

there is no reason why we should hesitate in referring death to the effects of a multiplicity of injuries. Among non professional (and we might now add, in Canada among professional) persons, a strong prejudice exists that no person can die from violence unless there be some distinct mortal injury actually inflicted on his person. By this we are to understand a *visible* mechanical injury to some organ or blood vessel important to life; but this is obviously a very erroneous notion, since death may take place from the disturbance of the functions of an organ without this being necessarily accompanied by a perceptible alteration of structure. The prevalence of this popular error often leads to a severe cross examination of medical witnesses."

Beck, Morton and Stille, Duvergie, &c., might be quoted to the same purposes, but sufficient and more than sufficient has been said, to show the untenable position of the medical gentlemen for the defence. But there are questions of far greater moment than the correctness of this one or the error of that. What is to be the effect upon the public of these exhibitions of contrariness? What must be thought of a profession, the members of which are found so ready and so willing to oppose each other? What must be thought of its teachings when men educated in the same principles are found to disagree? Where that *esprit de corps*? "Doctors differ" is a Proverb. We do not all see through the same medium, otherwise we could be all of one mind, but educated men should carefully ascertain the correctness of the data given them. In this case it was not so. One gentleman hears the evidence of those whom he intends to support; another, of those he is about to confute; a third takes the evidence furnished before a different tribunal; while a fourth gleans his information from the morning papers! The only ground on which they meet, is, the opinion formed as to the cause of death. But then the cross-examinations are inconvenient; the data are found to be incorrect; *n'importe*, the witness box in a public Court is not the place to retract, and they will not retract; although they might do so with grace. "No! no! our facts were wrong but our theory is right! Yea and it shall be so." One gentleman discovers a fancied discrepancy between the evidence of an ignorant excited woman, and that of the Physician whose peculiar province it was to decide in the premises; the choice must be made, and the choice is made; the theory must be supported; the evidence of the old woman suits better than that of the medical witness, and is accepted! What, let me ask, would be thought of the physician, who, when called in consultation were, to listen to the symptoms detailed by an ignorant nurse in preference to those of the physician in attendance?

That noble specimen of female obstinacy and determination which submitted to be gagged, kicked and cuffed, and at length drowned, because she would not be prevented from saying "scissors," deserved a better fate. She died for principle. She had a perfect right to string any number of characters together, and to form, and when formed, to read, write, sing or speak the word "scissors," unless her husband showed her, that, besides being more euphonious in the mouth of a female, a jack knife, for cutting and other purposes, would do as well. She had reasons, valid ones too, for continuing to cry out "scissors" so long as she had breath to do so; and a right, though the sequel was against her, to continue with her fingers to describe the cutting motion of the scissors when the air bubbles rising to the surface told the happy swain that indeed she would ne'er again