

various sections in the recent International Medical Congress answer. There, at that babel of tongues, it was deemed necessary to prepare a synopsis in *three* modern languages, so that the great bulk of the members could perceive in his own language that wherewith he wished to familiarize himself, as if there was no common vehicle of intercourse in that language which has long been the language of the learned. It may be stated, as it is partially believed, that the time spent in acquiring this liberal education is wasted in the presence of work more useful and more profitable. But this is an error. If one country has contributed more than another, in recent times, to the advancement of every department of medical science, it is Germany. We have the recent testimony of Dr. John Struthers and others in favor of the greater completeness of their anatomical institutes; to the completeness of their teaching, and to the result in the large contributions which the anatomists of Germany have made in modern times to the progress of anatomical science in all its branches. Yet are the Germans at the same time the best educated nation in the world. If matters are now as when I was in Germany, I presume there was not a German at the Congress who could not read English or French or Latin as easily as his own *deutsche sprache*. How many Frenchmen could read (or would wish to read) German. How many English or Americans (out of the higher walks) could read either French or German? The fact that there was a widespread ignorance of classics may be gathered from the circumstance that it was not deemed advisable to put the abstracts in a language which might not be understood. One word more relating to the Congress.

You have all read in the different periodicals the remarkable statement of Dr. Keith as to the employment of carbolic spray in abdominal surgery, and you have all been more than amazed at the unexpected admission of Professor Lister. How true is the old Horatian adage, *nil admiratur*. For I know not at which to be most surprised, the enthusiasm with which Listerism was hitherto advocated as the *essential* feature in *all* surgical operations; or the admirable frankness with which its ablest defender has admitted that in one department, at least, of operative surgery it is *de trop*.

But, to return to our rooms at No. 14 Phillips square: In leaving the chair to which your kind partiality has assigned me, I have again to thank you for the honor you conferred upon me in elect-

ing me your President, and not for the first time, and for the uniform courtesy which has been extended to me by you all. I have to return also special thanks to our quiet, unobtrusive, but most efficient, Secretary, Dr. Edwards, for much valuable assistance. Our indefatigable Treasurer, also, Dr. Molson, will please accept my thanks for relieving me of much labor which a less energetic officer would have entailed upon me.

### THE QUEEN *VERSUS* HUGH HAYVERN FOR THE MURDER OF JOHN SALTER.

MEDICAL AND LEGAL VIEWS OF INSANITY.

*As usual, Doctors Differ.*

By DR. HENRY HOWARD, Visiting Physician Longue Point Lunatic Asylum.

From the medical evidence given in this case, it is quite evident that the five doctors for the Crown not only differed from Doctors Henry Howard and Angus Macdonald, but they also differed from one another. This did not look as if the medical profession was a very scientific one, or as if medical men had any scientific data upon which to base their opinions. Some of them evidently based their opinions upon the writings of others, while Dr. Howard based his opinions chiefly upon his study of insanity, as he found it to develop itself in nature.

It appears that, at the request of Mr. Curran, Q.C., who defended the prisoner, Dr. Henry Howard undertook to examine into the mental state of Hugh Hayvern, and report to Mr. Curran his opinion of the man, as to whether he was, or was not, a man that was legally responsible for his acts, particularly for the act of which he stood accused of, the killing of John Salter.

What was Dr. Howard's course of procedure? First, to learn, as far as it was possible, the *history* of the man. Why did he do so? Because, according to his evidence, he maintains that a man's *conduct* gives very strong evidence as to whether he is sane or insane. He said no sane man *would*, not *could not*, live in the constant breach of all social and natural laws, particularly in the breach of the first natural law, self-preservation. He therefore wanted to find out by his enquiries if that Hayvern did or did not live in the breach of all social and natural laws.

He also wanted to discover what had been his physical state in childhood, maintaining that, if