Abraham Verity, Esq., Surgeon, Bridgend, sworn:—Has examined the body of deceased, and found the small intestines and peritoneum very much inflamed; the stomach was ulcerated in various places, and at its depending portion there was an orifice, through which its contents had escaped into the cavity of the abdomen. Attributes this orifice to the effects of ulceration. There were patches of the stomach in a gangrenous state, and the pyloric orifice of the stomach was very much indurated and gangrenous, all of which he attributes to the effects of inflammation. Witness is of opinion that deceased had been labouring under chronic inflammation of the stomach, and that Baron Spolasco, by exhibiting drastic medicines, produced acute inflammation, which ended in gangrene and death. Is of opinion that the medicine now produced, which the Baron gave another patient, is composed of aloes and jalap, which would, if administered to such a subject as deceased, who was weak and delicate, have accelerated her death.

Elizabeth Arnott recalled:—The Baron appeared to have only one sort of pills, folded in pink and blue paper, and one sort of powder in white paper, which were given to every patient, with the same directions to every packet, no matter what the disease was. Witness was in the room and saw ten or twelve persons have exactly the same medicine as he gave her niece, the deceased. The medicine now shown her, which was given to another patient, is exactly the same as the Baron gave deceased.

John Llewellyn, Esq., Surgeon, Cowbridge, sworn:—Attended deceased about four months ago, she was then labouring under irritability of stomach, which was liable to end in inflammation. Thinks deceased, from what he had heard, had inflammation of the stomach. Witness then corroborated Mr. Verity's testimony about the medicines.

The Jury brought in a verdict of *Man-slaughter* against the "Baron Spolasco."—*The Cambrian*, Feb. 2.

kindness to inform me if I am entitled to it, and, if so, in what manner I am to proceed against the Coroner to obtain it.—I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

JOHN STORY.

Mile-End-road, Feb. 20th, 1839.

* * We have stated, repeatedly, that the medical witness cannot enforce the payment of the fee from the Coroner, unless he be summoned *by that officer*. A summons signed simply by the *constable* does not, in any case, entitle the medical practitioner to the fee which was awarded by the Medical Witnesses' Act. We begin to suspect that some of the Attorney-Coroners are in the habit of resorting to the trick of making *the constable* sign the summons merely for the purpose of annoying medical practitioners—of subjecting them to vexation and loss of time. Nobody knows better than the Coroner that the medical witness is not entitled to the fee unless he be summoned by the Coroner, and in accordance with the provisions of the Act. When the members of the medical profession are prepared to act *in union* throughout the whole of England, as the medical practitioners have recently done in Middlesex, then medical Coroners will be elected to preside at inquests, and medical witnesses will be treated as gentlemen, and, with a due sense of justice, by the officer who presides in the Coroner's Court. Medical practitioners should understand that, by the new law, the constable, in summoning medical witnesses, when he acts otherwise than as the mere messenger of the Coroner, is a nonentity in law as well as in fact. We again repeat that the summons must be signed by the Coroner himself, or the medical witness is not entitled to his fee.

MEDICAL WITNESSES AT INQUESTS,
SUMMONED BY THE CONSTABLE AND
NOT BY THE CORONER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—On the 19th inst., I was summoned to attend an inquest to be held on the body of Joseph Russell, who was found hanging in his room on the Sunday previous. I attended, according to the summons, which was signed by the constable and issued in the usual manner. After the several witnesses were examined, the jury thought there was no occasion for the medical evidence, and they would thus save the county the expense. The Coroner has refused to pay me the usual fee. Will you have the

OFFICE OF CORONER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—Mr. Burchell, and other philosophers of the same school, tell us that the office of Coroner is "strictly judicial." This is half true, and *half* the truth is a boon that the lawyers know full well how to appreciate. But they tell us, also, that if a Coroner be acquainted with the laws of organic life he must become a "witness" as well as a judge. This is *all* false. There is a medial character, however, to which they will not advert, namely, that of the advocate,—the searching, penetrating, inquisitive advocate.