

one of them was derelict in her several duties; but that a misunderstanding had arisen between Dr. Ferguson and these officers of the hospital, she being charged with being austere and dictatorial in her intercourse with them, and she on the other hand charges them with insubordination and plotting against her. Bitter feelings and acrimonious remarks passed between them, crimination and recrimination, until it culminated in those three ladies drawing up specific charges of a most serious character against the resident surgeon. These charges, it would seem, were credited by the directory and she was requested to resign. It is evident that the directors did this sincerely for the benefit of the institution; and to prevent a person whom they considered incompetent, as an opium eater, a drunkard and a thief (for these were the charges made according to their ideas), to officiate any longer in that institution.

But here arises another phase of the matter which is this; that while they had authority to dismiss her from the institution on these alleged charges, they had no right to malign her private character and reputation which it does not appear that they desired to do, but to avoid, as far as possible. Yet these things having taken place, and these allegations having been made on paper, and she having been dismissed from the hospital, they leaked out without her having any opportunity to defend herself against these statements, and her reputation has been seriously injured; hence comes in another law—the law of the Gospel, above referred to, or under other circumstances, the celestial law, or what is sometimes substituted for it here, the law of equity.

President Taylor resumed: There

are very many nice points of discrimination associated with a subject of this kind. When we talk of law it is a very comprehensive subject, and enters into all the ramifications of human life, and, as has been remarked, through all nations. Generally among the governments of the world—and also among many of the institutions referred to, there is a kind of neutral ground, a sort of neutral zone, something similar to that which sometimes exists between one State and another in order to prevent collision and difficulty, and it is upon this ground that a great many troubles and difficulties frequently exist on various matters. The people on their part occasionally claim things that they have no right to claim, and those who govern sometimes go beyond the bounds allotted to them. And hence arises difficulty and trouble. Courts are appointed generally for adjudication of these matters, and sometimes it is very difficult for these courts to decide correctly, justly and equitably the cases that come before them. Among the nations they are very frequently submitted to what is termed the "arbitrament of the sword." That, however, is a very poor thing when put into the scales of justice. I have heard it said, for instance, when certain questions have arisen in the United States—that is, in regard to States rights and in regard to the rights of the people, and in regard to how far they should be sustained in their privileges, rights, etc. I have heard some people very flippantly say, "Oh, that has been decided by the sword." A very singular piece of justice is a sword with which to administer one's social, political, or national affairs. When we come to put it in the balance of the goddess of justice—who is supposed to