

gave evidence for the defence, contending that the deceased's symptoms did not correspond with those of patients suffering from poisoning by arsenic. Mr. Paul's evidence went to show that there was arsenic in the glazing of the pan in which the lunch was warmed, which might be set free by muriatic acid. He also contended that if arsenic had been present in the urine it must have shown itself by Reinsch's test which Dr. Humphreys employed.

Mr. Justice Stephen, in summing up, alluded to the partisan character of expert evidence, quoting also the old saying that "a physician was a man who put medicine, of which he knew little, into a body of which he knew less." He deprived the sarcasm of its sting, however, by the compliments which he paid to the various medical witnesses, the whole of whose evidence, as well as that of others, he went carefully through. At her own request the prisoner was allowed to make a statement. She stated that the solution of fly-papers was for a cosmetic, as her mother and some friends in Germany could have testified. She added that she put some white powder in the meat juice at her husband's request, and, as some of it was spilt, filled it up with water.

The jury were only absent from court about forty minutes, and returned with a verdict of "Guilty." Sentence of death was pronounced upon the unhappy woman, who throughout the whole of the long trial, and in a close court, in sultry weather, bore herself with remarkable firmness.

The case resembles in some points that of Wooler, in others that of Madeline Smith; but it has its own peculiar features. As in Wooler's case, the poison was arsenic, and it was suspected during the deceased's lifetime. But there was not the same delay in coming to a conclusion as to the real nature of the case, or the same performance of Reinsch's test with acid contaminated with arsenic. The cosmetic theory set up in Madeline Smith's case was again set up here.—*London Lancet*, Aug. 17, 1889.