

be informed of these facts, which materially affect the value of the service rendered, previous to the adoption of measures to enforce, what we cannot but consider, a most righteous claim, for most important services, faithfully rendered.

We perfectly agree with our contemporary that there has always existed on the part of every government, a strong desire to place the services of scientific men, on the lowest possible scale of remuneration; and merely to say that this is a disgrace to it, is but giving an expression to our thoughts, in the mildest possible terms. And when we observe, that the government remunerates a lawyer at the rate £3, 15, per diem with his travelling expenses, and has been in the habit of employing non-professional men at the rate of £2 10s. per diem for their services on especial occasions, we have stated, we think, enough to show the light estimate which it puts upon a duty, than which none other can compare in the magnitude of its results.

We now subjoin the answer of our contemporary, and renew our request to our contemporaries in other cities for an expression of their opinion on the merits of the case submitted.

Your question is difficult to answer, because it is vaguely put; the amount of labor required is not stated. Was the analysis required to be made in search of one article known or suspected to be given, or was it made in search of *any* poisonous substance that may have been administered? Was the analysis a quantitative one, or merely qualitative? For the minute and laborious investigation made by Professor Doremus in the Stevens case, we believe the fee paid was about \$3,000, but in this case it will be recollected that two entire bodies were subjected to scrutinising investigation. In making these chemical analyses it should be borne in mind that the labor is not ended when the analysis is complete; there is the examination of the chemist before the Coroner's Jury, before the Grand Jury, and before the Criminal Court on the prisoners trial. There is the cross-questioning on that and many other irrelevant subjects, to try to show to the jury that the chemist is not perfect, that he does not know everything, and therefore his testimony is but of little value in the present case.

There is another and more important feature to be borne in mind. A fellow creature's life depends upon the skill, judgment, and honesty of the analyst; there can be here no mere suspicion, the poison must be positively shown to exist, not by one, but by all the known reagents; and if the quantity of poison is small, it must be shown that there is enough present to destroy life. We think for the amount of scientific skill, labor, and annoyance in the Stevens case, that Professor Doremus was inadequately paid, and if the case to which our friend refers was of that nature, we think the charge should be equal. For the analysis of a stomach and its contents, with the intestines, when the search is for one article only, known or suspected to have been administered, the minimum charge should be \$500, and larger in proportion to the labor and scientific skill required. When our fees more nearly approach those of our professional cousins, the lawyers, our skill and judgment will be more highly appreciated. —*American Medical Times*.

---

#### THE EMEUTE IN THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

It is with anything but pleasurable feelings that we give insertion to the following extract from the *American Medical Gazette*, which is a very condensed statement of the occurrences which have lately taken place in the New York University. We regret to say, that from all that we have read upon the subject, Professor Draper had too much cause to send to Dr. Aylette the letter which he