assistance in diagnosing the cases, for his general interest in the investigation, and for his permission to publish this work.

References.—(1) Clark, E. P., and Collip, J. B., *Journ. Biol. Chem.*, 1925, lxiii, p. 461.—(2) Scholberg, H. A., and Goodall, E., *Journ. Ment. Sci.*, 1926, lxxii, p. 51.—(3) Henry, G. W., and Ebeling, W. W., *Arch. Neur. and Psychiat.*, 1926, xvi, p. 48 (abstr. in *Journ. Neurol. Psychopath.*, 1926, vii, p. 169.

Medico-Legal Notes.

Rex *v.* Albert Thomas Rudge.

This case was tried at the Monmouth Assizes on November 1, 1926, before Mr. Justice Swift. The prisoner is a farm labourer, aged 29 years. He was accused of murdering a girl named Doris Byard, aged 19 years. He lodged at the house of the girl's mother. He had been engaged to the girl. She had, however, broken off the engagement—a circumstance which appears to have greatly upset him. On September 12 he picked up a gun from a corner, in which he had placed it on the previous evening, went into the orchard, and shot the girl before her mother's eyes. After this he made an attempt at suicide. The facts were not disputed, the defence being that of insanity.

A police constable, who arrested the prisoner, stated that the prisoner had, almost immediately, asked "Is my darling girl dead?" The witness produced a letter, written by the prisoner, and found in the dead girl's possession, in which the prisoner threatened to take his own life. Another constable, who was guarding the prisoner in the hospital, on the day of the crime, stated that the prisoner had said, "We had a row in the orchard, and that got my temper up."

The prisoner gave evidence on his own behalf. He stated that he had no memory of any quarrel in the orchard, nor did he remember taking the gun, or shooting the girl. His memory only returned when he found himself in the hospital. He stated that the letter referred to had only been intended to frighten the girl, and so to induce her to return to him. He had only attained the third standard at school.

The prisoner's father deposed that the prisoner had a cut on his head at the age of 6 months, and, later, an illness which affected his head, and made him "unaccountable for his actions." Dr. S. B. Wyborn, Whitchurch, regarded the whole of the prisoner's family as a little deficient in intellect, but he did not think that the prisoner was insane in the legal sense. Dr. E. B. White, Medical

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.73.300.114 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Superintendent of Bristol City Mental Hospital, had examined the prisoner, and had found him apathetic, confused and with defective memory. He considered that the prisoner's story of loss of memory was possible, but he would not go further than that.

Dr. R. Fitzroy Jarrett, Medical Officer of Cardiff Prison, who had kept the prisoner under observation, was called, by the Prosecution, as rebutting evidence. He stated that he had been unable to find any evidence that the prisoner was insane.

The judge's summing-up appears to have been strongly against the theory put forward by the Defence. But the jury found a verdict of "Guilty but Insane," and seem to have made use of the expression "temporary insanity."

Rex *v.* Lesly Gardiner.

This case was tried at the Central Criminal Court on November 15, 1926, before the Common Sergeant. The accused is about 30 years of age, and the wife of a wealthy man. She was charged with stealing a dispatch box, and other articles, from an establishment in the West End of London. The stolen property was valued at £320. The theft occurred on October 7. There were other charges of stealing from a London club. Some of the stolen property had been sold, but it was stated that the owners had been compensated by the accused's husband. There had been a previous conviction for larceny in 1914, when she had been "bound over." The facts of the case were not disputed.

It was urged by the Defence that the accused, although not legally insane, was of disturbed mind. Dr. Porter Phillips stated that he had had her under his care since October. She had recently undergone two operations, and was in a bad state of blood-poisoning. He would not describe her case as one of kleptomania, but he considered that she had a morbid desire to acquire other people's property under an irresistible impulse. The judge remarked that "irresistible impulse" was not a term accepted by that court. Dr. Taplin, of Liverpool, said that he examined the accused in 1914, after her previous act of stealing, and came to the conclusion that she was suffering from what might be called moral insanity. The judge asked what was meant by "moral insanity," adding that he had not heard that expression before. The witness replied that it was a term, well known in medicine, to cover that condition in which people have a bent in a certain direction, and are not able to control it.

The judge declined to accept the view put forward on behalf of the woman. He stated that he could not treat her as a first offender,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.73.300.114 Published online by Cambridge University Press