

MAJORITY & MINORITY REPORTS

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

OF

THE BOARD OF TEN GOVERNORS,

TO WHOM WAS REFERRED THE SUBJECT OF INTRODUCING

HOMŒOPATHY

INTO

BELLEVUE HOSPITAL.

Submitted January 19th, 1858.



REPUBLISHED BY

J. T. P. SMITH,
HOMŒOPATHIC PHARMACEUTIST,

54 COURT STREET, S. BROOKLYN, L. I.

WBK
B449m
1858

New-York :

FRANCIS HART & Co., Printers, 63 Cortlandt Street.

1858.

MAJORITY REPORT

OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
ALMS HOUSE DEPARTMENT, PRESENTED DECEMBER 29, 1857.

The Select Committee to whom was referred the following Resolution :

Resolved, That it be referred to a Select Committee to report upon
“ the propriety of so amending the law organizing the Bellevue Hospital
“ Medical Department, as to provide that one-half of such Institution
“ shall be set apart for the practice of Homœopathy, under the care of
“ a Medical Board nominated by the Homœopathic Society of this City.
“ And that each case admitted in said Hospital shall be transferred to
“ the care of the Allopaths and Homœopaths alternately.”

RESPECTFULLY REPORT :

Until within the last ten years, Bellevue Hospital was so identified with the Institutions of the Alms House Department, that it had no separate existence. By resolution of the Common Council, in the year 1847, a Committee was appointed to inquire as to the propriety of re-organizing the Department. This Committee was composed of the following gentlemen:—James D. Oliver, Washington Smith, and George H. Purser. They associated with them several eminent medical gentlemen, among whom we may mention John W. Francis, Valentine Mott, and James R. Wood, and proceeded to examine into the condition of these public Institutions. The result of this inquiry showed great want of good management, giving rise to an alarming mortality among the inmates. On recommendation of this Committee the Department was entirely re-organized, and Bellevue Hospital assumed an independent position.

In perfecting its internal arrangements, it was deemed advisable to place its medical police in charge of a Board of medical gentlemen. In the selection of the members of this Board, great care and mature deliberation was exercised. The medical gentlemen appointed were

eminent in their profession, of high standing in the community, and of experience in the management of the complicated affairs of a Hospital. We need but mention the names of John W. Francis, Valentine Mott, Isaac Wood, Alexander H. Stevens, James R. Wood, to assure this Board and this community that the medical government of that Hospital was placed in charge of a Board of medical advisers which neither this or any city could surpass.

This change did not disappoint the anticipations of the authorities of the Department. Under the judicious management of its medical officers, who brought to the discharge of their duties, ripe experience in the affairs of a Hospital, and thorough practical devotion to its interests, Bellevue Hospital has steadily advanced to the front rank of similar institutions. Its mortality has fallen from 20 to 9 per cent., its internal arrangements have been perfected, and every department is characterized by the most rigid and salutary discipline.

Your Committee can bear personal testimony to the fact—and it is their pleasure to do so on this occasion—that under this Medical Board the character of that Institution has steadily improved, until from a lazar house to which the pauper even went with reluctance, it has become a well appointed Hospital, whose wards are crowded with grateful patients, and whose gates are thronged with eager applicants. We can ask no better test of the efficiency, capacity, and faithfulness of our medical officers, than the unrivalled progress of this Hospital in the confidence of that class for whose relief it is appointed.

We should not do those medical gentlemen justice, however, did we not allude to their position in their own profession—the true test of their professional capacity—as evidence of the knowledge and experience which they bring to bear upon the practical discharge of their duties in the Hospital. So great are the advantages which it affords for the practical study of medicine, that for the last few years medical students have been allowed to accompany the physicians and surgeons on their round of duty, and observe the nature and progress of diseases and the results of treatment. No one who visits the Hospital during the session of our medical schools, can fail to be struck with the throng of students and medical men who crowd its ample theatre, and the eagerness with which they listen to the instruction of their teachers. The high standing of the Medical Board has also given to Bellevue a national reputation in the medical profession, and rendered it an object of inquiry and compliment abroad.

The Resolution upon which this Committee has been appointed, is one of inquiry as to the expediency of placing a part of Bellevue Hospital under the charge of a new Medical Board. When we consider the rise and steady progress of that Institution to its present important position, and reflect that the same medical officers under whose judicious administration it has so signally prospered, still form its Medical Board, the pertinent inquiry suggests itself—What necessity is there for a change of its medical government? Has this Board lost confidence in the professional ability of Valentine Mott, John W. Francis, Alexander H. Stevens, William Parker, James R. Wood, John T. Metcalfe, Alonzo Clark, and the other gentlemen connected with that Hospital—men who to-day enjoy the full confidence of this community, both in their professional capacity and as citizens? After ten years' generous

devotion to the general interests of that Institution, and of gratuitous personal service in the care of its inmates, is it right, nay, is it politic, for this Board to supplant these gentlemen, and place that Hospital, or any portion of it, in the charge of persons having no experience in the economic or medical affairs of a Hospital?

The object of this change is suggested in the Resolution to be the introduction of a new system of medical practice among its inmates. And petitions of formidable length have been presented to this Board in favor of such change. But whence do these petitions emanate? Do they come to us from the inmates of the Hospital who are to be the subjects of the experiment? Do the sick who crowd its wards complain of the incompetency of the medical officers and of the inefficiency of their treatment, and petition us to change their medical attendants, and introduce a new system of practice? Do these petitions even emanate from the honest laboring classes of our city, whom the vicissitudes of life and the misfortunes of poverty may at any moment remove to the wards of Bellevue for relief to their bodily ills? These are questions which this Board would do well to ponder before it acts.

But what is the system of medical practice which we are petitioned to experiment with upon the inmates of Bellevue? It is the so-called Homœopathic. It may be said, that as laymen we are not capable of estimating the advantages or judging of the merits of a system of medicine. If this statement has weight, let us ask, What importance ought this Board to attach to the petitions of laymen for a change of systems?

It is not our province to discuss medical theories, nor would such discussion, even by medical men, aid us in the discharge of our duty. We shall regard the system only as unprofessional observers, and draw our conclusions accordingly.

The system of Homœopathy is evidently based upon a wild, transcendental theory, which pleases the fancy of its advocates, and appeals strongly to the credulity of the masses, who are fond of the marvellous. Its principles obscure, and its practice extravagantly refined, it naturally finds the proper field for the exhibition of its wonderful powers in obscure diseases, the nature of whose causes still baffle the investigations of science. This is the chosen theatre of all medical empiricism. If Homœopathy is a true system of medicine, why do we not have Homœopathy Surgery, Homœopathic Midwifery, &c.?

That this system is wide-spread, and that it has adherents among the intelligent portions of the community, is an argument that applies with equal force to every system of medical empiricism. The opinion of a man of simply general intelligence, has properly no weight in regard to any new theory and its application to practice in any department of the arts or sciences. We should naturally look for a reliable opinion of the merits of such theory to the scientific cultivators of the art in which its application is proposed. Thus tested, the Homœopathic system must utterly fail to receive our sanction. We appeal in vain to its adherents to point to a single medical man among its advocates in this city, whose scientific attainments in his own profession would entitle his opinion to our confidence. In no department of science is there more activity in the investigation of the principles upon which it is based, more acuteness in observation, or better logic in the deduction of practical precepts from such principles and observations, than in

medicine. And yet the records of science show that all those who truly advance the several departments of medicine, all, without exception, both in this and foreign countries, belong to the ranks of the so-called regular system.

Homœopathy has, in truth, all the elements characteristic of those peculiar medical delusions which from time to time have sprung up and spread over civilized communities, but which eventually fall into merited contempt and oblivion. The vaunted power of its infinitesimal doses excites the morbid taste for the marvellous in every community, and gives its popular notoriety. The history of every medical delusion shows that its success has had a direct ratio with the apparent absurdity and inefficiency of the remedies employed. When the patient comes to attribute to them miraculous powers, its success is complete.

For centuries the royal touch, or the imposition of royal hands, was believed in England to effect a miraculous cure of all diseases. Nothing could shake the confidence of the people in the hereditary power of their sovereign to relieve them of their maladies, especially scrofula, by the simple touch of his finger. Lords and ladies, bishops, princes, the learned and illiterate, and even his medical advisers, placed the most implicit confidence in this sovereign remedy, and thronged the royal palace for relief. During the reign of no less than fourteen sovereigns of England did this popular superstition prevail, although the bills of mortality show that many of the diseases thus believed to be cured miraculously, prevailed to an unusual extent.

Pertinent to our inquiry is the history of a medical delusion which had its origin in this country, and which the authorities of a sister Hospital of this city gravely referred to its medical officers to inquire as to the expediency of introducing into the practice of that institution. We refer to Perkins' Tractors. The discoverer of this instrument was a Connecticut physician, who having failed in obtaining practice in the legitimate pursuit of his profession, determined to try his success with the credulity of mankind. He caused to be made two pieces of metal, one of steel and the other of brass, about three inches in length, and tapering to a point. Their efficacy was attributed by the inventor to the development of a galvanic fluid. The success of this folly shows the credulity of mankind, and the fatal bias of the human mind to superstition. Within two years a Perkinian Committee reported the number of cures to be 5,000. Certificates were given in abundance, many of them emanating from the highest and most respectable sources. A divine, a professor in one of the New England colleges, thus wrote:—"I have used the Tractors with success in several other cases in my own family, and although like Naaman the Syrian, I cannot tell why the waters of Jordan should be better than Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, yet since experience has proved them to be so, no reasoning can change my opinion." They were now introduced into England, where their success was even more wonderful. They found patrons immediately among the nobility; and to facilitate the humane purposes of the inventor, a Perkinian Institute was founded, with Lord Rivers at its head, and a long list of noblemen as directors. The Tractors, which cost the author one shilling, were retailed at five guineas. This singular imposture, however, which in the short space of eight years spread triumphantly over most of the civilized world, found its end in the follow-

ing simple experiment. A physician, of England, suspecting there was not much virtue in these simple pieces of metal, prepared similar ones of wood, and gilded them so as to resemble the original: his success was quite as great as when he used those made by Perkins. After going from town to town, and working miraculous cures, he explained the nature of the instruments which he used. The Perkinian delusion was at once apparent; and that great system of medical practice, "called the greatest discovery of the age," at once fell into merited contempt, and at this time, 50 years after its announcement, these instruments of miraculous power cannot be found. And yet, it is a fact, however, it may excite our astonishment, that the Governors of the New-York Hospital directed the Medical Board of that Institution to apply Perkins' Tractors to the patients, and test their efficacy; and this was actually done. No doubt they were actuated not only by humane considerations, but also by motives of economy.

But we are not left to simple conjecture as to the actual success of Homœopathy as a system of medical practice. It is our duty, however, to inquire simply as to its success in Hospitals; and on this head statistics are sufficiently numerous to prove its entire inefficiency and utter failure wherever it has been tried. The following statistics have been collected with care from authentic sources:

In 1829, by order of the King of Naples, a commission was appointed to test Homœopathic remedies, under the following restrictions:—

1. The Commission shall consist of two Professors of the University of the Faculty of Medicine, two members of the Medico-Chirurgical Academy, two members of Public Instruction, and the heads of the Hospital.

2. The Commission after having proved the attenuation of the Homœopathic remedies, shall place the said remedies in a strong box, firmly closed, with two different locks, the keys of which shall be returned, one to the Director of the Clinique, and the other to the Commissioners charged with following the treatment.

3. The clinical ward shall have but a single door, guarded by a sentinel; its internal arrangements shall be adapted to health; it shall not contain more than 15 to 20 beds, and two assistant physicians, one chosen by the attending physician, the other by the Commissioners, shall keep an exact register of all that happens to the patients, the changes in their diseases, their regimen, cures, and deaths, if any die.

4. The admission of patients affected with acute or chronic diseases shall be left to the choice of the attending physician and Commissioners, with this condition, that the attending physician shall not be obliged to take patients known to be incurable: nor shall diseases equivocal be considered proper for positive experiments.

5. The Commissioners having selected the class of diseases, the attending physician shall make known the symptoms, administer the remedies, and prescribe the regimen.

6. Each day the condition of each patient shall be determined by the attending physician and Commission.

The result of this trial of 40 days of Homœopathic treatment under the observation of the Commission named by the King of Naples, was the conclusion that not only is this treatment of no effect, but that in certain diseases it has the inconvenience of preventing the employment

of remedies capable of effecting a cure. The physician in attendance was M. de Horatüs, author of a Homœopathic work, and who had boasted of the most marvellous cures.

Clot-Bey, Physician in Chief to the armies of the Viceroy of Egypt, states (*Annal de la Med. Physiolog.* Sept. 1834, *Ency. Decr.* 1834,) that a German Homœopathic Physician petitioned the Counsel of Health to try this system in the Hospital of Cairo, alleging its cheapness, &c. He was allowed to select, and chose patients suffering from ophthalmia and dysentery. The Counsel were convinced from this experiment that the Homœopathic system was not entitled to their confidence. The following is the conclusion of the Report of the Counsel of Health: That the cures obtained were due simply to the hygienic and dietetic treatment adopted, and not at all to the infinitesimal doses.

So unsuccessful did this trial prove, that the Homœopathic practitioner was obliged to abandon the country.

In April, 1832, a ward with 30 beds in the Hotel Dieu de Lyon was placed in charge of M. Guerard, the most distinguished Homœopathic physician of that city, with liberty to select his patients. He selected 15, suffering from febrile affections, pneumonias, erysipelas, catarrhs, &c. He visited them daily, and in presence of 60 students and several physicians, examined, prescribed Homœopathic remedies, and directed the regimen. The experiment continued 17 days, when the physician voluntarily retired. During this time there was no improvement in patients, nor advantage gained which could be ascribed to the Homœopathic treatment. The physician attributed his failure to the action of deleterious miasma *always existing in Hospitals*, and from which he could not protect his patients. He acknowledged that the remedies which produced such powerful effects in private practice, utterly failed in Hospitals, owing to the emanations from the bodies of persons collected together, which neutralized the infinitesimal doses.—*Gaz. Med. de Paris, Ency. Nov.* 1833.

In 1834, M. Andral employed Homœopathic remedies in 140 cases, in the Hospital de la Pitié of Paris. The arrangements of the ward, the regimen of the patients, and all the details of treatment, were carefully managed according to the directions of Hahnemann. The remedies were all obtained from the most eminent Homœopathic Apothecary in Paris, and administered with the most religious exactness. The result of this trial proved the entire inefficiency of the remedies employed. It was found necessary in most of the cases to resort finally to the regular treatment.—*Bull. Gen. de Therapeut.* 1834.

In 1835, the Homœopathic Society of Paris petitioned the authorities to establish a Homœopathic Hospital and dispensary. The Minister referred the matter to the Academy of Medicine, which appointed a Commission to draw up a report. This Commission reported in substance as follows:

That they had submitted the system of Homœopathy to the most rigid tests in practice, without obtaining any other than negative results, so far as the action of remedies was concerned; while observation proved that grave dangers were liable to follow its adoption in severe diseases, from the neglect of proper and reliable remedies. If the authorities yielded to this request, the advocates of Mesmerism, Animal Magnetism, &c., were equally entitled to have Hospitals opened for the

trial of their peculiar systems, and thus every form of quackery would demand attention. They therefore advised that the petition be not granted. The Minister of Public Instruction, acting upon the advice of this report, refused the petition.

In 1829, the Czar of Russia ordered that the system of Homœopathy should be tried in several military Hospitals. For several years the practice was continued, and reports of marvellous success were annually published, but it has entirely failed of obtaining the confidence of government, and by a recent edict it is forbidden to practice Homœopathy in the Russian territories.

Homœopathy and Allopathy were tried (*Ency. Jan.* 1836,) in the Hospital of Fultschin for two months, with the following result :

	Entered.	Cured.	Died.	Rem'ng.
In Allopathic Hospital,	457	364	—	93
“ Homœopathic “	128	65	5	58

Piorry states that he has tried numerous experiments with Homœopathic remedies in Hotel-Dieu, all of which failed.—*Ency. Apr.* 1835, *Soc. Sav.* p. 88.

Bally used Homœopathic remedies four months in Hotel Dieu, with the following result, “ pas un malade n'a gueri par l'homœopathie.”

Dr. Guillot, of le Salpetrere, gave six beds to the Homœopaths in 1849, for the treatment of cholera. Of 7 cases treated all died.—*Lancet*, 1849, v. 4, p. 542.

The per centage of mortality in the Homœopathic Hospital of St. Petersburg, 1833-4, was 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent.—*Ency. March*, 1835. *Rev. Med.* p. 41.

Although Homœopathy has existed nearly half a century, and boasts of having overspread the civilized world, and received the special patronage of the wealthy of every community as well as government sanction, it claims for itself to-day but seven Hospitals in which it is practised on the entire continent of Europe; and within the last year or two several of these have been closed. The great Homœopathic Hospital of Vienna, which has published annually the most wonderful results of treatment, and as far as its reports gave evidence, was entirely successful, has recently ceased to exist.

The Homœopathic Hospital at Leipsic, the home of the founder of this system, ceased with the death of Hahnemann. The London Homœopathic Hospital has recently closed its doors.

But we need not multiply facts of this kind; enough has been given to prove to the entire satisfaction of your Committee, that this system has been thoroughly tested in Hospitals, and found entirely inefficient. It is quite true that Hospitals established by its partisans have published reports of the most flattering success of treatment, but they must be rejected in this discussion, because partisan. If such reports are reliable, why the failure of these very Hospitals? Why is the Homœopathic system expelled, not only from the Hospitals of Russia, in which it has had years to establish itself, but even from the Czar's dominions? These are questions of grave import, and may well give rise to the inquiry in this community, Why are the sick poor of our city selected to be made the subjects of an experiment with this system of medical practice which has so repeatedly failed when put to this test of rigid

investigation? If the curiosity of the few *must* be gratified, why not choose the criminal for the experiment!

The just pride of every civilized and christian community is its public charities. They are not only the criterion by which we may estimate its christian philanthropy, but also its progress in the arts of civilized life. Well may the citizens of London, of Paris, and other continental cities boast of their Hospitals, the growth of centuries, and the merited recipients of public and private endowments. To them flock the students of every country, and from them emanate men learned in the laws of health and disease, and skilled in all the subtile arts of healing. They are demonstrating with mathematical exactness the fact that wisely and judiciously managed, the average of human life may be materially lengthened. So important, indeed, have they become to the well-being of the people, that they are incorporated with state and city governments. Well may we, under whose fostering care the public charities of our city are placed, inquire what is the character of the medical officers under which these Hospitals have attained such age and such celebrity! The answer, without exception, is, that they are of the same school of education and practice as that under the management of which Bellevue Hospital has for the last ten years so signally prospered. They have been men of professional learning, eminent as citizens, and often as statesmen, but always of one school—the so-called regular practice.

With this careful and dispassionate review of the subject submitted to their consideration, your Committee can but conclude that it would be both unwise and inexpedient to change the medical government of Bellevue Hospital, or place any portion of it in charge of a Board of Homœopathic practitioners, for the purpose of experimenting with that system of practice upon its inmates.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

WASH. SMITH,
P. G. MOLONEY,

Committee.

Governor SMITH moved that the Report be laid on the table and printed in the proceedings.—Carried.

Governor SMITH moved, that 250 copies be printed in pamphlet form, which were ordered not to be issued until the Minority Report was received and printed with it. Carried.

REPORT OF THE MINORITY

OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE IN FAVOR OF INTRODUCING HOMŒOPATHY
INTO BELLEVUE HOSPITAL.

The Minority of the Select Committee, to whom was referred the following Resolution :

“ *Resolved*, That it be referred to a Select Committee to report upon the propriety of so amending the law organizing the Bellevue Hospital Medical Department, as to provide that one-half of such Institution shall be set apart for the practice of Homœopathy, under the care of a Medical Board, nominated by the Homœopathic Society of this city; and that each case admitted in said Hospital shall be transferred to the care of the Allopaths and Homœopaths alternately.”—

RESPECTFULLY REPORT :

They have given this subject the impartial and thorough investigation which its importance demands; and without entering upon any discussion of the history of Bellevue Hospital, they would proceed at once to the examination of the question embraced in the above resolution, viz: the propriety of introducing Homœopathic practice among the inmates of said Hospital.

But inasmuch as the Majority Report, already presented to this Board, has entirely neglected to give any account of the *present* condition of Homœopathy, and mostly confines itself to statements of experiments made in Europe twenty years ago, your Minority Committee have thought proper to supply that oversight.

Homœopathy is no longer an experiment. More than half a century has passed away since its first promulgation, and each succeeding year more fully demonstrates that it is a true reform in medicine. “It has passed through the first stage of opposition from the profession—that of raillery and ridicule. It is now far advanced in the second stage—that of abuse; and ere long, it will enter the third and last stage—that of general adoption.” The greatest discoveries in medicine have always been subjected to this ordeal. For a long time after the first

announcement of the Homœopathic doctrine, it was laughed at and denied to have any virtue whatever; but of late years, a second charge, directly the reverse of the first, has been fabricated, to the effect that though its remedies cure at the time, they permanently injure the patient. Without setting themselves up as the appointed defenders of Homœopathy, your Committee feel constrained, most emphatically, to deny this accusation, which unfortunately recoils with terrible truth and power against its inventors. For the fundamental principle of Allopathy is *revulsion*; and to produce this revulsion, a drug must be administered until its peculiar *physiological*, that is, its *poisonous* properties are manifested. In proof of this, we would refer to any and all of the standard works on Allopathic practice. For example: no Homœopath gives arsenic until swelled face, nausea, and diarrhœa are produced; but the Allopath is taught to administer this drug in certain forms of neuralgia, intermittent fever, and cutaneous diseases, until these poisonous results are obtained, and then he is told to stop, lest he kill his patient! The same thing holds true in regard to all the more powerful and subtle drugs of the pharmacopœia. On all sides do we see the wretched victims of over-dosing with quinine, mercury, morphine, colchicum, nitrate of silver, &c.; but no such disastrous effects are ever observed to follow the administration of Homœopathic doses.

The well-known fact, moreover, that much less medicine is now given by the Allopaths than was formerly deemed absolutely essential to effect a cure, is in a great measure owing to the wonderful success of the Homœopaths—a reform the benefits of which none can deny.

There is but one way of rightly investigating this subject. The facts of Homœopathy must be received from those who have elicited them—whose testimony and judgment cannot be denied. We must take the reports of those who have fairly seen and followed the Homœopathic treatment, not of those who have refused to test it in any way, or who have made only partial and uncandid trials of its efficacy. Empty denials cannot offset positive proofs. At this very day, Homœopathic practitioners are to be found in every part of the civilized world; Homœopathic journals are published in almost every European language; Homœopathic Hospitals and Dispensaries are in active operation, not only in foreign countries, but within our own borders—at our very doors. But what use has been made in the Majority Report of all these sources of information? None at all. Not one of this great crowd of witnesses has been examined; not one of the European Homœopathic Court Physicians, whose successes have won honors from royalty; not one of the numerous practitioners in Homœopathic Hospitals; not one of the learned Professors in Allopathic Colleges who have been converted to Homœopathy; not one of all these, who have thoroughly and publicly proved the merits of the new system, has been allowed to testify in its favor. Of the *present* condition of the new school the Majority Report takes not the slightest notice, but casting its eyes back more than twenty years, totally ignores the fact that during these twenty years Homœopathy has been spreading at a rate unparalleled in the history of medicine! In the United States, its practitioners are now numbered by thousands. In this city and its suburbs, there are about 150 Homœopathic Physicians, most of whom formerly practised Allopathy; and certainly the experience of those who have studied and

compared the two systems is entitled to more weight than the mere opinions of those who blindly refuse to test the claims of any practice other than that in which they happened to be educated. In many of our States, Homœopathy has been sanctioned and encouraged by special legislative enactments. Witness the Act of the Legislature of our own State, passed during the last year, incorporating Homœopathic County Societies, and conferring upon them all the powers and privileges enjoyed by the Allopathic County Societies. Moreover, the Mississippi State Hospital, at Natchez, and very recently, the Chicago City Hospital, have been placed under the charge of the new school; and in our own city several private charities, such as the Protestant Half-Orphan Asylum, show a wonderful improvement in the health of their inmates since they have come under Homœopathic treatment. And of these facts before our very eyes, the Majority Report strangely omits to take any notice, but crosses the ocean and searches among records of a past generation for proofs that Homœopathy is now dying out.

But your Minority Committee would also call attention to the character of the advocates and supporters of Homœopathy. Go where you will—to our respectable hotels, on our steamboats and railroads, into our churches and courts of justice, into our banks and counting-houses, and almost every second person you meet is a Homœopath; while on the other hand, the steadily increasing numbers of sick poor who apply at the private Homœopathic Dispensaries for relief, show their appreciation of this new treatment. And the lengthy petitions which have from time to time been presented to this Board, testify to the confidence which great numbers of our first citizens have in this mode of cure. So large a number of practical men, who judge in no partisan spirit, but solely from results which they have witnessed and felt, in their families and in their own persons, during the course of many years, cannot be denounced as ignorant, or deceived by false representations. And simple justice demands that the wishes of so large a part of our tax-paying citizens should not be disregarded in this matter; for they, from whom these petitions emanate, are of the class who not only found our Hospitals, but support and endow them, and as such are entitled to an attentive hearing.

The Majority Report cites the case of "Perkins' Tractors," as "pertinent to this inquiry," and adds, that "at this time, fifty years after their announcement, these instruments of miraculous power cannot be found;" but it neglects to add, probably because not "pertinent to this inquiry," that Homœopathy, "at this time, fifty years after its announcement," is to be found in successful operation, and in increasing demand, all over the civilized world. In view, then, of the steady growth and the established position of Homœopathy, and of the high character of its advocates, your Minority Committee would claim your most earnest consideration of its *practical results*.

But before proceeding further, your Minority Committee would ask a few moments' indulgence, in order to correct some of the chief inaccuracies which crept into the Majority Report.

First. In regard to the trial of Homœopathy by order of the King of Naples, in 1829. It is true that a majority of the Investigating Commission, composed of twelve Allopathic Physicians, did report that Homœopathic treatment was of no effect; but the Majority Report omits

to mention three other notable results of that investigation. First—That two members of that Commission, Doctors Marchessani and Alessi, were thereby converted to Homœopathy, and published a pamphlet in its defence. Second—That a state paper was issued by the government, censuring the Commissioners for reporting in accordance with their prejudices, not in accordance with the clinical results; and, Third—That the government decreed, that “henceforth, physicians should be left free to choose what method of treatment they would adopt.” (*See Bibl. Hom. de Geneva, vols. vii. and viii.*)

“In Naples, a new journal, entitled *l’Anemanno*, has been established by Dr. H. Pellilo, assisted by eight other physicians. This is the second Homœopathic journal published in the Italian language.”—(*Neue Zeits. f. H. Klinik, Aug. 15, 1857.*)

Second. In regard to the experiments made in the French Hospitals, in 1832–5. M. Andral himself frankly admits that they were of no value, having been made under very unfavorable, not to say unfair circumstances. And a proof that the “miasm always existing in Hospitals” does not nullify Homœopathic practice, is convincingly shown in the statistics of French and other Hospitals, contained on pages 33 and 34 of this Report.

Third. The statement that “the practice of Homœopathy has recently been forbidden in the Russian territories” is entirely false, and no proof is offered for this assertion. On the contrary, Homœopathy continues steadily to grow in public favor, as the following extracts from recent journals will show:

“Among the Homœopathic Physicians in St. Petersburg may be mentioned Dr. Von Schering, Physician-in-chief to the Staff of the Imperial Body Guard; Dr. Wedrinsky, chief physician to the Military Hospital in Zarskoe-Selo; Dr. Steuder, chief physician to the Hospital for laboring women; Dr. Oblomiewsky, chief physician to the first cadet corps,” &c., &c. “The Homœopathic Hospital founded in Moscow in 1845 still continues under Dr. Schweikerb.” *Allg. Hom. Zeit. June, 1856.*

“The report of the Hospital at Nishni-Novogorod, for the year ending November, 1855, shows a mortality of less than 5 per cent. This Hospital was in 1854, by order of the Minister, Count Peroffsky, placed under Homœopathic treatment.” *Hom. Viertelj. Leipsic, 1856.*

“It is worthy of remark, that in Russia, the most conservative of all conservative states, Homœopathy has so shaken the old practice of medicine, that many physicians have been forced to study it, in order to enable them to retain their patients.” *Allg. Hom. Zeit. March, 1857.*

The advertisements so frequently seen in the German journals for Homœopathic physicians to go to Russia, (see, for example, *Neue Zeits. f. H. Klinik, Dresden, November 1, 1857,*) show that the demand is greater than the supply, and do not agree with the repeated but unsupported assertion in the Majority Report, that “the Homœopathic practice has been expelled from the Czar’s dominions.” The simple fact is, that the edict prohibited *Allopathic quack medicines.*

Fourth. The single instance in which the Majority report ventures upon a direct comparison of the two treatments, purports to be taken from the records of the Hospital of Fultschin, where 457 cases were treated Allopathically and not one died! and 128 Homœopathically and 5 died. This is unprecedented in hospital history; and would it not be

well to introduce Fultschin practice into Bellevue Hospital, where the deaths average ten per cent.? Even the Homœopathic practice at Fultschin, with a loss of 4 per cent., would be a decided improvement!

Fifth. The Majority Report says, "That the great Homœopathic Hospital at Vienna has recently ceased to exist." This charge is evidently without foundation—without the shadow of truth. From time to time, a private hospital, supported wholly by individual contributions, has closed its doors; but we are totally at a loss for the authority upon which this statement in regard to the great Vienna Hospital is made; for there are at this time no less than *three* Homœopathic Hospitals in Vienna in active operation, *viz*: the Gumpendorf Hospital, since 1834, under the charge of Dr. Fleischman, who has recently been knighted by the King of Bavaria, in honor of his signally successful treatment;* the Leopoldstadt Hospital, since 1850, under charge of Dr. Caspar, one of the most learned physicians of the age; and the Sechshaus Hospital, which was last November placed under the charge of Drs. Muller and Jachimovich.† But enough of these corrections. For further information in regard to the progress of Homœopathy in Europe, and honors conferred upon its practitioners, we would refer to *Hom. Vierteljahrschrift*, 1856, p. 203; *Allg. Hom. Zeitung*, Feb. 1, 1857; *Neue Zeits. fur Hom. Klinik*, Aug. 15 and Dec. 1, 1857; *Prager Med. Monatschrift*, March, 1857; *Hom. Record*, Aug. 1857; *British Journ. of Homœopathy*, 1856-7, &c. &c. &c.

We now come to the consideration of the all important point upon which the decision of this whole matter rests. What are the practical results of Homœopathic treatment? and how do its statistics of mortality and cure compare with those of Allopathy?

The reply to these questions is to be found in the following statistics and tabular reports. Your Minority Committee have confined themselves entirely to hospital returns, which they have collated from the most authentic sources, and have so arranged as to present the comparative results of the two methods of treatment; first, in diseases in general; second, in special diseases, taking as types, Cholera, Pneumonia and Typhus Fever; third, in the diseases of children, as shown by the records of our various Orphan Asylums; fourth, as regards the duration of diseases; and fifth, as regards the cost of medication.

I.

STATISTICS OF DISEASES IN GENERAL.

The authorities for the European Hospital Reports are to be found in the following works:

Cless's Statistics of the Catherinen Hospital at Stuttgart.
 Knolz's Charitable Institutions of Vienna. *Allg. Hom. Zeitschrift*.
 Journal Imp. Med. Chir. Acad. of St. Petersburg. Griesslich's *Hygea*.
 Brit. and Foreign Medico-Chir. Review. *Oesterreich Zeitschrift*.
 British Journal of Homœopathy. *Prager. Med. Monatschrift*.
 North American Journal of Homœopathy. *Neues Archiv*.
 Neue Zeits. fur. Hom. Klinik. *Hom. Vierteljahrschrift*.
 Stapfs. Archiv. der. Hom. Leilk.

* *Zeitung Oesterreichs*, Oct. 17, 1857. † *Neue Zeitung f. Hom. Klinik*, Nov. 15, 1857.

EUROPEAN ALLOPATHIC HOSPITAL.

Place and Name of Hospital.	Per Cent. Mortality.
Berlin Charité, 1838-9	10 to 11
Breslau, Zu Allerheiligen, 1838.....	17 " 18
Leipzig, Jakobshospital, 1839	11 " 12
Stuttgart, Catherinen, 1830-38	3 " 4
Strasburg, Forgets' Chinique, 1835-38.....	15 " 16
Hamburg, Allg. Krankenhaus, 5th Report	6 " 7
Munich, General Hospital, 1832	7 " 8
Milan, Great Hospital, 1814.....	15 " 16
Palermo " " 1823.....	12 " 13
Brussels, St. Peter's Hospital, 1823	11 " 12
St. Petersburgh, Civil " 1837	20 " 21
" " Seidlitz's Clinique, 1840	13 " 14
Vienna, General Hospital, 1834.....	13 " 14
" Brothers of Charity, 1838	9 " 10
" Elizabethherinnen, 1838.....	9 " 9
" Edinburgh, Royal Infirmary, 1818.....	6 " 7
" London, St. George's, 1850-55	18 " 19
" Lyon's, Hotel Dieu, 1837.....	13 " 14
Paris, Hotel Dieu, 1835	9 " 10
" St. Marguerite, 1851-2	11 " 12
" Val de Grace, under Broussais, 1819.....	7 " 8
Average.....	11 to 12

EUROPEAN HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITALS.

Place and name of Hospital.	Cases treated.	Deaths.	Per Cent.
Sisters of Charity, at Vienna, 1834 to 1856	17,313	1,087	$6\frac{2}{10}$
Sisters of Charity, at Ling, 1842 to 1854..	9,129	501	$5\frac{5}{10}$
*Hospital at Gyongyos, in Hungary, to 1855	1,538	143	$9\frac{3}{10}$
" " Guns " " " 1841	395	8	2
" " Kremseir, 1845 to 1848.....	1,520	94	$6\frac{1}{10}$
Leopoldstadt Hospital, at Vienna, 1850-54	3,789	211	$5\frac{5}{10}$
Hospital at Nechamitz, 1846-48.....	394	10	$2\frac{5}{10}$
" " Nishni-Novogorod, in 1855...	249	12	$4\frac{8}{10}$
" " Leipzig, Prussia	4,596	188	$4\frac{1}{10}$
Infantry Hospital at St. Petersburgh.....	397	61	4
Marenzella's Experiments at the Military Hospital at Vienna	38	1	$4\frac{7}{10}$
Hospital at Moscow, in 1854.....	166	8	$\frac{8}{10}$
Hermann's Experiments at the Military Hospital at Tulzyn.....	147	6	$4\frac{1}{10}$
London Homœopathic Hospital, 1850-56..	1,172	55	$4\frac{7}{10}$
Horatii's Experiments at Naples, 1829....	68	2	3
Sum Total.....	40,911	2,342	$5\frac{7}{10}$

* It is worthy of mention, as giving a direct comparison between the two systems of treatment, that the Hospital at Gyongyos was under Allopathic charge from 1849 to 1853, when the Homœopathists resumed treatment. Contrasting, we see that there were during—

Five years of Allopathy, Cases 622 Deaths, 98 per cent. 15 7-10ths.
 Eleven years of Homœopathy, 1,538 " 143 " 9 3-10ths.

To show that many of the cases were of the more severe and dangerous diseases, let us look at the specifications of the Gumpendorf Hospital at Vienna, in charge of the Sisters of Charity.

Of the 1,087 deaths, from 1834 to 1856, 466 were of altogether incurable diseases: among the remainder there were,

	Cases.	Deaths.
Erysipelas	514	4
Diarrhœa of all kinds.....	323	3
Inflammation of Joints.....	888	7
Ophthalmia	130	1 ⁷ uncured.
Inflammation of Lungs.....	1,058	48 deaths.
Typhus Fever (abdominal).....	3,165	368 "
Intermittent Fever.....	1,066	9 "
Gastric Fever	1,181	7 "
Rheumatic Pericarditis.....	15	0 "
Small Pox	194	14 "

These results compare most favorably with any Hospital Reports ever published, and their accuracy cannot be questioned, since this Hospital is under strict governmental supervision, and is constantly visited by Allopathic physicians. It is under the charge of Dr. Fleischmann, assisted, until within a few years, by Dr. Caspar, and the accuracy of their diagnosis cannot be questioned.

Let us now take a view of the comparative results of the two systems of treatment in Hospitals of the same city, and in different wards of the same Hospital.

In the *London Homœopathic Hospital* there were, during the years 1850 to 1856:—1,062 cases; 48 deaths; per cent. 4½.

In *St. George's (Allopathic) Hospital, London*, there were during the years 1854 and 1855:—5,413 cases; 1,018 deaths; per cent. 18.

Making all due allowance for the increased mortality in a large Hospital over a small one, we still have a very marked and striking difference in these results.

ALLOPATHIC.				HOMŒOPATHIC.			
Year.	Cases.	Deaths.	Per cent.	Year.	Cases.	Deaths.	Per cent.
1841	142	10	7.	1850	328	5	1.4
1842	138	17	12.3	1851	318	10	3.1
1843	189	13	6.9	1852	322	12	3.7
1844	208	9	4.1	1853	334	10	2.9
1845	248	10	4.4	1854	360	12	3.3
1846	274	15	5.4				
1847	327	14	4.2				
1848	325	14	4.3				
	1851	102	5.5		1662	49	2.9

Average Homœopathic mortality, 2.9 per cent. Allopathy 5.5 per cent.

Dr. Chargé* of Marseilles, France, has recently published a statistical table (p. 17) of the mortality occurring at the Convent of Refuge, since its foundation in 1841 up to 1854.

The highest mortality under Homœopathic treatment (3.7) was less than the lowest (4.1) under Allopathic treatment.

We have a fair and direct comparison of the two systems, in the Hospital of Ste. Marguerite, in Paris. There, there were two wards under the Homœopathic treatment of Dr. Tessier,† side by side with two wards under Allopathic treatment. Their published reports show

· UNDER HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT.

1849,	1292 cases,	126 deaths,	$9\frac{7.5}{100}$	per cent.
1850,	1677 “	138 “	$8\frac{2.2}{100}$	“
1851,	1694 “	135 “	$7\frac{0.6}{100}$	“

· UNDER ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT.

1849,	1087 cases,	169 deaths,	$14\frac{7.1}{100}$	per cent.
1850,	1195 “	107 “	$8\frac{9.9}{100}$	“
1851,	1442 “	135 “	$9\frac{3.6}{100}$	“

AVERAGE OF THREE YEARS' TREATMENT.

Allopathy,	3724 cases,	411 deaths,	$11\frac{3}{100}$	per cent.
Homœopathically,	4655 “	399 “	$8\frac{5.5}{100}$	“

A marked and indisputable contrast.

But some even of the opponents of Homœopathy are forced to testify in its favor. In the work entitled “Fallacies of Homœopathy, by C. H. F. Routh, M. D., F. R. C. S.” published in London in 1852, we find the following summary of comparative statistics :

PER CENT. OF DEATHS :

<i>Disease.</i>	<i>Homœopathic.</i>	<i>Allopathic.</i>
Pneumonia,	5.7	24
Pleuritis,	3.	13
Peritonitis,	4.	13
Dysentery,	3.	22
Typhus, (abdominal),	15.	19
All diseases,	4.4	8.5

Another opponent of Homœopathy, Dr. Forbes, in the British and Foreign Medical Review, 1846, says, “The amount of deaths in the fever and eruptive diseases (under Homœopathic treatment) is certainly below the average proportion.”

Much more testimony of the same kind might be adduced, but this will suffice.

Let us now consider the statistics of some of our own Hospitals, taken from their published Reports.

* “Dr. Chargé, of Marseilles, has recently received from the French government the Order of the Legion of Honor, and from Pope Pius IX. that of St. Gregory the Great, in consideration of the services he rendered during the cholera epidemic of 1849.”—(*Med. Hom. de Familles*, No. 6.)

† Dr. Tessier has since been removed to the Beaujon, one of the finest Hospitals in Paris.

I. ALLOPATHIC.

	Cases treated.	Deaths.	Per cent.
Massachusetts General Hospital, from 1835 to 1855,.....	11,610	1,122	9.6
New-York City Hospital, from 1792 to 1855,.....	106,111	10,893	10.2
New-York City Bellevue Hospital, from 1852 to 1856,.....	31,327	3,171	10.1
Average mortality, 10 per cent.			

II. HOMŒOPATHIC.

There are no Hospitals in this city under the charge of the Homœopathsists, but they have the care of some of the other charitable institutions, such as "*The Home for the Friendless*," whose medical statistics compare very favorably with like institutions under Allopathic charge.

"The Protestant Half Orphan Asylum" has exhibited a most striking improvement in the health of its inmates since it was transferred to the Homœopathsists. But this is more fully considered in the comparison of the mortality in the various Orphan Asylums in the latter part of this Report.

The "Chicago City Hospital" has had half of its wards given to the Homœopathsists during the past year—too recently to furnish any Report of the result.

The "Mississippi State Hospital," at Natchez, has been under Homœopathic treatment for the last four years. During that time there have been treated 500 cases, of which 45 died, equal to 9 per cent. of deaths; much less than the mortality in the New Orleans Hospital. To compare this with our Northern Hospitals, however, we ought not to include the yellow fever cases, (several of which were brought in dying.) Excluding these, we have

	Cases.	Deaths.	Per cent.
In Mississippi State Hospital, since 1853,	476	28	5.9

As compared with the New-York Hospital, a gain of 4 per cent.

Statistical returns, then, from the various Homœopathic Hospitals prove that the average mortality of all patients treated therein is about six per cent., while similar statistics from the Allopathic Hospitals show an average mortality of ten per cent. This single fact, that out of every *ten* patients who now die in our Hospitals, *four* might be saved under a different course of treatment, is most startling, and needs but to be clearly set before this Board to insure its immediate action thereupon.

II.

Your Minority Committee would now call attention to the statistics of particular diseases; and for this purpose they have selected Cholera, Pneumonia, and Typhus Fever, as *types* of the most serious and fatal maladies with which our physicians have to contend.

And first in regard to CHOLERA STATISTICS.

These are deemed the more worthy of your attention, as proving the falsity of the statement so commonly heard among the ignorant, that though Homœopathy may be successful in trivial complaints, it is of little or no avail in violent and dangerous diseases. There is nothing more certain in the history of medicine than the fact, that to the acknowledged and remarkable success of the Homœopaths in the treatment of cholera, more than to any other one thing, is owing their present favorable position with the intelligent public. During the ravages of this fearful epidemic in Europe, the cures of the new school were so surprising, that government commissions were established in several countries for the express purpose of inquiring into the facts of the case; and although these commissions were in most instances composed of physicians opposed to Homœopathy, they were compelled to acknowledge its superior and astonishing efficacy. In confirmation of this, your Committee would cite an extract from the work of Dr. Wilde, an Allopathic Surgeon, and the talented editor of the "Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medicine." In his book on "Austria, its Literary, Scientific, and Medical Institutions," he has these words:—"Upon comparing the report made of the treatment of cholera in the Homœopathic Hospital at Vienna with that of the other Hospitals at the same time, it appeared that while two-thirds of those treated Homœopathically were *cured*, two-thirds of those treated by the other Hospitals *died*. This extraordinary result led Count Kolowrat, Minister of the Interior, to repeal the law relative to the practice of Homœopathy." This Homœopathic Hospital, it should be remarked, was daily visited by two Allopathic Physicians, appointed inspectors by the government, who confirmed this report. Moreover, many of the cholera statistics in this report are taken from the pamphlet of Dr. Roth, an opponent of Homœopathy, who was sent by the government of Bavaria to observe this epidemic in different localities, and report on the best treatment. In their researches, your Minority Committee have found many well authenticated reports of the treatment of cholera in private practice, making the mortality under Allopathic medication 39 per cent., and under Homœopathic 10 per cent., but these they have not thought fit to include, being desirous of confining themselves to regular Hospital Reports.

Dr. F. R. Horner, in his pamphlet,* recently published, states that in the statistical report of the late cholera epidemic in England, by the Medical Board appointed for that purpose, the returns of the Homœopathic Hospital were "deliberately and designedly suppressed, because they showed that by that treatment two-thirds were cured; while according to the aggregate statistics of the other Hospitals, two-thirds died,"—and this too after that report had been verified by the Allopathic Inspector.

It is most noteworthy, that during the last two cholera epidemics in this city, the Homœopathists made earnest application to be allowed to practice in some one or more of the temporary Hospitals then pro-

* "Reasons for adopting the Rational System of Medicine, by Fewster Robert Horner, M.D., late President, and perpetual Vice-President of the British Medical and Surgical Association; late Senior Physician to the Hull General Infirmary, &c., &c.; London, 1857." It is a significant fact, that in 1851, *before* he had investigated Homœopathy, Dr. Horner presided over a meeting of 300 medical men at Brighton, which passed resolutions strongly denunciatory of that system; and now, in 1857, *after* investigating it, he announces himself a convert to the Homœopathic doctrine.

vided by the city authorities. Full of faith in the efficacy of their system, they were willing and desirous to put it to the proof on fair terms of trial; but the Board of Health, (Allopathic Physicians,) to whom the question was referred, denied them admittance, and on both occasions shrank from this practical test. This is a strong fact, and one which this Board cannot fail to appreciate, that the Homœopathists challenge and court thorough investigation. And your Minority Committee cannot but express the hope that the time has now come when this Board, which cannot be supposed to be actuated by professional jealousy, which certainly belongs to no medical clique, and which has to consider only the welfare of the poor committed to its charge, will act impartially in this matter, and judge, by a fair and thorough trial, of the merits of a system for which so much is claimed.

A. Cholera Statistics.

The General Board of Health of Edinburgh and Leith, Scotland, reported the total number of cases of Cholera treated from October 4, 1848, to February 1, 1849, to be as follows :

Cases, 817. Deaths, 546. Per Cent., $66\frac{4}{5}$.

Of these cases 236 were treated by the officers of the Edinburgh Homœopathic Dispensary, and were included in the general report above. Thus dividing, we have :

Homœopathic Cases, 236, Deaths, 57, Per Cent. $24\frac{1}{2}$.
Allopathic " 581, " 489, " $84\frac{1}{2}$.

By the Liverpool Homœopathic Dispensary there were treated, from July 25 to September 15, 1849,

Cases, 162, Deaths, 43, Per Cent., $26\frac{1}{2}$

British Journal, Hom., vol vii, p. 562.

This is among the poor classes, who are not often seen by the physician in the first stage of the disease, and shows the immense superiority of Homœopathic treatment.

In the Cholera epidemic in New York, in 1849, the mortality in the City Hospitals was 52 per cent. Inasmuch as the Homœopathists were refused admission into those Hospitals, they have only reports of the result in private practice to fall back upon. The Committee appointed by the Hahnemann Academy of Medicine to collect such statistics, reported the average mortality in the practice of Homœopathic physicians not to exceed 6 per cent.

But as private practice cannot with fairness be compared with hospital results, your Minority Committee have collected the following well authenticated reports, as furnishing a fair basis of comparison :

HOSPITAL TREATMENT OF CHOLERA.

Homœopathic.

Place and Name.	Cases.	Deaths.
Vienna, Sisters of Charity, 1834 to 1850..	1,202	409
Vienna, Leopoldstadt, 1850,	156	58
Berlin Hom. Hospital,	32	6
Bordeaux Hospital, by Dr. Mabit, 1832,..	31	6
Marseilles, "Convent of Refuge." 1849....	260	15
London Hom. Hospital, 1854,.....	37	7
Total,.....	1,718	501

Allopathic.

Place and Name.	Cases.	Deaths.
Edinburgh, Drummond street.....	461	291
Halle, Krunkenberg's Wards.....	104	53
Hamburg Hospital, 1831,	283	175
Berlin Cholera Hospital.....	97	60
St. Petersburg, by Dr. Lichenstadt...	636	314
Bordeaux Hospital, 1832.....	104	72
Raab " ".....	284	122
New York, in 1849.....	1,790	923
London, St. George's 1854.....	140	69
Total.....	3,899	2,089

Average Homœopathic mortality, 29 per cent.

" Allopathic " 54 "

Nearly twice as great.

B.

Let us next look at the statistics of PNEUMONIA, or INFLAMMATION OF THE LUNGS.

I. HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT.

Authorities.

1. Dr. Tessier, "Recherches Cliniques," 1850.
2. Dr. Henderson, of Edinburgh, in the British Journal of Homœopathy, 1850.
3. Dr. Routh, an Allopathic physician, who gives a *resume* of the statistics of the German Homœopathic Hospitals, in the work entitled "Fallacies of Homœopathy."

Results.

1 and 2. Of the 50 cases above the age of puberty, treated by Drs. Tessier and Henderson, three died, making a mortality of 6 per cent.; of these none were under forty years of age. Average duration of the disease, was $11\frac{2}{3}$ days.

3. Of 783 cases of Pneumonia, treated in the German Homœopathic Hospitals, according to reports admitted by Dr. Routh, 45 died, making a mortality of only 5.7 per cent.

II. ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT.

Authorities.

1. Routh's "Fallacies of Homœopathy."
2. Louis, Archives Generales, 1834-5.
3. Grisolle.
4. Bouilland, Memoire de l'Academie Royal de médecine, vol. 8, by Pelletau.
5. Dietl, Die Lungenentziendung, 1850.

Results.

1. Of 1,522 cases, treated collectively, in the Glasgow Infirmary, the Vienna General Hospital, and by Drs. Walsh, Taylor and Peacock, of London, 373 died; equal to 24 per cent.

2. Of 78 cases treated by the famous French physician, Louis, "all of which were in a state of perfect health when the first symptoms of Pneumonia began," 28 died; equal to nearly 36 per cent. Of 29 other cases, 4 died, or 14 per cent.

3. Of 430 cases of Pneumonia collected by *Grisolle*, from various Allopathic authorities, the mortality of cases between the ages of 40 and 70 was 23 per cent.

4. Of 75 cases treated by *Bouilland*, 10 died, or 14 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. Several of these cases are described as trivial.

5. *Dietl* treated 85 cases by bloodletting, and lost 17; equal to 20 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. He treated 106 cases by tartar emetic in large doses, and lost 22; equal to 20.7 per cent. He left 189 cases without medicine or venesection, and lost but 14; equal to 7.4 per cent.

Recapitulation.

Homœopathic treatment.....	5 to	6	per cent.
Allopathic "	14	24	"
Expectant "	7	8	"

These experiments of *Dr. Dietl* are the more valuable, as proving the falsity of the oft-repeated assertion that Homœopathic doses have no power whatever, while they as certainly prove that Allopathic medication does much harm, and destroys many lives that would otherwise have been saved. Taking the results of the expectant, or do-nothing treatment as a standard, *Homœopathy saves* nearly two per cent., and *Allopathy destroys* at least seven per cent. of all the cases of Pneumonia.

C.

TYPHUS FEVER.

In this disease, of which, unfortunately, there is no lack at Bellevue Hospital, the statistics collected by your Minority Committee show the decided superiority of Homœopathy. Even *Dr. Routh*, in his work against the new school, admits a diminished mortality, under that treatment, of four per cent.

The following statistics are taken from a work entitled "Comparison of Homœopathy and Allopathy, by *Dr. Caspar*, Physician to the Hospital of the Honorable Sisters of Charity of Vienna: Vienna and Olmutz, 1856."

STATISTICS OF TYPHUS FEVER.

I. *Allopathic.*—*In the Vienna General Hospital.*

1850, Cases, 872	Deaths, 144	Per cent. 16.5
1852, " 491	" 133	" 27.0
1853, " 1,119	" 259	" 23.1
2,482	536	21.6

II. *Expectant.*—*In the 2d Division of Prague Hospital.*

1849, Cases, 132	Deaths, 27	Per cent. 20.4
1850, " 96	" 13	" 13.5
228	40	17.5

III. *Homœopathic.*—*In Homœopathic Vienna Hospital.*

1850, Cases,	81	Deaths,	9	Per cent.	11.1
1851, “	80	“	10	“	12.5
1852, “	121	“	11	“	9.0
	<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>
	282		30		10.6

Here again we see that Allopathy loses 4 per cent. more, and Homœopathy 7 per cent. less than the expectant or do-nothing treatment, and that twice as many die of Typhus Fever under the old as would under the new mode of treatment.

D.

DISEASES OF CHILDREN.

And now, having seen the Homœopathic statistics in regard to adults, in general and individual diseases, let us look at the results of that treatment in the affections to which childhood is peculiarly subject. And for this purpose we would refer to the Report of the Homœopathic treatment in the Protestant Half-Orphan Asylum of New-York, by Dr. B. F. Bowers. We take the following extract and comparative statement from his work :

“The immense interest which the public has in forming a correct estimate of the relative value of the different systems of medical practice, and the absolute necessity for a collection of well-ascertained facts in order to come to a satisfactory conclusion, give importance to the subject. The number of children in the several Asylums is taken from a table kindly furnished by A. Gilbert, Esq., from the reports made annually, under oath, to the Board of Education.”

TABLE OF THE RESULT OF TWELVE YEARS TREATMENT.

I. IN ALLOPATHIC ASYLUMS.

1. *New-York Orphan Asylum.*

Years.	Whole No.	Deaths.	Mortality.
For ten years, ending 1852.....	1584	34	1 in 46
For year 1853.....	220	0	
“ 1854.....	209	0	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	2013	34	1 in 59

2. *The three Roman Catholic Orphan Asylums.*

Years.	Whole No.	Deaths.	Mortality.
For ten years, ending 1852.....	5149	94	1 in 54
For year 1853.....	964	2	1 in 482
“ “ 1854.....	1042	9	1 in 120
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	7155	105	1 in 69

3. *Leake and Watts' Orphan Asylum.*

Years.	Whole No.	Deaths.	Mortality.
For ten years, ending 1852.....	1688	23	1 in 73
For year 1853.....	262	12	1 in 22
“ “ 1854.....	262	6	1 in 44
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	2213	41	1 in 54

4. *Colored Orphan Asylum.*

Years.	Whole No.	Deaths.	Mortality.
For ten years, ending 1852.....	2142	136	1 in 15
For year 1853.....	348	13	1 in 27
“ “ 1854.....	403	23	1 in 18
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	2893	172	1 in 16

II. IN HOMŒOPATHIC ASYLUMS.

The Protestant Half-Orphan Asylum.

Years.	Whole No.	Deaths.	Mortality.
For ten years, ending 1852.....	2543	21	1 in 121
For the year 1853.....	275	0	
“ “ “ 1854.....	257	0	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	3075	21	1 in 146

Recapitulation of Mortality in New-York Orphan Asylums.

ALLOPATHICALLY.

At six City Orphan Asylums, 1 in 41, or $2\frac{2}{5}$ per cent.

HOMŒOPATHICALLY.

At Protestant Half-Orphan Asylum, 1 in 146, or $\frac{6.8}{100}$ of 1 per cent. showing the ratio of mortality under Allopathic treatment, as compared with Homœopathic, to be more than 3 to 1.

Let us compare the result of the two systems of treatment in the case of the foundlings and miserable, sickly orphans, so many of whom are thrown entirely upon the care of this Board. Most of these unfortunates, upon whom the sins of their parents are visited so heavily, are provided for at Randall's Island Nursery; but the Home for the Friendless, in East Thirtieth Street, now under the medical care of Dr. E. Guernsey, annually receives and provides for hundreds of this class of children, who, on account of their more tender age and diseased constitution, cannot rightly be compared with the inmates of the City Orphan Asylums.

From their published reports, we have

The Nursery at Randall's Island, under Allopathic treatment.

Years.	Whole No.	Deaths.	Mortality.
In 1853.....	3040	79	1 in 39
“ 1854.....	2690	208	1 in 13
“ 1855.....	2378	202	1 in 11
“ 1856.....	2021	96	1 in 21
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	10129	585	1 in 17

The Home for the Friendless, under Homœopathic Treatment.

Years.	Whole No.	Deaths.	Mortality.
In 1853.....	264	6	1 in 41
“ 1854.....	280	13	1 in 21
“ 1855.....	360	5	1 in 72
“ 1856.....	306	6	1 in 51
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	1210	30	1 in 40

Or a mortality of 5.8 per cent. Allopathically,

“ “ 2.5 “ Homœopathically.

Your Minority Committee cannot leave this part of their subject, without mentioning the brilliant results of Homœopathic treatment in the Brooklyn City Orphan Asylum during the past year. At times a species of ophthalmia rages among the children in Orphan Asylums to such an extent as to necessitate the closing of the institution and the dispersion of its inmates. This same necessity was threatening the Protestant Half-Orphan Asylum in this city in 1842, when the medical treatment thereof was fortunately transferred to Dr. Clark Wright; and the history of the Brooklyn Asylum shows that it has twice been compelled to resort to this last means of getting rid of this scourge.

In January, 1857, the executive of this latter Asylum applied to Dr. Carroll Dunham to treat the children Homœopathically, inasmuch as the ordinary treatment had been pursued without any beneficial results, either curative as regards the sick, or preventive as regards the healthy children. Dr. Dunham entered upon his duties on January 27, 1857, and found 25 ophthalmic patients out of 121 children. During the next three months, 13 new cases were added; but such was the efficacy of the Homœopathic treatment, that when Dr. Dunham was compelled by ill health to resign his charge on the 2d of May following, he left but three cases of ophthalmic diseases in the institution.

These results, totally ignored in the Report already presented, are most earnestly urged upon the consideration of this Board, which has the health and lives not only of adults, but also of thousands of children dependent upon its fostering care and provision.

E.

COMPARATIVE DURATION OF DISEASE.

The duration of Pneumonia was particularly noted by Drs. Tessier, Henderson, Dietl and Louis, whose authority has already been given.

These show the mean duration of Pneumonia to be,

Under Homœopathic treatment,	11 $\frac{2}{3}$ days.
“ Allopathic “	29 “
“ Expectant “	28 “

Dr. Kurtz has compiled a statistical table of the mean duration of disease in general in the chief Hospitals of Paris, Berlin, Gottingen and Stuttgart, under Allopathic treatment, as compared with the Hospitals in Vienna, Munich and Leipzig, under Homœopathic treatment. This is to be found in the *Hygea* xviii, Part 2. This gives the *average duration of disease*,

Under Allopathic treatment,	28 to 29 days.
“ Homœopathic “	20 “ 21 “

F.

COMPARATIVE COST OF TREATMENT.

That Homœopathic treatment costs less, follows as a matter of course, from the fact that it cures more patients, and in a shorter time than Allopathic treatment. To demonstrate this, no table or figures are needed; but another reason of its greater economy is to be found in the

much smaller quantity of drugs and medicines which it requires. To illustrate this, take an extract from Dr. B. F. Bowers' Report of the Protestant Half-Orphan Asylum in this city.

"In the first period of *seven years* (under Allopathy) there was paid for medicine the sum of \$239.64; for extra nursing, &c., \$95.25 more.

"In the last period of *ten years* (under Homœopathy) there was paid for medicine the sum of \$35; for extra nursing, nothing."

This shows the Allopathic medicines to cost nearly *ten times* as much as the Homœopathic; and if the extra nursing be included, the old treatment cost that institution, here before our eyes, thirteen times as much as the new! But who can estimate *the cost in life*? For, these statistics, which are acceptable to all of us, prove that of the 352 children who have died in City Orphan Asylums during the twelve years ending 1854, two-thirds, (that is to say more than 230) might have been, in all human probability, saved to the world by Homœopathic treatment. This single fact demands the attention and action not only of those in charge of public institutions, but also of the entire community.

The Apothecary's report for Bellevue Hospital for 1856, shows a disbursement of nearly \$5,000 for drugs and medicines, exclusive of liquors; and your Minority Committee are assured, upon reliable authority, that an annual saving would be effected of at least \$4,000 per annum, by the introduction of Homœopathy. Extend this to the other public institutions under the charge of this Board, and a large item of expense, to our already tax-ridden community, would be materially reduced.

RECAPITULATION.

Per cent. of Mortality.	Under Allopathy.	Under Homœopathy.
In all Diseases in Hospitals,	10 to 11	5 to 6
“ Asiatic Cholera “	54	27
“ Pneumonia “	14 to 24	5 to 6
“ Typhus Fever “	21 to 22	10 to 11
“ New-York Orphan Asylums,.....	$\frac{2.4}{10}$	$\frac{6.8}{100}$ of 1

Allopathically. Homœopathically
 Mean duration of Disease,..... 28 days. 21 days.
 Cost of Drugs and Medicines, as 10 to 1.

Your Minority Committee cannot close this Report without tendering their thanks to Dr. E. M. Kellogg for his kindness in preparing statistics and offering facilities to your Minority Committee in their researches for authorities in support of their position.

From the statement of facts thus presented, your Minority Committee deduce the following conclusions:

I. That Homœopathy has ceased to be an experiment, and is an established system of medicine.

II. That as compared with Allopathy, the expense of Homœopathic treatment is much less.

III. That the duration of disease under Homœopathic treatment is much less.

IV. That the mortality under Homœopathic treatment is much less.

And relying upon the sound judgment of this Board, confidently offering for your adoption the following Resolution :

Resolved, That one-half of the wards of Bellevue Hospital be transferred to the charge of Homœopathic Physicians, under the supervision of a Medical Board, to be appointed by the Homœopathic Medical Society of the County of New-York, and that a Select Committee be appointed to prepare such rules and regulations therefor as they may deem proper.

BENJ. F. PINCKNEY,
Committee.