

to his jury who try the case, and if the druggist or apothecary is proved guilty simply hand him over to the authorities for breach of the statute. Cases of this kind are constantly coming up before the courts in Great Britain and men are put on their trial on a charge of manslaughter and in some instances severely punished.

In such cases the rights of society are assailed, and the offenders are dealt with as the law provides. There is no hardship in this. If for the well ordering of society and for the safety of individuals a law is enacted, which is made public, and which every good man is desirous of seeing carried out, the offender or controvener of that law has no just cause of complaint if made to suffer for his guilty neglect or obstinate refusal to regard the conditions of that law. What shall we say of the court official or of his jury who wilfully neglect to "well and truly try, and a true deliverance make between our Sovereign Lady the "Queen," and the individual so implicated whom they are supposed to have in charge and a true verdict render according to the evidence, to which they called upon God Almighty to help them in making. It is a farce, it is worse than a farce, it almost comes within the meaning of blasphemy.

An individual well known in this community was found by our police in a dying state, he was taken to the Montreal General Hospital and shortly after his admission died; after death in his pocket was found two bottles, one marked aconite, the other belladonna, but no poison label was attached in either case. A hurried inquest was called, no post-mortem examination of the deceased was made, no analysis of the contents of the stomach was ordered, no evidence was sought to be elicited touching the actual cause of death. The man may have died from natural causes, although there is nothing to show that such was the case. The farce of a coroner's inquest was gone through and a verdict rendered of death by disease of the heart. When will our Government apply the necessary pruning knife and put a stop to such monstrous public immorality. Was it to screen the druggist who sold the poison? possibly he may have possessed a physician's order. Such did not appear in evidence before the coroner's jury and it remains a question unsettled to the injury of the druggist. Such things ought not to be.