

lungs and stomach!" Had Andrews no disease of the *brain*? Had he no disease of the liver? And what disease of the lungs, and what of the stomach, were those which he had? And were these primary or secondary affections? If the Toronto Asylum, which has cost the Province so large a sum, is to be managed in this manner, its fertile sources of knowledge closed by the wilful blindness of those who should be keenly alive to their importance, then we say that but little real benefit from it will be conferred upon the community. It will be as it has been—a mere lazarus house, existing for the day, and exerting no possible influence on the future.

But the climax of our contemporary's special pleading is capped by the following, which, lest we should be considered as doing violence to the original language, or perverting its meaning, we give entire, "Dr. Scott has in our opinion displayed 'indiscretion and want of judgment' not in removing and retaining the portions of the body which he considered worthy of particular and careful examination, but in not directing his subordinate officers to see the body of his patient properly and decently interred, and in allowing it to be left to the custody of an unscrupulous sexton, who for some consideration, or the gratification of his own idle curiosity, would subject the corpse to the gaze of inquisitive and officious bystanders. Again we think Dr. Scott to have been in error, in sending at the time he did, the portions of the body he had retained, to the sexton for interment; it was a concession to public sensitiveness; a tacit acknowledgment, as it were, of impropriety on his part, which really did not exist." Such then, we presume, is the standard of morality advocated by the *Upper Canada Journal*, the self-constituted organ of the Upper Canada Profession. *Oh, tempora! Oh, mores!* The thief who robs you of your purse, would exhibit both sound judgment and

discretion in not returning it, except at his convenience; and the offence would cease to be one, if he kept it for ever, *provided it was never missed*. Such is a legitimate application of the sentiment conveyed in the above quotation; and differing, *toto calo*, from our contemporary, we think that Dr. Scott exhibited both sound judgment and discretion in returning "when he did," what clearly was not his, no matter for what purposes soever retained, although these are too patent, while our contemporary has exhibited both "indiscretion and want of judgment" in inditing such nonsense as that quoted, and in pledging *ex cathedra* the Profession to its accuracy and support.

We certainly did not intend to have alluded to this Toronto Asylum business, or to have expressed any opinion upon it, beyond that contained in the four lines of editorial comment when we published the Report in our last number; but the singular defence of the medical superintendent, adopted by the *U. C. Journal*, has forced us to declare our opinions on the point more unreservedly than we purposed. Our contemporary will not give us the credit for being influenced by any of the private cliques, political or otherwise, of Toronto. We have taken the subject up on its mere merits. And while the medical superintendent has little cause of rejoicing, in the mode in which the *Upper Canada Journal* has advocated his cause, the *Journal* itself must learn, that its opinions and judgments should be guided neither by fear, favor, nor affection, and that, holding in its hands the integrity of the Profession, it should be cautious, lest that integrity should be impeached.

But before we conclude, we must take the opportunity of correcting our contemporary on a misapprehension under which it labors. The *U. C. Journal* observes "on the broad question of the necessity for minute anatomical study, little, it may be