

in the report of the experts did not prove that the deceased had been poisoned.

It will be observed that M. Hébert limited his attack on the evidence given by the experts to what we believe to have been the most vulnerable point in their report—the physiological experiments. He left entirely unnoticed the symptoms which had been observed before death, and the entire absence of natural disease revealed by the autopsy of the deceased. The objection to the report, founded on the state of preservation of the internal organs of the body, was answered by the statement that the experts did not rely upon that condition as any proof of poisoning, but simply as enabling them to pronounce definitely as to the non-existence of previous disease. The assertion that the extract obtained from the viscera really contained organic matter in a state of putrefaction was met by the statement that the matter with which the dog was inoculated was not the mere *debris* of the organs themselves, but was the product of the treatment of the organs with alcohol at 95 °, and with boiling water, and subsequent filtration and evaporation. The objection that a second dog had not been poisoned by digitaline was answered by the assertion that the experimenters had not thought it necessary; their conviction was complete. Moreover, that the readiness with which a dog vomits was a reason for not administering to that animal digitaline by the mouth. The only way to obviate immediate vomiting was by tying the gullet—an operation which was now allowed to have thrown doubts on the results of all Orfila's experiments. We may observe, however, that this was no answer to the objection that digitaline had not been introduced into the subcutaneous cellular tissue. Another objection, that a larger quantity of the extract of the stomach and intestines had not been given to the dog which recovered, was met by the assertion that the dog was poisoned, although it did not die. Its pulse fell from 100 to 50. It was clear that the poison existed in less quantity in the viscera than in the vomited matters. In answering the objections derived from the action of putrefying substances, M. Tardieu referred to a paper by M. Reveil, now before the Academy, which the writer supposes to have established the fact, that, contrary to the observations of Orfila and other authors, no poisonous substance, such as the cyanide of ammonium, separable by solvents or distillation, is formed during putrefaction. It need scarcely be observed that such an unsupported assertion, derived from a document not in court, would not have been received as evidence in England.

After a long discussion between the experts for the prosecution and M. Hébert in reference to the extract from the soiled shavings, the lat-