

tions of the viscera and blood, which he took to Montreal for analysis.

A small phial which Dr. Dartois had noticed on the wash stand was enquired for, and was found in the dust heap, was also handed to him.

He made his analysis, and determined that the woman had had a miscarriage produced not by natural causes, but the result of some irritant poison. The result of his analysis being that the irritant poison was oil of savine.

The process for the detection of which was detailed as follows:

Portions of the various viscera were cut up, put into an evaporating basin and acidulated with hydrochloric acid and water, and put on a water bath and digested until all the tissues were dissolved, this was filtered through a wet cloth, and the residue washed. The filtrate and washings were then put into another evaporating dish and evaporated to dryness with sand, the residue was beat in a mortar with alcohol and hydrochloric acid and water—10 or 12 of water to one of acid—agitated with amylic alcohol neutralized with ammonia, and agitated with hot amylic alcohol, this was washed with hydrochloric acid and water, and neutralized with ammonia, and agitated again with amylic alcohol, and evaporated, with this residue he tried to obtain colours, but could not obtain any.

Another experiment was made with the blood mixed with alcohol and evaporated, and an extract obtained in the same way was tried upon a frog, also part of extract obtained by the former process was tried, and a frog died. Amylic alcohol tried on another frog, frog did not die. Chloroform did not kill another frog. Oil of savine mixed with chloroform on another frog, he died.

The little phial spoken of contained a small quantity of reddish yellow fluid, much inspissated, and this smelt like pain killer mixed with oil of savine, this mixed with chloroform applied to another frog's back, frog died.

From these experiments the doctor inferred that the deceased had taken during lifetime, enough oil of savine to be absorbed, and to cause death.

The crown failed to make out the connection of the prisoner with the case, further than being supposed to be the father of the child, and therefore the case was withdrawn, and the jury instructed to find a verdict of not guilty, which was accordingly done, without going into the defence. On the moral evidence there is no occasion to comment, there was nothing to prove that the prisoner had any knowledge of the use of oil of savine, or that he had