
E. NORTH SHIELDS POISONING CASE
GILBERT V. FENWICK AND

Monday before WILLIAMS was taken to the County Jail, he received a writ of inquiry, signed by Judge HARRIS, for the damages claimed by him, for the loss of his wife and child, as defendants. The damages were \$10,000.

He was employed, instructed by the court, to prepare affidavits for the plaintiff; and he was also employed, instructed by Judge HARRIS, to prepare affidavits for the defendant.

"—Gentlemen of the Jury, what damage Martin Williams sustained, and singular the goods, clothing, and furniture, deceased, is estimated at \$10,000, and the Court of Exchequer has awarded to him and Robert Septimus Pease against them, for that sum, with interest from the time of the said Jane Williams' death. He was employed as surgeon's assistant, and he was killed in that behalf, and so I have conducted them to you."

The jury returned a verdict in favor of the plaintiff, and awarded the said Jane Williams' estate the sum of \$10,000, with interest from the date of her death.

big and deadly monster which ought not to be allowed to exist. James Gillespie, in his suit John Gillespie, to have sold medicine, and before the court and swallowed the medicine afterwards, and with the mid suit, died; and administrator as aforesaid, purchaser, and of Anna Gillespie, the children of John Gillespie, the children of the said John Gillespie, who died, claimed \$1,200; and the said John Gillespie said Martin Gillespie had, sought to recover against H Robert Septimius Pegg for pneumonia. But because it was what damages the administrator as aforesaid; both damages the said Martin Gillespie, both sustained as aforesaid; as for his counsel, Sheriff of St. Louis.

The state county attorney, Court of Eschschwege, said to be taken as by the court. I am commanded. The court will appear by the public inquiry. The court and jury, said—Y. The inquiry before you, said—Y. I wish to shorten this case by saying you that the parties are by which those duties are lightened by the defense. The court said the plaintiff's case is pleasant consequence to bring up the malice which have, I understand, and which, if they be extended painful feelings as the representative of those who were caused by an unfair result of these who were not. Mr. Penwick and his partner, and death result.

intended to be part of the trial which ultimately became fixed in the death of the plaintiff. I made no such remark, because I knew which I have to offer on behalf of my client. It appears that on March 10, 1906, a bottle which contained a potent poison was found in the house and in an hour and a half was a dead person. The fact that the medicine was a deadly poison, as of strychnine. How it came there—It is not for me to say. I am a lawyer, not a law the defendant, make him the agencies of those he employ. Mr. Fenwick, or as far as I know, no evidence trace—no intelligence to the actual homicide. Pearl. They are present combined position of a man on the day when the woman's wife, they had been

of Mr. Peart were present whose personal negligence brought about. But the law for the netted the public; and the law for the loss sustained by through the death of t have great pleasure far as regards the pain mind of Mr. Peart connected with such a same time, in claim a gentleman as Mr. Peartness the feeling of Man does not eliminate, as suffered.

our to appear on beha of Mr. Peart. My hearties—and done in term of the defendants; I farmer I expected of his cause of painful feel

olent, the defendant have for a man who has lost their mother, have they consensually or illiberal spirit. variations, and I may have. I have to express, a deepest regret that the acts of some one, for whom My friend has personal negligence. I trust they will continue to give attacks to them. The medicine was wrong. Be competent as they have, they are liable for the acts of negligence, and sensation. It will be seen that, £20 for each of the children—two is eighteen years old. If you see that amount. If you if they were satisfied

DR. COLENSO.
I am presented on the part of the
BISHOP, D.D., LORD BISHOP OF
IRELAND, and Bishops of the
Ireland, address you to the
you shares with us the same
office. It is impossible for
with you as to your method
believe to be the first and
rest all our hopes for the
question whether you are
sufficient office and position
and, that question is before
in the Church in the
your diocese and province
you another view of the
(Part II., p. xiii. of your
Critically Examined the
h you voluntarily profess

We understand you also have not abandoned the use of the Ordination Service and must require from others a deliberately believe all the Old and New Testament are you, "It is impossible for those who think with a rational Service, and consider the offices of the Prayer Book as assuming the truth of ex. Now, it is an inconsistency between the official position now causing great pain to us. And we solemnly call the most serious attention to your own conscience, which you have subjected to no longer discharge which you have subjected to, through earnest prayer may, under the guidance to a state of belief in conscience again to discontinue; a result which, from

we should welcome
 We are, your faithful

Marcus G. Armagh, B. D.
 meim, C. E. Winslow, H.
 Shiffeld, T. Ely, S. Oron
 Manchester, J. Chester
 W. K. Sarum, Auckland
 John T. Norwich, J. C.
 Carlisle, H. Worcester
 H. Meath, Plimcot
 Ferns, Robert Coshel
 and Dromore, William
 Cloyne, and Ross, H.
 F. Sydney, F. E. The
 T. Spencer, late Bishop
 op.


