awaiting his trial on a charge of quadruple murder is scarcely likely to be in high spirits. He may even be very depressed without exceeding the bounds of the normal. Is he to be considered irresponsible because he is weak and confused in mind? To this the only possible answer is, that it is a question of degree, and that the degree of weakness and confusion of mind that carries irresponsibility can be determined by the jury alone.

Dr. Nicolson's evidence was that he had no reason to think that at any time the prisoner was insane.

Thus, upon a careful examination of the evidence, we find that the reason why the plea of insanity failed was that the evidence was not sufficient to substantiate it. The failure was not due to any undue narrowness in the law, nor to any rigidity of interpretation of the law by the Judge, but simply and solely to insufficiency of evidence, and the conclusion at which we arrive is that the prisoner was rightly convicted.

Reg. v. Tinkler.

Jane Tinkler (24) was indicted for the murder of her child. She had tied an apron string tightly round its neck and thrown it into the river. Counsel for the prosecution, in opening the case, said that the Treasury had instructed Dr. Smith, of Sedgefield Asylum, to carefully watch and examine the state of mind of the prisoner, and he was of opinion that she was not able to plead or to understand the plea. Another doctor had also examined her, and said she had sufficient intelligence to understand the trial. He proposed to put both doctors into the box. His lordship said that if one doctor said one thing and one another he could have no hesitation in saying that the prisoner could and would have to plead. The plea having been taken, counsel for the Crown (Mr. Hans Hamilton) detailed the facts, and told the jury that he thought that their verdict would be that when she caused the death of her child she was of unsound mind.

The facts being proved, Dr. Renton deposed that in his opinion the prisoner was insane. She was undoubtedly of unsound mind.

Dr. Smith was decidedly of opinion that prisoner was of unsound mind when she committed the deed.

Dr. Gilbert (gaol surgeon) had no doubt that prisoner was insane when she committed the deed.

The jury found the prisoner guilty, but not responsible for her actions.—Durham Assizes, Nov. 20 (Mr. Justice Grantham).—"Newcastle Daily Leader," Nov. 25.

The medical evidence in this case was very remarkable. The medical witnesses were allowed to say not only that the prisoner was insane at the time of trial, but that she was insane *when she committed the deed.*

Reg. v. Forde.

This was the case in which a man ran "amok" in a common lodging-house at night, wounding four persons. The evidence showed that the prisoner with six other men slept in one room. About midnight a man who slept in the same bed with prisoner roused the rest by crying "murder." A light was struck, and the prisoner was seen to rush at one Thrustle, who was still in bed. Thrustle fled, but prisoner pursued him out of the room and down the stairs, stabbing him, in all, six times. Prisoner ran off in his shirt, and at half-past five next morning presented himself at the police station, stating that he had stabbed five or six men who had been following him all night with lights. He had then a knife in one hand and a pricker in the other.

Dr. Arbuckle proved that about the time of the occurrence the prisoner suffered from delusions, and that, on the morning on which he was locked up, he declared that he had been running about all night pursued by thirteen or fourteen poachers. The Judge is reported to have told the jury that the main question for them was whether the prisoner was responsible for what he did. The jury found the prisoner guilty, but insane.—West Riding Assizes, Dec. 4 (Mr. Commissioner Forbes, Q.C.)—"Yorkshire Daily Post," Dec. 5.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.42.177.456 Published online by Cambridge University Press