

far as relates to one question alleged to have been put to me, somewhat amplified by him, it is yet sufficiently continuous to indicate the ideas which passed through my mind at that examination, and therefore to obviate any such necessity on my part.

With reference to Dr. Hingston's report of the examination of myself on page 70, I have again to repeat that it has been drawn from his imagination, but put forward so artfully as to lead to the impression that it actually occurred. I regret that Dr. H. should have selected such an occasion for a display of his ingenuity or wit, and more especially, that he did not hasten to correct the false impression made on the minds of some of the Editors of the daily Press, who accepted it as fact, and commented upon it accordingly. This, I think, as a duty to those whom he had placed in a false position before the public, he should have done. I can only explain this dereliction on the most charitable supposition, that every person does not entertain the same ideas, as to the performance of what seems the obvious obligation of one man towards another.

I remain, yours very truly,

DR. CRAIK, &c., &c.

A. HALL.

---

(From Dr. Nelson.)

MONTREAL, April 5th, 1860.

DEAR DOCTOR:—

I have neither the leisure nor the disposition to enter into a discussion with Dr. Hingston, a man who enjoys an extraordinary capacity of drawing upon the resources of a very fertile imagination, for sustaining positions based upon false promises, as well as ignoring that the French Writers characterize a sudden stroke of apoplexy *un coup de sang*, une *apoplexie foudroyante*, or as the English Writers have it, *thunder-struck*, and too, in many cases, without leaving any vestige behind.

The pathologist in question, is advised to refresh his memory by perusing any of our excellent elementary works, for the proofs of the absence of any special lesion in many of the cases; he will, at the same time, learn to appreciate the therapeutical effects of narcotics in complaints of such tendency, and how fatal an error my prove under such circumstances.

Drs. Hall, Peltier and yourself are quite qualified, from having been present and unprejudiced in every way, of judging of the veracity of Dr. Hingston's report of my evidence, the correctness of which none but a very sprightly (*spirituel*) and visionary personage would dispute.

I am, Dear Doctor, very truly yours,

WOLFRED NELSON.

To R. CRAIK, Esq., M. D., Montreal.

In justice to Dr. Nelson, I must remark that he did not state that deceased died from an "apoplexie foudroyante," as Dr. Hingston reports him as having done. He merely mentioned the "apoplexie foudroyante," by way of contrasting it with congestive apoplexy which he was describing. The assertion is simply another of Dr. Hingston's fictions.

---

(From Dr. Peltier.)

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—

In answer to your kind note of yesterday, I have simply to state in reply to Dr. Hingston's remarks as to my opinion, that it was substantiated upon a statement written by the Coroner's clerk under the *immediate* (so I have been told) guidance of Drs. Howard and Hingston; and moreover that Dr. Hingston's wit throughout his communication has somewhat helped him to elude the weakness of his argument.

Very sincerely yours,

HECTOR PELTIER, M.D., *Edinburgh*.

ROBERT CRAIK, M.D., Montreal, 5th April, 1860.