

A brief sketch of the 'Hounslow inquest' and of the late trial 'Wakley versus Cook & Healey', in a court in Exchequer / with a few remarks by Horatio Grosvenor Day.

Contributors

Day, Horatio Grosvenor.
Royal College of Physicians of London

Publication/Creation

London : Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1849.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/u9k6xaft>

Provider

Royal College of Physicians

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by Royal College of Physicians, London. The original may be consulted at Royal College of Physicians, London. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

With the Author's Comments.

(3)

A BRIEF SKETCH

OF THE

“HOUNSLOW INQUEST,”

AND OF THE LATE TRIAL,

‘WAKLEY *versus* COOK & HEALEY,’

In the Court of Exchequer;

WITH A FEW REMARKS,

BY

HORATIO GROSVENOR DAY,

Surgeon,

ISLEWORTH.

LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & Co., STATIONERS' HALL COURT;

J. TAYLOR, POST-OFFICE, ISLEWORTH; AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

—
Price Sixpence.

A BRIEF SKETCH

HOLLISLOW INQUEST

WILLIAM COOK & HEALY

ROYAL COLLEGE
OF
PHYSICIAN
OF
LONDON

THE "HOUNSLOW INQUEST,"

AND THE

LATE TRIAL IN THE COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

THE recent Trial in the Court of Exchequer, "Wakley v. Cook and Healey," having recalled public attention to the circumstances attending the Inquest at Hounslow in July, 1846, on the body of the soldier Frederick John White, of the 7th Hussars, who died in the barracks on the 11th of July of inflammation of the heart and pleura, alleged to have resulted from the effects of corporal punishment inflicted on the 15th of June, I avail myself of the opportunity to make a few observations, in order to reply to some unjust and illiberal remarks made on my conduct, which appear to have been widely circulated in the neighbourhood.

On the 15th of July a report was current that a man had been flogged to death at Hounslow Barracks, or rather that he had been flogged on one day, and died on the next! Knowing how frequently unfounded rumours get abroad, I paid little attention to the statement; but between eleven and twelve o'clock at night, the Police Inspector (Mr. Lawrence) came to me with the Coroner's warrant to examine the body of a soldier the next morning; and said that he was desired by Mr. Wakley to request that I would pay particular attention to *the skin of the back, as a portion of it was missing!* Connecting this with the reports I had previously heard, I must confess that the case appeared to be one of extraordinary character, and the Inspector could not furnish me with any decided particulars. He merely stated that I had been selected by the jury to examine the corpse. On the following day, July the 16th, I drove to the barracks, accompanied by my partner, Dr. Mackinlay,

whom I asked to go with me. We met Dr. Warren, the regimental surgeon, at the barrack hospital, and upon ascertaining that he had attended the deceased, made some inquiries respecting his death. He stated that he had been flogged in the middle of June, and apparently got quite well afterwards; but that he was taken ill about the 5th of July, and died after a few days. We then proceeded to examine the body, which was lying in an out-house, and had it removed into the yard. It was in an exceedingly decomposed state, and we found had been previously subjected to minute investigation, performed, as the hospital serjeant informed us, by two military surgeons from London. Dr. Warren did not accompany us to the examination. On re-opening the body, we discovered the heart to be in a softened and flabby state, with appearances of inflammation on its lining membrane; the lungs, especially the left, much congested, and the pleura inflamed. It was impossible in consequence of decomposition, with the additional difficulty of every organ having been previously taken out and examined to be very accurate in our diagnosis; but we saw sufficient, in the appearances above mentioned, to account for death. We then turned the body on its face, and examined the superficial muscles of the back where the skin had been removed, and found them perfectly healthy. The portion of skin which had been taken off was brought, and corresponded in shape with the exposed surface; but the skin having shrunk, and the opening expanded, there appeared considerable difference in the size. There were marks of lashes on the remaining skin, and also on the removed portion, but they were completely healed. On returning to the hospital, I asked Dr. Warren why the portion of skin had been taken off, and he said it was done by Dr. Reid, not knowing there was any probability of an inquest, for the purpose of ascertaining with a microscope

the effects of flogging upon the *cutis vera*, or true skin.

I informed Dr. Warren of the appearances which we had discovered in the thoracic viscera, and he said they were the same as those found by Dr. Hall and Dr. Reid; and that he had treated the deceased for an attack of pleurisy.

He then asked us to have a glass of wine in the mess-room after the disagreeable duty we had been performing; we consequently adjourned there for a few minutes, and I then, for the first time, saw the account in *The Times* newspaper, of the occurrences of the previous evening. On the Saturday following, thinking it probable I might be asked a few questions at the inquest respecting military flogging, I drove to the barracks, and asked Dr. Warren to allow me to see the back of a man named Mathewson, who was, I understood, in the hospital, from having undergone a similar punishment, and he immediately acceded to my request.

On the Monday following I attended the inquest, and something being said by one of the soldiers respecting White's limbs having been paralysed a day or two before his death, Mr. Wakley asked me in what state I had found the spinal marrow. I told him that I had not examined it, as I considered it would have been useless to do so in the decomposed state of the body. The Coroner, however, was of a different opinion; and the room was cleared for the purpose of consulting with the Jury, relative to the expediency of exhuming the body in order to have the spine examined. On my re-admission, Mr. Wakley called me to a seat by him, and informed me, that the Jury had decided to have the corpse disinterred, and that he would send a gentleman from London to assist me in the examination. I told him I did not think the Jury would have so decided if they had heard the medical evidence, and that decomposition had proceeded too far to detect any spinal affection. The next day I received a note from Mr. Mills, the deputy coroner, informing me

that Mr. Erasmus Wilson would call on me on the following morning, and accompany me to Heston Church-Yard. We accordingly went there on Wednesday, July 22nd, and found the Rev. Mr. Trimmer, Mr. Teuten, (who had reported the original proceedings in *The Times*,) and a party of police. The body was removed from the grave, and the dissection of the back commenced, when the serjeant of police came to say that two medical gentlemen wished to be present, but that he had orders not to admit any one without my authority. I went to the gate and found Dr. Hall and Dr. Reid, who had on the Monday preceding expressed a wish to attend, waiting at the entrance. I shewed them the note I had received from Mr. Mills, directing me to exclude all other medical men, and they handed me their order from Sir James Macgregor to come down. I thereupon requested Mr. Wilson to speak to them, and he produced a still more peremptory order from the Coroner to exclude them. They took copies of these instructions, and left, stating they should lay the matter before the military authorities.

Proceeding with the dissection of the muscles of the back, Mr. Wilson discovered a peculiar condition of the fourth layer near the spine, to which he called my attention. After examining it carefully, we withdrew for a short time under the shade of the church to rest ourselves, and to discuss the cause of this appearance. Mr. Wilson stated that he thought the violent spasmodic action during the punishment might have caused such muscular contraction as to lacerate the fasciculi of the muscles, and thus to induce inflammation and suppuration, and consequent disorganization. My impression was, that, if it had taken place during the flogging, it was caused by some of the fibres of the muscles being torn from their attachment to the spinal bones, by the violent strain that was likely to be put upon them, and that inflammation had resulted.

I had not the slightest notion that this muscular disorganization, however it had originated, could have any influence upon the internal inflammation of the chest; nor did Mr. Wilson give me the least reason to suppose he considered such a thing at all probable; indeed we were both of opinion, that, had the man lived, the muscles would have recovered their normal condition.

Mr. Wilson returned to my house to luncheon, and there wrote a brief statement of the appearances we had observed, which we signed conjointly, each of us keeping a copy of it. Before leaving, he said he would send me down a more popular report, meaning thereby, one that would be more intelligible to the Jury.

I neither saw nor heard anything of Mr. Wilson until the following Monday, in the inquest-room, when I asked him why he had not sent me the promised report; upon which he said, he had thought it better to shew it me in person. He then produced a lengthened statement, in which he gave an opinion that the disorganized muscle might have produced the inflammation in the chest, and thereby caused the death. I immediately told him I could not agree with any such opinion, and expressed my surprise that he should have come to that conclusion after the conversation we had had on the day of the examination, and also that he had not communicated with me on the subject of his after-consideration. Dr. Warren was allowed to make a statement on this day (the 28th,) and afterwards, Drs. Hall and Reid were examined. They all gave a decided opinion that the flogging had nothing whatever to do directly with the cause of death. My evidence was to the same effect, but I was not asked a single question relative to the examination of the spine at the exhumation.

Mr. Wilson then read his report, and the inquest was on the point of being adjourned, when Mr. Clark, the solicitor,

requested I might be recalled to know if I coincided with Mr. Wilson; upon which I stated that I agreed with respect to the state of the muscles, but that the cause of that state was purely conjectural, and that I altogether differed from him in the supposition that the muscular change had in any way tended to produce inflammation of the internal organs. In reply to one of the Jury, I said, that I considered there were no anatomical appearances to connect the death with the punishment, but that it was possible the mental depression likely to ensue, the confinement to the hospital, &c., might have rendered the deceased more liable to illness and less able to withstand its attacks, and thereby *indirectly* contributed to the fatal result.

It may be remembered that the case occurred in the hottest summer experienced for many years, and that there were frequent and sudden changes of temperature, which gave rise to a great number of inflammatory attacks.

On the 3rd of August, the whole of the evidence was gone through, the depositions of the medical witnesses were read over to them, and I then put in the report which Mr. Wilson and I had signed, and also one which I had drawn up in consequence of Mr. Wilson's having failed to furnish me with one with which I could agree. Both these documents were correctly inserted in the *Lancet*, in the report of the inquest, on the 15th of August. Mr. Wakley then summed up, which he did with great clearness and precision, but the impression it must make upon the Jury, (already predisposed, as had been evident during the whole inquiry, to judge unfavourably of the military authorities,) could not be mistaken.

The verdict, as all the world knows, was "that the deceased had died from the effects of flogging," and the Coroner said he cordially concurred in the correctness of the decision come to by the Jury.

Immediately after the inquest, Mr. Wakley, in his place in the House of Commons, defended his conduct against several charges that had been brought against him ; and read letters, in reply to some inquiries he had made, from Mr. Clark and the Rev. Mr. Trimmer, as to his conduct on the occasion. He also stated his intention to move for a criminal information against Messrs. Healey and Cook, the proprietor and publisher of *The Medical Times*, for their remarks upon the mode in which he had carried on the investigation. He accordingly applied to the Court of Queen's Bench ; affidavits were put in on both sides ; and after a long consideration, their Lordships unanimously refused the application. Upon this Mr. Wakley instructed his solicitors to proceed against the parties by an action-at-law ; and the matter remained in course of preparation for nearly two years.

At length the day was fixed, and on Monday, February 12, 1849, the trial commenced. The Attorney-General began by reading the alleged libels, upon which he commented with great skill and severity, and declared that he should be able to produce such evidence as would effectually disprove all the charges brought against his client. He accordingly called the Rev. Mr. Trimmer, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Pownall, Mr. Armstrong, and Mr. Twining, magistrates who had been present during the whole, or a portion, of the inquest, and they all stated the conduct of Mr. Wakley to have been perfectly fair and impartial on the occasion. Mr. Mills, the deputy coroner, Mr. Lawrence, inspector of police, Mr. Bailey, landlord of the George the Fourth (where the inquest was held,) gave similar testimony. Mr. Teuten, a reporter for the press, contradicted the statement made by the defendants, that he had suppressed portions of the evidence at the request of Mr. Wakley ; and stated that the defendant Healey had told him that he meant to turn

Mr. Wakley out of the coronership, and then put up for it himself. This, I have good reason to believe, was a mistaken idea. Mr. Erasmus Wilson repeated his statement as to the flogging having caused the soldier's death, and declared his readiness to defend his opinion in opposition to the whole medical world; but did not think there was one bold enough to dispute it with him, excepting Sir G. Ballingall, to whom he had replied in the *Lancet*. Mr. Litchfield, of Twickenham, stated his opinion to be in accordance with that of Mr. Wilson. Mr. Coventry, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Grubb, and others, who had acted as jurymen, deposed that the proceedings were conducted by Mr. Wakley with decorum, fairness, and impartiality; and that they had lost confidence in me on account of my having been reported to have lunched with the officers!

The proceedings were then adjourned to the following morning, when Mr. Serjeant Wilkins addressed the jury for the defendants in one of the most powerful and energetic speeches ever delivered, which occupied nearly six hours. Colonel Shirley, who had been a Captain in the 7th Hussars at the time of the inquest, was then called, and deposed that the Deputy Coroner had examined him during the absence of Mr. Wakley and the jury; but that he was not allowed to be sworn, and that the Coroner had behaved very uncourtously to him, and he thought had conducted the proceedings with considerable levity. The next witness, Colonel Whyte, who commanded the regiment, complained of the conduct of Mr. Wakley, and considered that he had admitted extraneous evidence with a view of damaging his character, without allowing him to rebut it. Sir David Baird, who was next called, had attended the inquest out of curiosity; and his opinion was that the Coroner had shown a desire to exclude evidence favorable to the military authorities, and to receive anything that might prejudice

the public feeling against them. Serjeant Darling deposed to the same effect ; and stated that the Coroner had a private interview with Mathewson and Elsworth, two discontented soldiers, during the inquest ; another soldier named Hooper made the same statement, which was denied by the landlord of the public house. Two or three reporters were then called to prove their reports of speeches made by Mr. Wakley at some meetings on the subject of flogging.

The trial was again adjourned, and the next day Dr. Warren, the regimental surgeon, who had witnessed the punishment of White, was called, and he affirmed that the back had completely healed, and the man was perfectly well, but that he had caught cold, which brought on fever and inflammation, and terminated in death ; and that he considered his death was in no way connected with the punishment. He complained very much of the treatment he had received from the Coroner, and said it was calculated to place him before the public as a kind of murderer. He had moved for a criminal information against Mr. Wakley, as he had been informed that he (the Coroner) had applied to counsel to draw up a verdict of either murder or manslaughter against the witness. He considered the inquest a one-sided affair altogether. A deposition from Dr. Hall, taken at the Cape of Good Hope, was then read, in which he stated that the deceased's death was not attributable to the flogging ; and complaining that he was prevented being present at the examination of the body at the exhumation. Dr. Reid, whose deposition was taken at the Mauritius, made the same statement, and complained strongly of the Coroner's conduct, as partial and improper ; also, that the inquest-room was more like a play-house than a court of inquiry ; and that the Coroner had acted rudely, and in a bullying manner, towards the witnesses opposed to his views. I was the next witness examined, and I gave an account of

the circumstances connected with the affair as far as I was concerned, and expressed the opinions I entertained. In reply to the Attorney-General, who asked me respecting my alleged lunching with the Officers at the Barracks, I said I was much obliged to him for asking the question, as it afforded me an opportunity to explain the real facts as I have previously given them; and I added that I thought Mr. Wakley had behaved very unfairly towards me, in not informing me of the frivolous objection made by the Jury, that I might have explained the matter to them. Mr. Camden, of Hounslow, deposed that he had attended the inquest, and thought the summing up extremely partial: he did not believe the muscles had been ruptured; or, if they had, that they could cause the inflammation of the heart and lungs. Mr. Hilles, lecturer on anatomy, had never heard of such a theory as that of Mr. Wilson's; and considered it at variance with all medical authority. Mr. Bransby Cooper considered that the change in the muscles was the result of decomposition: and did not believe it possible that a muscle could be ruptured by its own spasmodic contraction; and had heard nothing to lead him to suppose the punishment was the cause of death. Mr. Guthrie declined giving an opinion upon a case he had not seen himself. Mr. Todd agreed in opinion with Mr. Bransby Cooper. Mr. Bowman also agreed with Mr. Cooper, excepting with regard to a muscle rupturing itself, which he thought might occur.

The Attorney-General then replied on the part of the plaintiff, and after going through the evidence, urged the Jury to shew their condemnation of the conduct of the defendants, by giving heavy damages, as unless they did so, Mr. Wakley could not continue to hold the office of coroner.

The Lord Chief Baron summed up, and the jury found for the plaintiff—damages £350.

Serjeant Wilkins was unable to attend on the third day

from illness; the management of the case for the defendants, therefore, devolved upon Mr. Dearsley and Mr. Jones.

I shall now, having given a brief sketch of the most important facts, make a few remarks on the proceedings generally; principally with a view of explaining some points in reference to my own conduct.

In the first place it should be remembered, that I had no instructions whatever from the Coroner prior to the first examination of the body, beyond the mere verbal message that "I was to pay particular attention to the skin of the back, as a portion of it was missing;" and I knew nothing whatever of the nature of the case, more than the vague report in circulation. When I arrived at the Barracks and found the true state of affairs, viz.—that the body had been examined, and a report forwarded to the Horse Guards; that the man had recovered from the flogging which had taken place some weeks previously; and that the body itself was in an extreme state of decomposition; I concluded that Mr. Wakley merely wished me to re-examine the deceased, with a view to calm the minds of the Jury, who would be more likely to give credence to a person known to most of them, than to the military surgeons who were entire strangers, and might be supposed by the Jury to be interested in the result.

It certainly did not appear to me to be necessary to examine such parts as the spinal canal, &c., which are not usually referred to in cases of death; or to dissect each layer of muscles on the back, when I had found that the superficial, or those which alone could be influenced by the lash, were perfectly sound and uninjured.

It came out at the inquest on the following Monday, that the man had shown partial paralysis a day or two before his death; upon which, as I before stated, Mr. Wakley asked me the condition of the spine, and I replied that I had not

examined it. Mr. Wakley thereupon appeared to me to make this circumstance a point of peculiar importance, and to fix upon me a charge of neglect of duty, which had added considerably to the difficulty of the case. I confess that I felt exceedingly annoyed at this, as I thought he was quite as much to blame in not communicating to me specifically the course he wished me to have adopted; and I expressed myself very warmly on the subject to the medical gentlemen who were at the house when the room was cleared that he might consult with the Jury. Having thus endeavoured to explain why I had not examined the spine, and also repeating that it was a perfectly useless task in the decomposed state of the body, I must say, as I did at the trial, that I think it was very unfair in Mr. Wakley not to have informed me of the erroneous impression the Jury were under, relative to my acquaintance with the officers. I must also be permitted to say, that although I might possibly feel that a compliment had been paid me by the Jury, in selecting me to re-examine the body, that I must consider the compliment was entirely done away with, when they admitted the suspicion that I should "shape my evidence," not according to facts, but to please the officers of the regiment. Supposing I had been guilty of *the crime* of lunching at the barracks, was that to induce me to state an untruth to the coroner, and to compromise my own veracity?

I have before stated that the circumstance itself was utterly untrue; I merely took a glass of wine, which Dr. Warren offered me after the operation, (which had been a most offensive one,) and did not see any of the officers, to none of whom was I at all known. To the best of my recollection, I did not even know at that time the name of the commanding officer, whom I never saw, excepting in the inquest-room, during the whole of the proceedings, and it was not until after the third day of the inquiry, that I was

informed that his brother had married a relative of a most highly esteemed lady, resident in Isleworth, and yet this, forsooth, I find was an additional charge brought against me, and completed the "dissatisfaction" of the Jury. This absurd trash found its way into some of the scurrilous radical papers, and some ribald verses were sung about the neighbourhood, on the subject, for weeks after the inquest.

In order to get rid of the stigma thus thrown on me, I addressed a letter in self-defence to "The Times," and "Herald" Newspapers, and here I cannot forbear contrasting the conduct of the two Editors. The Times, altho' it had taken what might be called the popular view of the question, generously inserted my letter almost immediately, whilst the Herald, which had professed to be opposed to the manner in which the affair had been investigated, never accorded me the indulgence, nor would the Editor even reply to a note I sent him to inquire if it had been received!

With regard to my difference of opinion with Mr. Erasmus Wilson, it was principally founded on what I conceived to be a change of opinion on his part during the interval which elapsed, which he altogether disavows. He however made an attack upon me in the *Lancet*, to which the Editor most impartially permitted me to reply. Notwithstanding Mr. Wilson's assertion that no one but Sir G. Ballingall would venture to dispute the correctness of the conclusion he had come to, I must remind Mr. Wilson that he has never attempted to prove that any anatomical appearances existed to support his theory of the disorganized muscle having caused the thoracic inflammation, and I must beg to say, with all due deference, that the real facts, as we both observed them, strongly tend to an opposite conclusion.

I perceive in the *Lancet* of February 24th, that Mr. Litchfield of Twickenham, has published a letter in which he endeavours to appear as a kind of champion for Mr. Wilson!

That gentleman will I am sure say in this case, "save me from my friends." Not content with his unnecessary testimony to the well-known anatomical and physiological skill and talent of Mr. Wilson, he gives a gentle intimation that he, (Mr. Litchfield) had in his own mind ascertained the precise cause of death, (altho' he had never seen the man either alive or dead,) and as a matter of course was perfectly prepared for the appearances which Mr. Wilson declares were altogether novel even to him! Mr. Litchfield gives also a quiet inuendo respecting the want of anatomical knowledge and experience of those who opposed Mr. Wilson's opinion. Now I must take the liberty of informing him, that both Dr. Hall and Dr. Reid, of whom he perhaps knows nothing, are gentlemen of very great professional skill, and as competent to form an opinion, and to support it by argument, as any members of the profession, but unfortunately they were on the unpopular side, and therefore did not appear to advantage in Mr. Litchfield's eyes. It is to be lamented that persons have not the power, as the Scotch Song says,

"To see themselves, as others see them,"

or Mr. Litchfield would perceive that a wonderful difference might be observed between Mr. Litchfield himself ensconced in his study, framing a facetious article for the *Lancet*, and Mr. Litchfield in the witness box at the Court of Exchequer under the "tender mercies" of Mr. Serjeant Wilkins. I think he will admit that his arguments in the latter "peculiar position" were *not quite so logical* as those "concocted" by his "ain fireside;" and that he has far more practical knowledge of * "a bullet swallowed" than of "a pulpy muscle." With reference to the manner in which Mr. Wakley conducted the inquest, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying, that it would be impossible for any one to have shown more ability, talent, and indefatigable perseverance than were

* *Vide LANCET.*

displayed by him on the occasion ; but at the same time, I should not be expressing a conscientious opinion, if I abstained from saying that he appeared to me, either to be fully impressed with the notion, that the soldier had actually died from the effects of flogging, or that he thought the case presented an admirable opportunity to bring about the abolition of what he styled in his summing up, to be "a disgusting, an odious, and an abominable law." I am borne out in this opinion by his speeches at Exeter Hall and the Craven's Head, neither of which places, in my humble judgment, ought to have been attended by the gentleman who had acted as coroner at the recent investigation. I must also repeat my assertion, that Mr. Wakley was uncourteous and abrupt in his manner to Dr. Warren, Dr. Hall, and Dr. Reid, and that I cannot but consider his exclusion of them from the inquest room on the 20th, and his order not to allow them to be present at the exhumation of the body, unfair and inexpedient.

The refusal to take the evidence on oath of Dr. Warren, Colonel Whyte, and Captain Shirley, appeared at the time very extraordinary, and gave rise to some most unjust reflections on the conduct of those gentlemen, who had merely discharged an irksome but imperative duty. This however has been fully explained at the late trial, with regard to which I must add, I think Mr. Wakley will do himself an injustice, if he fails to publish a full report of it. It will be seen that I take the liberty of differing in some degree from the opinions expressed by the Middlesex Magistrates, but must beg to say, that, as none of them excepting the Rev. Mr. Trimmer watched the whole proceedings, they were not in a position to be enabled to have any decided knowledge of the subject. Mr. Wakley's conduct to me, individually, was courteous, and as far as I am personally concerned, I have only to complain of his not informing me of the fri-

volous objection made by some of the Jury, and of his omitting to take my evidence, with respect to the spinal examination. The defendants at the late trial, did not appear to me to have got up their case with any care, and they certainly failed altogether to substantiate the more important charges brought against Mr. Wakley.

The result of the inquest has been almost entirely to abolish the punishment of the lash, and it must be admitted, whatever opinion may be entertained of his mode of conducting the investigation, or whatever motives may be attributed to him, Mr. Wakley was most undoubtedly mainly instrumental in putting an end to corporal punishment in the British Army, and no doubt is satisfied that "the end sanctified the means."

I am aware that I ought in conclusion to offer an humble apology to those readers who have had patience to peruse the foregoing pages. They are written hastily, amongst numerous avocations, and can possess but little interest to the public at large. I have endeavoured to be brief, and to avoid repetition as much as possible, but an unpractised hand will I fear be visible throughout.

It should be remembered that I have been severely handled by the radical portion of the press, and other parties; and it was said by one widely-circulated journal, that the Jury ought to have selected some one "who had a character to lose;" I therefore could not resist the solicitation of a few friends to endeavour to explain my conduct to my immediate neighbours, and trust, that in so doing, I have not made any remarks that can be offensive to the feelings of the individuals whose names I have had occasion to mention, as it has been my earnest wish and desire,

"Not to extenuate
Nor set down aught in malice."

POSTSCRIPT.

—o—

Since the foregoing pages have been in type, I have been informed by a most respectable member of the Society of Friends, that all sorts of reports prejudicial to my character, relative to the inquest and the late trial, are in circulation in the town of Hounslow and the neighbourhood. I have also been favored with *The Satirist* of last Sunday, which, I perceive, still harps upon my motives and conduct, altho' in a jocular manner.

These circumstances have entirely removed some little doubt I had previously entertained, as to the propriety of putting myself forward in print on the subject; but I now consider it a duty, not only to myself but to my Father, whose reputation, either professionally or otherwise, has never been attacked during a practice of more than 40 years in this parish, and also to my other partner Dr. Mackinlay, whose name has it appears been incidentally mixed up with the matter, to state publicly that there is not a shade of truth in the fabrications so industriously disseminated; that I defy any one to prove that there was the slightest ground for the gross imputation of concealing the real facts from interested motives, thrown upon me by the jury; and that altho' I have not attempted to give any novel anatomical descriptions or scientific explanations, I trust I have proved that I have under all the circumstances adhered conscientiously to the

“ Plain, unvarnished tale ”

it was my duty to offer.

To the Inhabitants of Isleworth generally, I fearlessly appeal for a character; and I trust they will allow me to avail myself of this opportunity to thank them for their generous support on all occasions, and for the favor I have invariably received from them.

H. G. D.

ISLEWORTH,

March 7, 1849.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the foregoing pages have been in type, I have been informed by a most respectable member of the Society of Friends, that all sorts of reports prejudicial to my character, relative to the inquiry and the trial, and in circulation in the town of Haverhill and its neighbourhood. I have also been favored with the 2nd of last Sunday, which I perceive, will hardly pass my master and servant, either in a proper manner.

These circumstances have entirely renewed some little doubts I had previously entertained, as to the propriety of putting myself forward in regard to the subject; but I now consider it a duty, not only to myself but to my Father, whose reputation either professionally or otherwise, has never been attacked, during a practice of more than 30 years in this office, and who to my other name Dr. Haverhill, whose name has it appears been industrially mixed up with the matter, in some public prints, that there is not a single of truth in the Liberator's and Liberator's only statement, that I do not any one to prove that there was the slightest ground for the gross imputation of concealing the real facts from the public, though upon me is the fact; and that I have not attempted to give any novel and original description of similar exhibitions, I now I have proved that I have under all the circumstances, adhered consistently to the

it was my duty to offer
To the Liberator of Haverhill, generally, I have
appeal for assistance, and I am sure that the
avail myself of this opportunity to thank them for their
generous support on all occasions, and for the favor I have
invariably received from them.

H. G. D.

Haverhill,

May 7, 1840.