely reciprocate all the kind expressions contained in your letters. As you are not of my profession, we may very easily agree to differ on the subject of homœopathy; but that this difference may ever be thoroughly amicable, the best plan is, after this mutual explanation, to let the matter drop. You cannot convince me that homœopathy is true in theory, or that “the system,” so-called, is honest in practice, or that it legitimately brings riches to starving doctors. On the other hand, I could not satisfy you that the facts of “the proscribed system” bear a less proportion to its astounding theories than Sir John Falstaff’s half-penny worth of bread to a gallon of sack.

We have both written what we conscientiously feel, and I hope you will always consider me as

Yours, very sincerely and obliged,

JOHN ROSE CORMACK.

No. IV.—Mrs. A. B. to Dr. Cormack. Some days later.

My dear Sir,—It struck me for the first time this morning, that you have possibly thought we had decided on, or at least contemplated, changing our baby’s treatment, before I saw you on Friday, (4th July). I write to you immediately to assure you that this was not the case. We have often from time to time given the children a globule, and on Friday evening when Mr. A. B. came home, he was very anxious to give baby something, to see if it would relieve her cough; it appeared to us to do her so much good, that we resolved on Saturday to let her see Dr. —, and to try homœopathy properly with her. I feel sure that you will excuse my troubling you with this explanation, as it would really grieve me if you thought I could speak to you as I did on Friday, at the same time intending to act as we did on Saturday. You will, I think, like to hear that dear baby’s cough has nearly left her, though she continues very weak, and has a bad appetite. I hope you will come to see us before we leave —. I shall always feel grateful to you for your kindness to me and to the children. Believe me, my dear Sir, yours very sincerely,

MATILDA A. B.

#### LETTER FROM DR. HILBERS, ON HIS DEFENCE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

To the Editor of the *Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal*.

SIR,—Having been absent from home for a few days, the number of the *Provincial Journal*, containing your strictures on my letter, only fell into my hands a day or two ago. As you have impugned my conscientiousness, I trust you will not deny me a place in an early number of the *Journal*, in order that I may point out the error in your article to which, as I conceive, your remarks are mainly attributable.

The “sophisms” which you are pleased to call mine, are of your own manufacture. My “sophisms” are quite different, and are not touched by your article. You say,—“He admits, in fact, that equivocation is justifiable when it is necessary to obtain a certain end.”

I say,—“If a set of men can be found so blinded by prejudice to a sense of their duty, as to punish a man because he knows all that they do, and something more, any reasonable amount of deception is justifiable, when the object to be attained is a laudable and a necessary one, and when, through their dishonesty, it cannot be obtained without it.” I would suggest that there is some slight difference between the qualified and the unqualified assertion; about as much as if you were accused of justifying assault and battery in the abstract, because you had said that if a man assaulted you, and tried to take away your coat, you would feel yourself justified in knocking him down. Methinks it seems passing strange, and somewhat inconsistent, for so stern a moralist to fall into such an error and consequent injustice, for I presume it is not a part of your moral creed that it is unnecessary for “a Christian and a gentleman” to act fairly and honestly to a heretic.

If you desire fairly to put the question to your clerical adviser it would run thus:—I am in want of a distinction which the State has empowered a University to bestow on all candidates who comply with certain conditions. I have complied with those conditions, and consequently consider myself legally and equitably entitled to the distinction. But some members of this University, in order to gratify a blind prejudice, based on ignorance, have illegally and arbitrarily appended certain other conditions never contemplated by the State, and diametrically opposed to the genius of our institutions and the spirit of the age. Am I justified in answering in the third person, (the sum and substance, be it remembered, of Dr. Hale’s delinquency, and of my justification,) instead of the first, in order to evade these conditions. Despite your taunt as to my want of conscientiousness, I still think that such an act of “deception,” if deception it can be called, is justifiable, exactly as I should consider the unfortunate red-haired prisoner, mentioned in my former letter, justified in going into court with his hair dyed black. The old English proverb—“what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander,” holds good here. If it is imperative on the homœopath to answer purely conscientiously, it is imperative on every other candidate to do so too. Considering the diversity of opinions which exist in the treatment of disease, any examination on such terms would be impossible. Every man would naturally contend for the correctness of his own views; the examination room would speedily be transformed into a bear-garden, and the police office, or the riot act, would be the finale of every examination. The examination always has been, and always must be, a test of a man’s knowledge, and not of his creed. If he is found to possess a competent share of the former, he ought to be presumed capable of correctly determining the latter.

As to the members of the University deciding that homœopathy is a mischievous fallacy, it is not surprising, when it is remembered that it is something new, and that they are quite ignorant about it. Granting for a moment that the system is as true as its warmest advocates assert it to be, how is it possible that either you or they can ever be convinced of its truth so long as you refuse to test it, or to believe a word spoken in its favour by those who have tested it? To talk in a grandiloquent style about its not being worth testing, and of its having been refuted over and over again, is