

With regard to my own evidence I have a few words to say. In his report of it and in his remarks, Dr. Hingston eclipses all his other performances, absolutely placing no bounds to the license of his pen, and I regret to be obliged to add, that he there states what he must have known to be incorrect, when he represents me as saying that "persons receiving frequent beatings are uninjured by them, &c." What I did state, and what he has so grossly misrepresented, was in answer to a question from the judge, and which was as follows:—*Ques.* "If the prisoner had gone into his wife's room at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. making use of most violent language, and had seized his wife and raised her from the bed, letting her fall back upon it, would not such conduct have accelerated death, by producing a shock to the nervous system?" *Ans.* "In a nervous and timid woman unaccustomed to such scenes, the treatment described would undoubtedly have that effect, but in one like deceased, accustomed to habitual quarrelling, the *amount of violence described*, inflicted 5 hours before death, would not necessarily accelerate that event." On being asked "whether pregnancy did not render women more susceptible of injury," I replied that, "as a general rule it did, but that there were exceptions." The reader will perceive the great difference between what I really did state, and what Dr. Hingston has absurdly represented me as stating, and will not fail to attribute it to the same motives and tendencies which have been so conspicuous throughout.

Had this article not already been extended much beyond its proposed limits, I might treat Dr. Hingston to a parody on his own evidence, when its grotesque proportions might somewhat astonish him. I might also allude to the exquisite taste he displays in the selection of his illustrations. His grief at the loss of his "dear departed Sarah Gubbins" is only equalled by his admiration for the tailor's wife to whom he devotes half a page; but as my object is merely to defend myself and my respected colleagues from an unjust and indecent attack, I shall not pursue the matter further.

I cannot close this article, however, without in conclusion, calling attention to the very peculiar views which Dr. Hingston entertains regarding the duties of medical witnesses. On page 73 he says: "But there are questions of far greater moment than the correctness of this one or the error of that. What is to be the effect upon the public of these exhibitions of contrariness?" Here we have the secret of the whole matter. It signifies not whether the opinion sworn to, be right or wrong, whether the ends of justice be maintained or frustrated, whether the life of a human being be saved or sacrificed; all is right so long as the public is satisfied! Perish forever the revolting thought, that any responsible being should thus be willing to barter both soul and body for the sake of a little transient popularity!

Montreal, April 6, 1860.

---

Dr. Craik's reply to Dr. Hingston closes this subject, as far as these pages are concerned. The whole subject is not worthy the space which we have permitted to it.—EDITOR B. A. J.