

tioned nor even suspected that recourse had been had to any agent capable of inducing a state of stupor, which in that case would have lasted much longer. On the other hand, our knowledge as a Medical man, compels us to deny the possibility of its taking place under the circumstance of an attempt being made to deprive a woman of her chastity, whether it be considered as the effect of an overexertion or of an amorous extasis. The state of insensibility approaching syncope which is apt to follow these kinds of prostration, are never more than a few minutes in duration, and very seldom such as to occasion a total loss of the powers of the mind or of the body, as contended for in this case.

The Jury therefore have certainly followed the dictates of their conscience, by returning a verdict of guilty against this unfortunate youth: but we also feel no hesitation in saying that, had proper Medical evidence been called, in order to point out the numerous discrepancies which appeared in the evidence of the witnesses on both sides, they might have taken a very different view of the case, and thereby discharged their noble functions with all the knowledge which it was incumbent on them to possess.

A respectable number of citizens are now praying for a commutation of punishment, and we sincerely wish their prayer may be accomplished.

---

**TRIAL FOR MURDER.**—A case of this kind was also tried at the last Criminal Court, and as it involved a question not often to be met with, we will give it some attention.

It appeared in evidence that the prisoner inflicted a wound with a knife in the thigh of the deceased, by which the femoral artery was divided a little below the crural arch, and which proved mortal. Both were in a state of intoxication. It was contended by the Counsel for the prisoner, that, as there was no ground for suspecting that any kind of provocation had taken place on the part of the deceased, to determine the prisoner to attempt at the life of one who had always been his intimate friend, the wound could not have been inflicted with the intention of killing, by the fact of his having only struck him in the thigh, and accidentally wounded the artery; whilst it could not be supposed that a man, without a sufficient knowledge of Anatomy, could at all suspect that a wound in the thigh might occasion death. Medical evidence was had recourse to, in order to prove this assertion. Dr. Grasset, Surgeon to His Majesty's Forces, was called on the part of Crown, and Dr. N. Tessier, the Editor of this Journal, on the part of the prisoner, who both agreed in stating that a wound in the thigh was only mortal, when it involved the artery; it could not therefore be expected that a man, not conversant with the anatomy of the parts, would think of occasioning death by a wound at that place. The Jury accordingly brought in a verdict of Manslaughter.