

the purpose of robbery. Expecting to find his victim abed, he took with him a bottle of chloroform, with the intention of deepening the unconsciousness of sleep so that he could pursue his scheme of robbery unmolested. The robber met with unexpected resistance and the room of the victim gave evidence of a desperate struggle. The old man fought hard. The bed and walls of the room were splashed with blood and the carpet was soaked. The victim was found dead by the police with finger marks on his throat, three cuts on his head; his jaw dislocated and a rag soaked in chloroform jammed down his throat.

Two medical men were found by the defence who were willing to go on the stand and testify that the old man died of natural causes and that the assault was not the cause of his death. One of these experts, described as an elderly physician by the press (*N. Y. Times*, August 31st), admitted that he had not made an autopsy in thirty years. His name is not to be found in the forthcoming "Green Book." From what depths of obscurity he was dragged by the defence does not appear in the evidence. The other physician, although not a member of the County Society, is a graduate of sixteen years' standing of a reputable institution. In the face of the evidence that the old man had three cuts on the head, a dislocated jaw and a chloroform soaked rag thrust down his throat, this "expert" testified that he was positive that death resulted naturally from myocarditis, the position of the body in death proving this to his complete satisfaction. He was also certain that a person could not die of asphyxiation and at the same time have bleeding wounds. He persisted that he would remain of this opinion even if the chloroform soaked cloth which the murderer had shoved down the victim's throat had shut off his breath.

It is not often that we are confronted with so atrocious an example of the evils of our present system of expert testimony. Medical men are unfortunately too apt to look favorably on the side which summons them to testify, but it is very seldom that they do not have at least a colorable excuse for their testimony. The evidence of these two witnesses was a joke, a sorry joke, a most humiliating joke, absolutely unique in its grim humor and grotesqueness. The old man was savagely assaulted and choked to death. Yet, after all, two medical men were found by the defence who were willing to make themselves ridiculous and disgrace the profession in the eyes of all men by insisting that the poor strangled victim of a murderous young thug died of natural causes. The mind revolts at such perversion and the blush of shame rises to the cheek of every man to whom the honor of the profession is dear. But what is to be done? Is there no remedy for such a