

THE
BRITISH AMERICAN JOURNAL.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

ART. XVIII.—*Reply to Dr. Hingston's Communication on the "Medical Evidence in the Wellington Street Murder Case."* By ROBERT CRAIK, M. D. House Surgeon to the Montreal General Hospital, and Demonstrator of Anatomy, McGill College.

When I took up a late number of the *British American Journal* to peruse Dr. Hingston's long article on the medical evidence in a late trial, I did so expecting to find the case set forth in a fair and truthful manner, being the least that I could expect from a member of our honourable profession: but although I anticipated some expressions indicative of wounded vanity, I was not at all prepared for such a tissue of misrepresentations. It is always a painful task to accuse another of aught but the fairest dealing, but in this case justice compels me to say that Dr. Hingston has been guilty not only of the *suppressio veri*, but also—to use no harsher term—of the *suggestio falsi*.

He has so distorted the medical testimony as to render it scarcely recognizable and certainly not reliable; he has introduced absurd parodies on the same testimony so artfully, that nine-tenths of the readers of the *Journal*—even the Editors of the daily papers included—have actually mistaken them for the reality; and he has crowned the whole by a puerile and bombastic commentary, which, though professedly written in a spirit of modesty and fairness, savours strongly of feelings and motives much less commendable.

There is no sound reasoning nor logical deduction in the whole article, but there are to be met with instead, here a sweeping assertion, there an inflated tirade, and anon a lachrymose deprecation. Indeed, from the mental qualities which he displays throughout, he might with more hopes of success try his hand at a sensation novel or other work of fiction, for his resources in that line are apparently inexhaustible.

Dr. Hingston begins by lamenting the—to him—unedifying spectacle of medical men presuming to differ in their opinions, from their confrères in a court of justice. He then attempts to say that if one set were Homœopaths and the other, Allopaths, he could understand the anomaly, but for pupils of the same