

on this subject. They all go to show that the Statute of Edward I was right.

Properly speaking there are no sudden deaths of which the cause can be known, except such as happen in the presence of a physician, and which present evident symptoms of disease.

Hence the laws justify the definition given at the beginning of the present Article.

56. The second point to be established is that investigations in these cases of sudden death are necessary, and that they should always take place.

Investigation is really more necessary in these cases than in a good number of deaths through violence.

In the latter, — deaths through violence — it often happens that the murder's act has been perpetrated in the presence of a fair number of witnesses, and it only remains for the Coroner to verify and control the facts known. In truth, there is no investigation or inquest; there is only a report containing written facts of public knowledge.

In the case where the cause of death is unknown, all is mystery, and it is then that it behooves us to rend the veil that prevents our seeing whether crime exists or not.

57. In the case of violent deaths it is generally known before the inquest whether murder has been committed by another, or whether the death is the result of an act of violence which may be imputed to another, or to the victim. It is known that there has been violence; investigation will confine itself to ascertaining whether the violence is homicide or not.

In the first case, by the very fact that it is known that there has been violence, public opinion is aroused, and if the State failed in its duty of seeking for the homicide, citizens would petition it, and homicide would then with difficulty pass unnoticed.

In the second case, by the fact that the death presents as