

by pounding, and the *dummer junge* who prescribed thee, and not the prisoner—the culprit!

Where is the “respect for the profession,” and charity for the members of it now? I well know that Dr. Nelson, whose goodness of heart I have long rated fully as high as his discretion, and for the possession of which I respect and esteem him, scarcely contemplated saying what he has said; nor do I believe that he seriously intended to deliver a judgment *ex cathedra* upon the opinions of others, as little likely as himself to lag behind “the modern researches in Physiology and Pathology.” And yet the tendency of his observations is to usurp such a position, though it may be without his having fully perceived it.

With the *substance* of the evidence of the fourth medical witness, Dr. Peltier, I cannot find fault. He predicated his hypothesis upon the meagre statement made before the Coroner—a statement drawn up in the language of the Coroner’s Clerk—and not upon the evidence of Dr. Howard and myself in the witness box; (where circumstances were more fully brought out,) and was wrong in so doing. But upon the imperfect *data* afforded, he advanced an opinion, with caution and modesty. He was consistent throughout, not the least consistent portion of his testimony being that he necessarily knew less about the case than those from whom he differed.

And now as to the external violence, which, according to the medical gentlemen for the defence, did not *cause* death, (though three of them admit that it *accelerated* it!) it was such as I had never before witnessed—and as Dr. Howard described as “*black and blue all over*”—such as the Coroner and Clerk had never seen—such as to shock and sicken the majority of the jury, many of them doubtless not unused to seeing bruises—and such as to defy any attempt at description—less skin being in its natural colour than discoloured. Yet as none of the contusions were, singly, mortal, they were said not to have caused death.

*Apropos*—I shall quote from Taylor, the highest authority in legal medicine:

“There is no medical doubt that a person may die from what is termed shock, without any marks of severe injury being discovered,” \* \* \* \* \*

“A medical witness must give his evidence with caution in such cases since it is the custom to rely in the defence upon the absence of any visible *mortal* wound to account for death—a principle which, if once unrestrictedly admitted as correct would leave a large number of deaths, undoubtedly occurring from violence, wholly unexplained.” \* \* \* \* \*

p. 211. A person may have received many injuries as by blows or stripes, not one of which, taken alone could in medical language, be termed mortal, and yet he may die directly or very soon afterwards. Death is commonly referred to exhaustion, but this is only another mode of expression; the exhaustion is itself dependent on a fatal influence or impression produced on the nervous system.”—*Ibid.* \* \* \* \* \*

“It is a well ascertained fact, that a multiplicity of injuries each comparatively slight,—are as capable of operating fatally as any single wound. \* \* \* \* \*

p. 212. “From these considerations, it is obviously *absurd* to expect—that in every case of death from violence or mal-treatment there must be some specific and well defined *mortal lesion* to account for that event; when the circumstances accompanying death are unknown, a medical opinion should always be expressed with caution; but if we are informed that the deceased was in ordinary health and vigour previous to the infliction of the violence, and there is no morbid cause to account for her sudden illness and death