

have been definite in their formations if the substances had been the same; if tartar emetic had been present in the urine Dr. Williams tested with nitric acid, that acid would have given a white precipitate; I have made the experiment; I know well the laboratory room at the Maryland Institute, and I fitted it up; I know Professor Tonry's scales, and I do not think any reliance could be placed in delicate weighings made in the Maryland Institute building; the building is shaky, and the continual passing also interferes; the building is on made ground; I saw the spots showed by Professor Tonry; I could not say from the appearance of those spots whether they were antimonial or arsenical; in my opinion they resemble arsenical spots; in the 1-16th part of the solution used by Professor Tonry there was 1-64-100ths of a grain; then each spot would contain 1-832d of a grain; Professor Tonry said he had four milligrammes, and that it was equal to six-tenths of a grain; I find by a calculation that it would have been 6-100ths of a grain—ten times less; I do not believe that such minute spots could have been manipulated; so far as his manipulation of the spots goes it gave rather negative proof of the presence of antimony; if he had had a precipitate of sulphide of antimony and dissolved it in potash, and added tartaric acid, he would have gotten a yellow precipitate if antimony had been present in the solution: I never used Prof. Tonry's scales, and don't know that they would weigh the 25-100ths of a milligramme; I do not think that all of Prof. Tonry's tests, taken together, demonstrated the presence of antimony in any portions of the solutions he used; the five last spots he obtained were much smaller than the first thirteen, and I think they were too insignificant for any reliable manipulation; the spots were too small to determine their character; the nitrate of silver test was never carried out, and no precaution was taken to prevent the passage of sulphuretted hydrogen gas into the nitrate of silver; Prof. Tonry showed me a small tube, and it contained a few minute flakes of a light colored substance; I suppose there were only eight or ten flakes, and the average size was about that of a pin's head; I came to no conclusion as to their character; I could not conclude that they had been produced by sulphide of antimony.

Cross-examined by Mr. Syester—If I remember Prof. Tonry's testimony he did not say that he came to any conclusions as to the character of those flakes, but he said they looked more like antimonial flakes than anything else; they resembled more the sulphide of antimony than anything else: they did not look like the orange red sulphide of antimony which I have seen in my experience, but I do not say that they did not look like flakes of that size which sulphide of antimony might give; they did not have the decided orange red color of sulphide of antimony which I have seen, but I would not say that they were not characteristic of the sulphide of antimony in such small quantities; I think I know other metals which would give similar results, if treated in the same way in which Professor Tonry treated his solution with the nitrate of silver

test; chadnum, arsenic or tin would have yielded similar results; I would not pretend to account for the presence of chadnum in a man's liver; it was first discovered as an impurity in the salts of zinc, and, for all I know it may yet be given in medicines; I would not know how to account for the presence of tin in a man's stomach; chadnum occurs in ores of zinc as a sulphide of chadnum; chemists find it in the market, and it is used for the purpose of manufacturing fusible alloys; I think it has also some minor uses in medicine; I should certainly call all Professor Aikin's tests liquid tests; I do not consider a gaseous and a liquid test identical.

Mr. Syester then read from Taylor on Poisons, page 351, and Professor White said he agreed with the author because he stated that the results he reported had been obtained in the absence of organic matter.

Mr. Syester read further, and Professor White said that the metallic sublimate spoken of was the metal itself, but that it was objectionable as determining the presence of antimony.

Mr. Syester further read from Taylor's Medical Jurisprudence, page 127, and Professor White said he agreed that the tests there described were characteristic, but not decisive of the presence of antimony.

Prof. White continued—I did not understand Prof. Aikin to say that the dark brownish precipitate which he obtained from a portion gave him the characteristic results of antimony; in the experiments I took a mixture of yellow jessamine and chloral, passed sulphuretted hydrogen gas through it, dissolved the precipitate in boiling hydrochloric acid, dropped that solution into water and obtained a white cloud; I did nothing with that white cloud; Dr. Aikin treated his white cloud with sulphide of ammonium and obtained an orange red precipitate; I do not recollect that he did anything else with that precipitate, but I remember that he said it was characteristic of antimony; I remember that Taylor also says such a precipitate would be characteristic of antimony; I remember that Professor Aikin, in portion, dissolved his white cloud in tartaric acid; I think the results I obtained were analagous to those obtained by Professor Aikin.

The Court here adjourned until 10 A. M. to-morrow.

The attendance was much larger to-day, notwithstanding the character of the testimony. Among those present were Colonel Brantz Mayer, Hon. Barnes Compton, Ex-President of the Senate of Maryland; Capts. Greer and McAuley, of the navy; and Hon. Daniel Clarke, of Prince George's county.

THIRTY-FIRST DAY.

ANNAPOLIS, January 10, 1872.

The great trial has become as regular and monotonous as a country school, and the proceedings are devoid of sensational interest.

Professor White, of St. John's, was recalled, upon the opening of the Court to-day, for con-