

his last illness he had gone to some races and had got wet, and that these facts explained the occurrence of the gastro-intestinal symptoms and the finding of arsenic in the various organs of his body. Again, it has not been proved that Mrs. Maybrick actually administered any arsenic to her husband, and it was asserted that any purchases of arsenic she had made were for use as a cosmetic. Not only is the British public strongly in favor of the prisoner's reprieve—for the jury found her guilty and the judge concurred in the verdict—but the propriety of carrying out the death sentence is questioned by many of the medical men I have spoken to on the subject. Among the profession it is believed (1) that the symptoms above referred to can be explained only on the theory of poisoning by an irritant poison (probably arsenic), given at intervals in solution, during the six weeks of his last illness; (2) that the deceased did not die from gastro-enteritis alone; (3) but that the proof that the prisoner administered the poison is weak, and she ought to have the benefit of the doubt. In the meantime petitions from "all sorts and conditions of men" and women are pouring in addressed to persons high in power, and there seems little doubt but that she will be reprieved or pardoned. A certain cause of delay in carrying out the sentence, *i.e.*, the fact of her being *enceinte* will also likely tell in her favor.

Not only is there no institution for the treatment of rabies in England, but very little help is extended to Pasteur's Institute in Paris as a sort of compensation for the large number of pauper English patients annually treated there. A foreigner studying insular characteristics might easily conclude that the English mind does not object to, if indeed it does not rather favor, the continuance of rabies in our midst if he were to observe the rapid opposition to the attempts made by the London authorities to have all dogs in the kingdom kept

muzzled. There is a society here, as there is also a society for the propagation of almost every idea, good, bad and indifferent, which has obtained a hold upon half a dozen humane minds, called the "Dog Owners' Protection Association," whose special purpose appears to be to prevent the "dear creatures" from wearing those inconvenient, unartistic and "horrid" things called muzzles.

The transition from the worship of that peculiarly British fetish the "liberty of the subject" to the advocacy of license for the "subject" dog is easy enough. The secretary of the above named society thus delivered himself: "An ill-fitting muzzle (as most muzzles are) is undoubtedly calculated to produce a state of mind and body favorable to the development of rabies." The work of this society for the spreading of hydrophobia and sickly sentiment largely consists in writing letters to the press threatening with the utmost rigors of the law those who use ordinary muzzles, "most of which," etc.

I have just returned from the annual meeting of the British Medical Association, held this year at Leeds. So far as I could judge, there were not nearly as many members present nor were the proceedings quite as interesting as at a previous meeting which I attended at Brighton, but the difference in the outside attractions may easily have made a large difference in the attendance. Many practitioners regard this meeting as their annual holiday, and the opportunities for recreation afforded by the town and neighborhood where the meeting is held must be considered. However, the number and value of the papers read were both very great, and I am sure most men were well repaid by hearing and joining in the discussions which followed them. Dr. Hughlings Jackson's profound and thoughtful address in medicine on the comparative study of diseases of the nervous system was really a tribute to the value of the doctrine of evolution in