visible, so that effectual cleansing presents no difficulty. The front part of the utensil is raised for the convenience of male patients and yet is not so high as would interfere with douching in the case of females, for which this bed-pan, having a capacity of over two quarts, is well adapted. The contents are easily emptied out from this end or over one wing posteriorly. To place it in position it should be laid on the bed between the patient's knees, if possible with the handle end pointing to the patient's feet. He then raises himself to the necessary extent, with or without the help of the nurse, who then pushes or pulls the utensil under him. It is easily adjusted in a correct position on account of the lateral wings serving as handles for the patient to grasp. The utensil has a well-fitting cover, shown in Fig. 3, which is a perspective

FIG. 3.

view of the whole. Both utensil and cover are substantially constructed in glazed earthenware and their weight in consequence may be regarded as a drawback. Dr. Pitt-Taylor, however, says that this is amply compensated by the various advantages which the utensil possesses. The "bed-easee" can be obtained from Messrs. James Woolley, Sons, and Co., Limited, of Manchester. The price is 11s. without the cover, or 14s. with the cover.

A NEW EYE-DROP BOTTLE STAND.

THE accompanying illustration shows a portable and compact eye-drop bottle stand which was designed by me on the ordinary cruet principle, and has been supplied to the Guest Hospital at Dudley by Messrs. Mayer and Meltzer of 71, Great Portland-street, London, W. It is circular in shape, eight inches in diameter, and holds one dozen one-ounce drop bottles with ground glass stoppers, which serve as

droppers. It is a great improvement on the ordinary wooden stands which hold from four to six bottles and which so frequently get upset. This stand is made of electro-plated metal. It has been in use for nearly two years and is still in perfect order. I can recommend it strongly in the out-patient departments of the eye hospitals or in the eye out-patient departments of the general hospitals; the number of bottles which it holds being one dozen the surgeon has at his command so many varieties of eyedrops in different strengths.

S. B. GADGIL,

Late Senior House Surgeon, Guest Hospital, Dudley.

MEDICINE AND THE LAW.

"Christian Science Treatment."

AN inquest was held recently at Richmond upon the body of Mary Elizabeth Dixon, 58 years of age, who when suffering from bronchitis refused medical aid and preferred to rely upon "Christian Science treatment." This was administered by Edith Davidson who explained at the inquest that she was not a "practitioner" but only a "student." Her intervention had been successful, she said, on a previous

occasion when the deceased had a cold, but owing to her "lack of understanding" in the more serious case of the bronchitis it was ineffective and the patient died. The deceased had also been attended by Bessie Hales who said that she was a trained nurse of nine years' experience recently converted to "Christian Science." The coroner, Mr. M. H. Taylor, questioned these two witnesses closely as to their tenets without extracting anything very novel to those accustomed to the answers given by "Christian Scientists" in similar circumstances. The jury returned a verdict of death from acute bronchitis in accordance with the medical evidence and at first added that the death had been accelerated by the gross neglect of the two women mentioned and especially by that of the ex-nurse. The coroner, however, pointed out that this amounted to a verdict of manslaughter and at his suggestion severe censure for the neglect to secure medical aid was substituted for the addition.

Medical Evidence in Cases of Cruelty to Children.

Charles George Golden Rushworth, solicitor and secretary to the York education committee, and his wife Sarah Katherine Rushworth were charged recently under five summonses with repeated acts of cruelty towards two girls, aged respectively 14 and 13 years, whom they had adopted. The cruelty consisted in treatment of the kind usually to be found in such cases—insufficient food, insufficient clothing, compelling to sleep in unsuitable circumstances, beating, drenching with water, scalding, and burning with hot iron. The summonses were heard by the petty sessional bench of the Eastern Ainsty division and the defendants were convicted, the man being fined £50 and ordered to pay the costs of the prosecution, and the woman being ordered to be imprisoned for nine months in the second division and to pay the costs of the prosecution. The case has been fully reported in the newspapers and contains features, as has been suggested above, common to others of cruelty to children and young persons in a helpless position. In particular, it will have been observed that as to the acts alleged there were direct contradictions by the witnesses on either side and explanations given by them or by counsel with regard to these acts, creating a conflict of evidence only to be determined by the impartial testimony of independent observers. This was supplied by two medical witnesses, Dr. Robert Draper and Dr. William Arthur Evelyn, who had examined the children before proceedings were taken and who spoke to their improvement since their removal to suitable surroundings. They agreed that the various scars which they found were consistent with the children's stories of burning with a flat-iron and with a poker, with kicks upon the shin, and with the other treatment described, and, equally important, that they were not consistent with accidental or self-inflicted injury arising in the various ways alleged by the defence. A small but important point was brought out in the evidence of Dr. Draper where he said with regard to certain scars upon the foot of one of the little girls that she accounted for them by saying that she had caused them herself. There could have been no reason why she should not have imputed them as well as the other marks on her person to the female prisoner if she had been bringing false accusations against her. Considerable importance must have been attached by the magistrates who heard the case to the medical evidence as to the increase of weight in the child who had been ill-treated for a longer time than the other. This little girl, who when first rescued weighed about 5 stones 3½ pounds, after six weeks of kind treatment and proper feeding weighed 6 stones. Such a fact where a child is said to have been starved is one from which any layman can draw his own conclusions and must always be difficult for the most ingenious defender to explain by any theory consistent with his client's innocence of deliberate cruelty or neglect. Another point in the case of the Rushworths, for which a parallel could be found in many of the noted trials in which cruelty to children has been charged, consisted in the allegation by the defendants that one of the children was "dirty in her habits," in order to justify their denial to her of proper bedding and clothes. This, again, was dealt with by the medical evidence, with the explanation that any incontinence if it existed was likely to have been caused by the treatment to which the little victim was subjected. Of course, in no circumstances could it justify or excuse severity or cruelty. No question was raised as to the mental condition of the female prisoner. We understand that the male defendant is about to appeal from the sentence.