happened, I realized at once that the statement which I had made to the police was false, and I was horribly ashamed, because I deliberately killed my wife and daughter. But for the words 'malice' and 'aforethought' I would gladly plead guilty. There was no malice or forethought." The judge advised the jury that they need not be troubled with the words "malice aforethought."

A verdict of "Guilty but insane" was returned, and the accused was ordered to be detained during His Majesty's pleasure.

Rex *v.* Charlie Benson.

This case was tried at the Central Criminal Court on October 15, 1928, before Mr. Justice Finlay.

The accused, a motor-body builder, aged 25 years, was charged with the murder of Charlotte Alice Harber. The deceased woman had been married for six years, and had two children, the younger being an infant of about twelve months. In February, 1925, the accused came to lodge with the woman and her husband, although they only occupied one room. In August, 1926, the husband discovered that his wife and the accused were having improper relations, and ordered the latter to leave. After two days, however, the accused was allowed to return, but to a different room in the house. About October, 1927, the husband again ordered him to leave.

In April, 1928, the deceased woman, in the name of Mrs. Benson, engaged a room in Bayswater, and occupied this room with the accused. On September 5 they stayed at a boarding-house in the Euston Road. Next day the accused went to a constable at Coulsdon, Surrey, and said, "I want an ambulance; I have just killed my girl; I did it to prevent her going back to her husband." He then took the constable to a place where the body of the deceased was found, with a wound in the breast.

The defence was that of insanity. Counsel urged that passion had rendered the accused insane, in the legal sense of that word, at the time of the act. The accused's mother gave evidence of the existence of insanity in the family.

Dr. Watson, medical officer of Brixton Prison, was called, and stated that he had found no signs of insanity in the accused. He is further reported as saying that he "agreed that the accused might not have been able to distinguish, at the time, between right and wrong, because of his passion." (The newspaper report of Dr. Watson's evidence is, unfortunately, very scanty. It is probable that many details have been omitted.)

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.75.308.128 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The President, at the request of Her Royal Highness, then presented the other members of the Deputation, namely:

NATHAN RAW, Esq., C.M.G., M.D., F.R.C.S.E., The *President-Elect.*

HAMILTON MARR, Esq, M.D., F.R.F.P.S., The *Ex-President.*

JAMES CHAMBERS, Esq., M.A., M.D., The *Treasurer.*

REGINALD WORTH, Esq., O.B.E., M.B., The *General Secretary.*

JOHN R. LORD, Esq., C.B.E., M.D., F.R.C.P.E., *Co-Editor* of the *Journal of Mental Science*, representing the *Registrar*, who was unavoidably prevented from being present.

After some conversation, during which Her Royal Highness evinced great interest in the nursing of the mentally afflicted, in the welfare of the mental nurses, and in the work of the Association, Her Royal Highness withdrew. The Deputation then left, each member being much impressed by the kindness of Her Royal Highness's reception and the charming way she had spoken.

The Association in General Meeting assembled on the 23rd day of November, 1928, received and approved the Report of the Deputation with acclamation.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.75.308.128 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nothing of what had happened. Dr. Grant cited the case of a man who threw his baby into the sea at Blackpool, in the presence of twenty witnesses, and then went up to one of them and said, "I have thrown my baby over the pier." That man had been found guilty but insane.

The judge, in his summing-up, said that there could be no doubt that Bagguley was an epileptic. It might be difficult to understand how a man in that condition gave rational answers to questions. But if the jury could reconcile Bagguley's conduct with the theory of post-epileptic automatism, they must return a verdict of insanity. The judge added that the public were very much indebted to men who devoted their lives to the scientific investigation of such a difficult problem as that of disease of the brain.

The jury found the accused "guilty but insane," and the usual order for his detention was made.

The newspaper report is, unfortunately, not at all clear as to whether the accused actually remembered what he had done (a sufficiently rare occurrence after post-epileptic automatism), or had only realized what he had done when the facts were placed before him.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.75.308.128 Published online by Cambridge University Press