

(seeing no chance of success in the real object of his journey), to write a brief account for the satisfaction of his family, and medical friends, of his connexion and that of Drs. Banks and Barlow with the case; which he promised to do, but, in this also, he failed.

Finally, seeing that moral means were hopeless weapons against such men, Mr. Hossack consulted Messrs. Washburn and O'Sullivan, advocates and attorneys, with a view to legal remedy, but here also he was foiled. Mr. Washburn waited on Dr. Leach, threatening an action, but he replied by a persistence worthy of a better cause, reiterating the monstrous falsehood, that the bottle contained all that was taken out of the body, and that he was prepared to stand an action at law.

Conduct, so base and ungrateful, leaves no alternative but to bring the offenders to the bar of the "fourth estate"—public opinion;—where the occasional trial of ignorant pretenders to science and humanity, like Dr. JOHN SCOTT, (who infest New York like a plague,) may save others from similar cupidity and ruthless plunder.

To sum up this nefarious transaction. It is clear that Scott and his confederates who are equally base and culpable, had not the remotest idea of the class of persons they had to deal with in this affair. Well might *Doctor (?)* Leach ask for the "anus and lower portion of the rectum," knowing that he and his allies were already in felonious possession! They imagined that by an obstinate persistence in their attempted deception, the friends and professional advisers of the deceased gentleman would be quieted. That a mere look through a glass darkly, at a portion of tolerably healthy intestine, SEALED UP in a bottle, as well as tied over with bladder, would satisfy medical men, who *might* be as ignorant as themselves perchance; and, that they would never go to the trouble, expense, and disagreeable ultimatum of a disinterment and minute surgical examination, for the mere sake of science and justice. They evidently thought, that *the obstinate reiteration of a monstrous lie*, would cover their duplicity, insincerity, inhumanity, ingratitude and turpitude. What do they think now?

In conclusion, it is little enough to say of them, that the conduct of the relatives of the deceased is worthy of a name that is destined to figure in the annals of liberty, humanity and justice: conduct, that is characterised throughout the distressing incidents of this case, by a liberality and magnanimity, worthy of commendation and example.

Quebec, 3rd November, 1860.

---

ART. LX.—*A case of Ovarian Tumour—Ovariectomy—Recovery.* By REGINALD HENWOOD, M.D., Brantford, C. W.

Mary Ann F., aged 38, unmarried, by occupation a dressmaker, a delicate woman, for whom I was first called upon to prescribe about a year and a-half ago, for menorrhagia, from which she had been suffering for nearly a year, during which time had experienced a great deal of pain in the back hips, and lower part of the abdomen, likewise suffered at intervals from excessive irritability of