

The prisoner was sent to the Penitentiary for five years. The father, three years afterwards, was admitted as an insane patient, by Dr. W., into the asylum. He never evinced the slightest ill-feeling toward Dr. W., but very far to the contrary. He recovered his reason, and he and Dr. W., up to the death of the old man, visited each other, and maintained the most friendly relations. The criminal son himself visited the asylum, to see an insane brother, after leaving the Penitentiary, and evinced no hard feeling.

Had Dr. W. understood that it was the duty of a medical witness merely to avoid speaking untruth, and that at the same time he may feel free to withhold most important truth, because it was not sought for, his allusion to the hands of the prisoner would probably not have been made; yet the fact must have had much weight with the jury, as justifying the conclusion that some sort of weapon must have been used by the prisoner.

The second illustrative case was also one of homicide, but was more interesting than the preceding, as it involved the question of the mental unsoundness of the prisoner at the time of perpetrating the act.

The culprit was a man of common rustic position. He had, some years previously, been a patient in the asylum under Dr. W., but left it in a state of mental competency. His insanity seemed to have returned in the form of intense jealousy; and under the promptings of "the green-eyed monster," he one day, in the bush, at sugar-making with his wife, beat her to death with a heavy billet of wood. He then stuffed her head and shoulders into a basket, and went a little distance from the body. The son, a boy of about 13 years, brought the dinner, and found his mother as above stated. He saw his father not far off, and questioned him as to the death of his mother. The man neither denied the deed, nor attempted escape.

At the trial a number of credible witnesses testified to the manifestation by the prisoner of the most palpable delusions connected with his jealousy. The son also gave convincing evidence of this mental condition, and his evidence was the sole direct proof of his father's guilt.

The defence, of course, set up the plea of insanity, and Dr. W. was summoned as a witness. He visited the prisoner in gaol, in company with the gaol surgeon, on the morning of his trial. The prisoner being addressed familiarly by Dr. W., said he did not know him, did not recollect ever having seen him, did not recollect ever having been in the asylum, but people told him he had been there; he did not remember Mr. B., the steward, nor A. B. his keeper. In short, his memory, if he was speaking truly, was a complete *tabula rasa*.

But his health was good, his appetite and digestion were regular, his