

on a person of her habits? No! no matter what her habits may have been, a blow or fall must have been received for each discolouration. They were not a few large, but a great number of small ecchymoses.

*By the Court.*—Had the deceased been ill-treated between twelve o'clock and nine on the day she died, death would have unquestionably been accelerated. A woman when pregnant, as she was, is more susceptible to injuries than at other times, from the exalted state of the nervous system. [Probably Dr. H. means that the nervous *functions* were exalted, unless, indeed, Mrs. Connell lived in a garret.]

Dr. Hingston was evidently aware of the discrepancies between his deposition at the inquest, and his version of his own evidence as given in the Journal, when he endeavoured to forestall criticism by saying that it was "drawn up in the language of the Coroner's clerk." In reply to this, I will simply state that the Coroner's clerk—Mr. Lionais—is not in the habit of tampering with the evidence of medical witnesses, nor are the discrepancies of a kind that could possibly arise from such a cause. It is well also to bear in mind, that evidence given at a coroner's inquest, when all the facts and details are fresh in the memory, is much more reliable than that given at a remote period of time, in a crowded court-room amid all its exciting and confusing episodes.

The discrepancy is most extraordinary with regard to the external marks, and particularly those on the head. In the evidence given before the Coroner, the external marks are carefully enumerated, only one instance occurring in which the precise number of marks on any part is not stated, and that instance refers to "several bruises of long standing on the left arm." Only one external mark on the head is at first described, viz.: "an abrasion about the size of a sixpence on the right temple," and this abrasion was so slight that there was no corresponding ecchymosis beneath the scalp. "*Between the scalp and the skull*" however, there were "four patches of ecchymosis" and one of these "behind the right ear" was found to "correspond to an external mark"; this latter mark being probably concealed by the hair, accounts for its not being previously observed. There can have been no external marks corresponding with the other ecchymoses beneath the scalp, or the fact would doubtless also have been mentioned; but it now suits Dr. Hingston's purpose to make them appear, and at his bidding they appear as in duty bound. Nor is it said in the same deposition that the "ecchymoses on the convexities of the hemispheres of the brain" corresponded to those behind the ears; indeed, from their positions as described they could not have done so. To effect this, however, the bruises in question have been brought up from their positions *behind* the ears to a more favourable spot *over* the ears. Neither is there any mention made in the former case of the numerous other bruises—"too numerous to count"—on which Dr. Hingston