

justice and science, which is derived from the very state of things which is here flippantly termed a nuisance.

Had we not already unmistakable evidence of the fertility of Dr. Hingston's imagination, I should feel at a loss to discover whence his report of the case is derived, for it differs most materially from any of those which I have been able to examine, and I have examined every one to which I could possibly obtain access, including all those published in the daily papers. With the evidence of the non-medical witnesses I have no fault to find, as I shall presently show in what important particulars it flatly contradicts Dr. Hingston's statements; but the medical evidence is so garbled and misquoted that its meaning is in many instances entirely reversed.

To begin with Dr. Hingston's own evidence. In the first place, it is very much abridged; and in such a manner that many important statements are entirely left out. (The same occurs in the evidence of all the crown medical witnesses, while the evidence of the others is given *in extenso*. The motive for thus suppressing parts of the evidence we need not stop to examine).

Interpolations have also been made which tend to favour his own peculiar views. For instance, in describing the condition of the deceased on the night before her death, he says, "I asked her to turn over, she seemed from pain unable to do so." Now the words "from pain" do not occur in any of the printed reports of his evidence, nor were they in the Judge's notes which were read to the jury. It will be remembered also by those who were present at the trial, that Dr. Howard, after hearing all Dr. Hingston's evidence, declined giving an opinion as to the cause of death, unless Dr. Hingston were re-examined as to the cause of her inability to turn over. Had Dr. Hingston given *pain* as the cause, Dr. Howard's difficulty would not have occurred. The object of this interpolation I can readily show. Dr. Hingston having given no reason for the inability of deceased to turn over in bed, and the spine not having been examined, it was suggested *after Dr. Hingston had been examined*, that paralysis may have existed. Now this was a strong point in favour of death from apoplexy, and therefore Dr. Hingston thought it necessary, in giving his version of his own evidence, to meet difficulties which *were not started until after his evidence had been given and recorded*.

Another interpolation of the same kind occurs farther on in his evidence. In describing the condition of the brain and its membranes, he reports himself as having said that they "were pale and healthy." The word *pale* is an interpolation, and a most unfortunate one, shewing that his anxiety to prove that the woman did not die of apoplexy, actually outstrips his anatomical knowledge, for only such an imagination as Dr. Hingston's could reconcile *paleness* of the *pia mater* with its *healthy* condition, much less with extravasation into the sac of the arachnoid.

There are numerous other alterations in Dr. Hingston's evidence, some of which I shall merely mention: for instance, in his deposition before the coroner, as well as in his evidence at the trial, he stated that there were "ecchymoses" in the cavity of the arachnoid; some kind friend, however, having probably told him that an ecchymosis in the cavity of the arachnoid was a new fact in patho-