

combination of causes, and among them the chief was drink and its consequences. Death might result from spontaneous hemorrhage alone.

In order to appreciate the medical testimony, it will be necessary to say a few words about the evidence of the non-medical witnesses. I have already said that it was of a most partial character, and they all, both male and female, seemed to have made up their minds that the prisoner was a brutal monster, although the only act, even of *unkindness* towards the deceased was, having, on the morning of her death, *pushed* her from the door as if to get her into the house. On the defence it was proven that prisoner was uniformly kind to deceased, who, on the contrary, was much addicted to drink, neglected her domestic duties, frequently leaving prisoner either to cook for his children himself, or get some neighbor to do so. That deceased had frequently struck the prisoner, and he had never resented it, and that she had occasionally barred him out of his own house at night, so that he was compelled to sleep at a neighbor's, unless he had broken into his own. A witness from an adjoining parish proved that he had called at the house of prisoner, on the morning of the death of deceased, on his way from Quebec, and that he found her intoxicated at 8 o'clock in the morning, and *blood flowing from her as she staggered across the floor*, and that he, witness, prevented her from falling into the cellar, the trap-door of which had been opened to bring up something for witness. It was also proved that the marks and bruises which one of the above-named medical gentlemen declared were recent, "and had most likely been caused the same day!" had existed for several days. The push referred to was such an one only as was necessary to remove an unfortunate creature from the door, where she was exposing herself in a state not fit to meet the public gaze.

There are several points of pathological interest in this case which it will not be possible to touch upon in this paper as I desire, without making it too long, but I purpose resuming it in your next. It establishes the necessity of the Coroner being furnished with competent and disinterested testimony; that is, testimony unbiassed by any local prejudices or knowledge, but what the evidence before a jury never brings forth. In the present case, such testimony would have prevented the immense cost to the Province, and the harassing persecution of a public criminal prosecution. The medical evidence, also, or medical notes of the gentlemen examined before the Coroner, seem to have been very loosely taken, as one gentleman swears that there was no hemorrhage from the bladder, although it *was not opened*, and the other states distinctly that it *was* opened. Such errors, (for errors there evidently are,) are not creditable to the profession in any case; but more especially so where life and death are involved.

One of the medical gentlemen swears that the violence was the cause