

sum total of the proof of "Scrutator"—no other had he upon which to found his false accusation. Dr. Barry, who was in attendance on McKay, gave his evidence at the inquest. I saw no occasion for more evidence, which would require to be paid for, being submitted to the jury; and even although I had known of Dr. Going's attendance on McKay, I do not see yet what necessity there was for it. According to the facts of the case, I would say that "Scrutator" has got precious little to do, when he steps out of his way to attack an inquest in so vile and calumnious a spirit. A "*cacoethes scribendi*" has taken hold of Dr. Going, too. "Scrutator" and the Dr. are two different personages; but Dr. Going says that they travel in harness together; nevertheless, "Scrutator" was *imperatively* called upon to scribble, for his love of the administration of public justice; Dr. Going is *compelled* to scribble in justice to himself. Why, where is the proof that any person harmed them, poor fellows? Echo says, where!—unless it be the loss of \$5 to Dr. Going.

Now, if Dr. Going means his letter to contain the evidence which would have converted the inquest from a mockery into perfect justice, had it been necessary to call him, for the life of me I can see nothing in it that would have been of the least importance at the inquest, further than when *tricking* a little upon upon "political acumen," he makes mention of the case being a "somewhat obscure surgical injury;" (when, in reality, according to the diagnosis verified by *post mortem* examination, there was no obscurity about it.) If Dr. Going could not give any other but "obscure evidence," then I think again that the jury did not lose any information by Dr. Going not being called upon. Had I known that any evidence of the least importance would have been elicited from Dr. Going, of course I had the power, legally, to call upon him to give it; but I beg to tell Dr. Going, and "Scutator," too, that I will be no party to call in medical evidence at any inquest over which I preside, unless that evidence appears to the jury or me to be required, however much these two gentlemen may deal in *imperatives* and *compulsion*, or what professional jealousy they may disclose in their puerile attacks. I shewed "Scrutator's" reasons for the mockeries, and I will leave them with the Profession. Now, as to Dr. Going, of course the inquest was a mockery with him, too! and how does he prove it? In this way. It was a mockery "because the coroner keeps a drug-shop; it was a mockery, because Dr. Going makes up his mind not to meet a medical man professionally," when that medical man never dreamt of asking him to do so!

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,

JOHN WANLESS, Coroner, Town of London.