

recession of a fit, that the epileptic is to be feared; *then*, indeed, some are supremely dangerous.

Mr. Justice Lush, as in duty bound, complimented the jury on their polite acquiescence in his own very erudite view of the whole case, including the hypothesis of the prisoner's failure of "endeavour to ransack the house"—a supposition unsupported by any tittle of evidence.

All judges have served a sufficiently long apprenticeship at the bar to render this sort of jury blarneying a chronic infirmity, and we need not wonder, when they become suddenly inspired by the prospect of donning the fatal black cap, that they should court the sympathy of their dozen of scapegoats.

How much might it have mitigated the painfulness of his Lordship's position, had he but known in time, that within the precincts of London one profoundly wise admirer was about to indorse his decision. Who, other than the correspondent of the *Toronto Globe*, should, or could that indorser be?

That no obscurity may rest on this after-piece of the Treadaway drama, I now offer to your admiration the following extract from the *Globe's* "London Correspondent's" letter, which appeared in *Toronto* on the 20th of March last.

HOMICIDAL MANIA.

The never-ending discussion as to homicidal mania has been revived once more by the unexpected pardon of the so-called Pimlico murderer. A few weeks ago a young man named Treadaway shot a retired tradesman in Pimlico under circumstances of peculiar brutality. Treadaway was engaged to be married to the niece of the man whom he murdered. He made a further attempt to kill the wife of the murdered man, and finally made good his escape with great apparent self-possession and presence of mind. He was captured shortly after, and the evidence against him was so overwhelming that he practically made no endeavour to dispute his guilt. The crime was a singularly brutal and unprovoked one. It was shown by very strong evidence *to have been deliberately planned beforehand*, and the only possible line of defence was that adopted, namely, that the prisoner was not in his right mind when he perpetrated the murder. No doubt the fact of a man's committing a very brutal crime under circumstances almost certain to secure his detection, and without any very apparent adequate motive, is strong *prima facie* evidence of insanity. Under our system, however, of criminal jurisprudence it is impossible to elicit the whole history of a prisoner's antecedents, unless they can be clearly connected with the offence of which he stands accused. It is, to say the least, possible that if the history of the relations between Treadaway and the family of the girl he was engaged to could have been investigated, some explanation might have been forthcoming as to the *possible motives for the crime*. As it was, the evidence to show that Treadaway was a lunatic *broke down* completely at the trial,