

and he was proved to have been regarded as a sane man by all the persons he had associated with throughout his life, and the *on fact* adduced in his favour was that as a child in arms he had had an epileptic fit. In fact, previous to his crime, there was not apparently one tittle of evidence on which his incarceration as a lunatic could have been justified, and the question whether the crime was in itself so monstrous as to be proof positive of insanity on the part of the perpetrator was decided in the negative by the jury after a very careful trial, their verdict being distinctly approved by the presiding judge. The execution of the sentence was regarded as a matter of certainty, especially as the crime was not one to elicit any outburst of popular sympathy. But almost at the last hour the Home Secretary had the prisoner examined by two medical men, who reported that in their judgment he was not responsible for his actions, and thereupon the sentence was respited. Mr. Cross is not given to err on the side of leniency, and I believe the truth is that evidence was submitted to him which created *grave cause for doubt as to the man's sanity*. It is clear, however, that this evidence ought to have been submitted in public to a court of law, and not to a secret and irresponsible tribunal. Indeed, the Treadaway case furnishes yet another argument for the necessity of a Court of Criminal Appeal.

This very truthful caterer to the columns of the very truthful *Globe* tells us that the crime "was shown by very strong evidence to have been deliberately planned before hand," and he says that "the one fact adduced in the prisoner's favour was, that as a child in arms, he had had an epileptic fit."

I have read to you, gentlemen, all the evidence bearing upon Treadaway's epilepsy, and the epilepsy and insanity of his blood relations, and I now ask you, whether, supposing the *Globe's* correspondent had heard, or read, that evidence, he is not a jewel of a truth hunter.

"Only as a child in arms he had had an epileptic fit!"

What, then, was that seizure which fell upon the unhappy man in the dock, and forced Mr. Gibson, the prison surgeon, to testify that he "was not in a state to justify the further continuation of the trial that day," and which led Dr. Hughes Bennett, on the next day, to say, that having seen the prisoner after the yesterday attack, he thought it "was of an epileptic character, though somewhat more prolonged than usual." Yet this skilled testimony, corroborated by the subsequent investigation of two eminent alienists, deputed by the Home Secretary to examine the convict, and report on the case, did not screen that Right Honorable adviser of Her Majesty from the censure of the London correspondent of the Toronto thunder-maker! How fortunate for the Imperial Cabinet, that Downing street was so distant from the *Globe* office!