which it was laid down that an infant a month old was not " newly born " within the meaning of the Infanticide Act, 1922. The infant in this present case had lived for seven weeks. It has often been noted that juries are reluctant to return a verdict involving a capital sentence in cases, such as this, in which there is a strong probability that the sentence will not be carried out.

Rex *v.* Edwin Gilbert Golding.

This case was tried at Birmingham Assizes on July 15, before Mr. Justice McCardie. The accused was charged with the attempted murder of his wife and his mother-in-law, and with attempted suicide. He is 54 years of age, was in business as a draper, and had always borne an excellent character as a sober, inoffensive, respectable tradesman. He suffers from a large ventral hernia, which had occasioned him much pain and worry, as he had thought that he had some malignant disease of the bowel (his father had died from that cause). Early in the morning of June 7, he rose, made tea, and returned to bed. Some two hours later, he went into the room occupied by his wife and mother-in-law, the latter being a chronic invalid, struck both of them several blows on the face and head with a hammer, and then inflicted a severe wound on his neck with a razor. He consistently claimed to have complete amnesia from the time at which he made the tea to the time, some five hours later, when he " came to himself " at the hospital to which he had been removed.

The facts were not disputed, and the defence was that of insanity. The accused's wife gave evidence that he had lived in perfect amity with her and her mother, for many years. There had never been the slightest quarrel. She knew of no financial cause for worry on his part. He had often complained of headache, and had been in great dread of malignant disease. Fred Storey, a neighbour, who was called to the house at the time of the occurrence, said that the accused man " looked insane, with his eyes bulging out of his head," and made no reply when asked what he had been doing.

Dr. M. Hamblin Smith, medical officer of Birmingham Prison, had kept the accused under special observation, since his arrival at the prison on July 9, and was of opinion that he was insane at the time of the offences. He regarded the accused man's alleged amnesia as genuine.

The defence adopted the course, which is somewhat unusual in this kind of case, of calling the accused man as a witness on his own behalf. He stated that he had no recollection of having committed the offences, and assigned the limits previously mentioned for this amnesia. He was not cross-examined by the prosecution.

The jury found that the accused was guilty of unlawful wounding, but " insane at the time of the acts," and the customary order for detention was made.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.75.310.478 Published online by Cambridge University Press