Rex *v.* Albert Edward Davies.

This case was tried at the Chester Assizes on October 22, before Mr. Justive Branson. The accused is 28 years of age, and was charged with the murder of his child by drowning her. The deceased child was one of a family of five children. The mother died this year from tuberculosis. The child herself contracted tuberculosis; measles followed, and *cancrum oris* supervened. Davies was in the habit of sitting up all night with the sick child. On the morning of July 19 he went to the house of his mother-in-law, and said that he had drowned the child as he could not bear to see her suffering.

Medical evidence was given to the effect that the child's state of health was such that the shock of lifting her from the bed might have killed her; and the jury would seem to have accepted this explanation of the facts, and found the accused "not guilty."

The chief interest in the case, from our present point of view, lies in the remarks which are stated to have been made by the learned judge. In his address to the grand jury, referring to the present case, he is reported as saying: "This is a heart-rending story of a father who, driven to distraction by the suffering of his child, takes it upon himself to put an end to its suffering. I cannot avoid saying this, that it is a matter which gives food for thought, when one comes to consider that had this poor child been an animal instead of a human being, so far from there having been anything blameworthy in the man's action in putting an end to its suffering, he would actually have been liable to punishment if he had not done so. That is the state of the law, and we must administer the law." In his summing-up, the judge is reported as saying: "The prisoner was prompted to his act by love for the child, but the law of this country placed so high a value on human life that it did not allow it to be taken, even from the best of motives."

Rex *v.* Mary O'Donoghue.

This woman was tried in the first instance at the Central Criminal Court, before Mr. Justice Talbot, on a charge of child-murder. The facts were of an ordinary character. She was a single woman, and found herself in economic difficulties owing to having the child to support. The child was born on August 19. On September 21 she confessed to having strangled the child, who was then more than a month old. She was found guilty, and was sentenced to death (this sentence being, later, commuted).

The case came before the Court of Criminal appeal on November 7. It was urged, on behalf of the woman, that it should have been

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.74.304.99 Published online by Cambridge University Press