M.'s father said that the lad would be placed under skilled medical treatment. On one Good Friday, when engaged in painting pictures of the crucifixion, M. became so obsessed with the scenes that " they had to take his thoughts right off the subject."

The magistrates dismissed the case, under the Probation of Offenders Act.

There would appear to be ample evidence of abnormality in this lad's case. But the existence of true " dual personality " is not so plain, judging from the details given in the report. There may, of course, have been other evidence, of which we know nothing. M.'s conduct in the shop, and when confronted by the detective, reads very like what we should expect in an ordinary case of theft. While not denying the occurrence of dual personality, there can be no doubt that the condition is a rare one. Such a defence, in a criminal case, should be received, and is received, with great caution. That the magistrates acted as they did does not necessarily imply that they accepted this defence. They may have had quite other reasons for their action.

Rex *v.* Ellen Beatrice Carvell.

The accused in this case is a married woman, æt. 32, living at Worcester. She was charged with the attempted murder of her two children, æt. 3 and 5 respectively, and with attempted suicide. On December 28, 1928, her neighbours heard groans proceeding from her house. They found the doors locked, broke a pane of glass, got through the window, and found the accused and the children lying on the floor of the kitchen, with the taps of a gas stove turned on. The children were on cushions, which were placed on a rug, with toys and halfpence beside them. The accused and the children were taken to hospital. A letter was found pinned to the under-vest of the accused, addressed to the Coroner, and stating that she intended to end her life and the lives of the children on account of neglect on the part of her husband. There was also a letter addressed to her husband, in which she expressed the wish that she might " haunt " him to the end of his days. When committed for trial by the magistrates she was granted bail—a course which is unusual in cases of this kind.

The case came before Mr. Justice Roche, on January 28, at the Worcester Assizes. A plea of " Guilty " was entered, but the judge refused to accept this plea, saying that the accused had never been under observation, and that it was evidently desirable that her mental condition should be investigated. He postponed the trial

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.75.309.304 Published online by Cambridge University Press

until the forthcoming Monmouth Assizes, and directed that the accused should be kept under observation in Birmingham Prison.

On February 8 the case came on again, at Monmouth, before Mr. Justice Roche. The undisputed facts, as outlined above, were related. Evidence was also given that the accused had always been a devoted mother, that she had worried over the fact that she was pregnant, and especially at having been told by a midwife that another confinement would be fatal, and that she was very sensitive about being deaf.

Dr. M. Hamblin Smith, medical officer of Birmingham Prison, stated that she had been under his observation since her appearance at Worcester. Having regard to all the circumstances, he was of opinion that there was good reason to consider that she was insane at the time of the act, in that, although she knew its " nature and quality," she did not know that it was wrong.

The jury found a verdict of " guilty but insane," and the usual order for detention during His Majesty's pleasure was made.

The delay which occurred in the final disposal of the accused indicates the objections which exist to the granting of bail in a case obviously requiring careful observation and investigation.

Rex *v.* Joseph Reginald Victor Clark.

This case is of interest in raising the question of what value should be attached to a confession made by an accused person.

Clark was 20 years of age, and was charged with the murder of a Mrs. Fontaine, to whose daughter he was engaged to be married. The murdered woman had annoyed him by repeating some objectionable remark made against him by a third party. He seized her by the throat with such violence as to cause suffocation. He then made an attempt to throttle the daughter, and inflicted injuries upon her throat with a pointed instrument. He was advised that the only possible defence would be one of temporary insanity, but he appears to have considered that no such plea could be successful. The case came before Mr. Justice Finlay, at Liverpool Assizes. Clark adopted the course (unusual in charges of murder) of pleading " Guilty." The learned judge asked him whether he thoroughly understood that he was pleading " Guilty " to a charge of murder, and whether he clearly realized what was the only sentence which could follow the acceptance of such a plea. Clark having replied in the affirmative, the plea was accepted, and the death sentence was passed.

Clark subsequently appealed, and asked that the case should be sent back and tried upon the indictment. The reasons he set out

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.75.309.304 Published online by Cambridge University Press