

the Crown only, and subject to the direction of the Attorney General alone, under the law which regulates his office.

The proposition to give Dr. Jones the monopoly of medical evidence, is simply one to create a lucrative office for him. In the nature of things he would not be the best evidence on matters not within his cognizance, and as a professional man, his reputation at the Bar is greater than at the bed-side.

In an enquiry touching the death of the subject of a Coroner's inquest, the Physician who attended the deceased in life, where death resulted from disease or other causes not instantly fatal, or who was first called after death, in others would be, of course, the best and most satisfactory witness; nor could his evidence be dispensed with, although the extraordinary measure were adopted of appointing a permanent Crown witness. Dr. Jones would be provided for, at a considerable additional and unnecessary expense, but without any public advantage.

Such an appointment would be an insult and a wrong to the whole medical profession of the district, inasmuch as it would be a declaration of their unfitness to act as witnesses of events within their knowledge. Nor would the constant appearance of the Crown Witness be calculated to favorably impress Juries.

We presume there is no question that the suggestion arose with Dr. Jones himself, who has a remarkable aptitude for this sort of business, and either by means of an uncommonly keen scent for a carcass, or by intuition, generally manages to be forthcoming at all inquests or legal enquiries where medical evidence is wanting, and fat fees are to be had. Being unsuccessful in his application for appointment as Medical Coroner, he is willing to accept the next best thing, Medical evidence.

What his particular claims are for public employment we are not aware:—whether he relies upon his beauty or his learning, his private labors, or his public services; but this we know that were not the appointment which he now seeks utterly objectionable and indefensible, we should be compelled to raise our voice against the commission to his hands of any employment from which might be implied public approval of the conduct which restored him to the practice of his profession.

Those who censured most severely the conduct of Lord Elgin, in the passage of the Rebellion Losses Bill, cannot approve that of his mounted escort; and they recognise in the suppression of the force a less than merited punishment for a treacherous dereliction of duty without a parallel.