

going to be positive.

Q So I suppose what you did here was merely do the best you could without that important assistance, in the first instance?

A. Yes.

Q And after you had got it, you were, like every scientific man, I assume, quite willing to hold a new opinion which came to you from getting new facts, did you not? A. Yes.

Q Were you told by any chance by any of these physicians -- Dr. Myerson perhaps -- that after he had been in jail three or four months he complained that his food was being poisoned, and his counsel took him seriously and had a chemical examination made of his food long before his trial? A. Dr. Myerson told me he had. I don't know that he stated at what date, but I think he said four months after having been brought to trial that he had complained of these matters. I don't think Dr. Myerson said ----

Q Assume the facts were made concrete and propounded later, that what Dr. Myerson told you in general terms were told you in specific terms, that within three or four months of his original confinement and long before his trial he complained his food was being poisoned and that his complaint was taken sufficiently seriously by his counsel so that they had a chemical examination made of his food, that fact would impress you as of considerable importance? A. Yes.

Q As indicating the length of time in which this disease -- perhaps not yet fully developed -- had been developing? A. Yes.

Q And were you also told that within four or five months after his original confinement in jail he had complained that his rest was being intentionally disturbed by loud noises intentionally made on the floor above him so that he could not sleep, and that