

cannot vouch positively for the correctness of the above numbers, but we think, considering the sources from which we have derived our intelligence, that the proportions are not far wrong. While in connection with this topic, we may notice that Dr. Macdonnell has returned to this city, and we hope to find his pen and personal efforts reoccupied in writing for the columns of this journal, and the advancement of professional learning among us.

New York reprint of the London Lancet.—We do not profess to understand the principle which guides the publication of this reprint. However much we would like to do so, one thing is clear, that we should expect in the usual monthly numbers, the matter which the original contained during the month preceding the day of ostensible republication at New York. But far otherwise is the case, and thus the reprint, far from keeping pace with the original, lags most fearfully behind, and treats its readers to matter months old. We were not aware of this until very lately, and having induced an intimate friend to undertake an analysis of the three or four last numbers, that gentleman has detected the following rather strange anomalies:—

The *August* number (N. Y.) contains papers from the March and April numbers of the original.

The *September* number (N. Y.) contains Guthrie's biography of 15th June. No reviews at all; Macmurdo's lecture on the eye, of May in the original, and Guthrie's lecture for March.

The *October* number contains the biography of Marshall Hall, which appeared in the original of 27th July. Macmurdo's lecture, number 7, of July 6. The review of Spencer Thompson, M.D., on Temperance, &c., 24th Aug.,

1850, is entirely different from the original, with many omissions; and in fact, many of the papers are so confused in the reprint, that it is almost impossible to compare the two.

Is this right, or is it wrong? If the latter, then is the reprint, not what it purports to be; and if the former, why these omissions, alterations, and delays in the republication of the papers. We say nothing of the entire omission of the *Lancet* editorials, which very frequently have important medico-political bearings. We ask again, why is this so?

Coroner's Bill for Upper Canada.—

We have published for the benefit of the profession in the sister province, the *Coroner's Bill*, passed at the last session of the legislature. We must say that the fees awarded for the duties of medical witnesses are most shabby, but shabby though they be, the profession is now in a better position than that in which they were.

13th AND 14th VIC. CAP. LVI.

An Act to amend the Law respecting the office of Coroner. [24th July, 1850.]

Whereas the regulations for holding Coroners' Inquests are insufficient, and it is desirable that some remedy should be provided therefor: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council and of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada, constituted and assembled by virtue of and under the authority of an Act passed in the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and intituled *An Act to re-unite the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and for the Government of Canada*, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That from and after the passing of this Act, no Inquest shall be holden on the body of any deceased person by any Coroner until it has been first made to appear to such Coroner, that there is reason to believe that such deceased person came to his death under such circumstances of violence or unfair means, or culpable or negli-